

Daniel PETIT

École Normale Supérieure, Paris

CASE SYSTEM AND TRANSLATION STRATEGY IN THE OLD PRUSSIAN *ENCHIRIDION*¹

I. Introduction

The position of Old Prussian in the Baltic language family is relatively precarious. It is the only attested West Baltic language and can therefore only indirectly be compared to East Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian), with which it presents several crucial differences. Furthermore, it is documented only through very few sources, namely: (1) the so-called Elbing Vocabulary (EV), a German-Old Prussian vocabulary of approximately 800 items, which dates from around 1400, but must be a copy of a text written at the beginning of the 14th or the end of the 13th century; (2) Simon Grunau's Vocabulary (Gr), a vocabulary of about 100 Prussian and German words included by Grunau in his *Preussische Chronik* (1517–1526); (3) three Lutheran Catechisms (Cat. I, II, III) published in Königsberg, the first and the second dating from 1545, the third from 1561. Old Prussian, formerly spoken in East Prussia around the city of Königsberg (today Kaliningrad), went out of use around 1700.

Among the major documents of Old Prussian, the three Catechisms are of great importance: they are the only sources we can use to reconstruct the Old Prussian linguistic system, since both the Elbing Vocabulary and Simon Grunau's Vocabulary are merely words lists. Yet they are far from being reliable documents of the Old Prussian actually spoken at that time. Besides the numerous misprints they are filled with, it is obvious that they represent a word-for-word translation of German original texts. Furthermore, it has been claimed that they were written by German-speaking clerics who had no

¹ I am deeply indebted to Steven Young (Baltimore) for having revised my English and to Claire Le Feuvre (Strasbourg) for her comments on an earlier draft of this paper. However, they are not responsible for the textual interpretations or morphological analyses proposed here, some of which they may not endorse. Needless to say, any shortcomings are my own.

knowledge, or a very weak knowledge, of Old Prussian. One should probably assume a complex diglossia, with a poorly educated Prussian flock and a German clergy that usually did not speak Old Prussian².

The Third Catechism or Enchiridion (1561) – the longest document in Old Prussian – is a translation of Martin Luther’s Enchiridion by a German cleric named Abel Will, who was assisted by a Prussian informant, Paul Megott. We have very little information on how Abel Will prepared his translation, but, as far as we can see, the situation can be summarized thus: Abel Will knew, if some, very little Old Prussian³ and his Prussian interpreter, Paul Megott was probably illiterate, but knew spoken German and Old Prussian quite well⁴. One can imagine that Abel Will read single German words and Paul Megott provided an oral translation into Old Prussian, which was then phonetically written down by Will as he heard it⁵. In any case, it seems clear that the text was composed as a word-for-word translation.

Due to the special circumstances of its composition, the Old Prussian Enchiridion presents, especially in the use of case forms, a large number of

² In the preface to the Third Catechism (1561), the Duke of Prussia Albrecht explains that there were at that time very few preachers who had any knowledge of Old Prussian (*das wenig prediger so solcher sprachen kündig* III 7₄₋₅), so that the clergy had to conduct the service through interpreters (*durch Tolcken* III 7₇). This was the reason why he ordered a Prussian translation of Luther’s book for use in preaching.

³ On Abel Will’s knowledge of Old Prussian, see e. g. Bezzenger (1907, 127), Hermann (1916, 14–158), Rysiewicz (1938–1940, 92–101) or Smoczyński (1995, 173).

⁴ In a letter to the cleric Johann Funken (26. July 1554), Abel Will explains that he is working with a translator (*tolken*), but he does not mention his name. He writes that this translator, who knew Old Prussian quite well, had to work at the same time as a serf for the *Hauptmann in Grünhoff* and therefore had little time to work with him. Since Will could not translate the text alone, he asked for some help to relieve his translator from servile work. In a request to the Duke of Prussia forty years later (3. February 1595), written in German probably by a third person, a Prussian called Paul Megott claims to be the translator of the Old Prussian Catechism; he complains he is now an old poor man and needs some help. Such is our information about the authorship of the Old Prussian Enchiridion. For further details see Mažiulis (PKP 2, 244–248).

⁵ Cf. Berneker (1896, 99): “Will fragte Wort für Wort, der Preusse antwortete wie es traf, einmal richtig, einmal falsch”. A different position has been assumed by Levin (1976, 13), who argues that the Enchiridion was recorded on the basis of a spelling tradition already existing at that time in Old Prussian.

irregularities that still require an explanation. The most striking difficulty one has to deal with is the fact that, for example in a sequence of a definite article and a head noun, the different elements can occasionally stand in different cases and show no agreement in case-marking. This of course is at variance with usual agreement principles that appear to be regular in most of the Indo-European languages. As an illustration of this fact one could quote, for instance, the phrase *sen stesmu wirdan* “with the word” (III 61₂₁, 87₂₂), in which the article stands in the dative (*stesmu*), and the noun in the accusative (*wirdan*). Such mixed constructions are usually considered to have resulted from interference of the German original text (*mit dem Wort*), where the article was clearly a dative (*dem*), but the noun was ambiguous (*Wort* can be either accusative or dative). This matter has long been recognized by Balticists and the main facts are already well known⁶. Still, there remain some difficulties I will try to solve in this paper. As we shall see, the problem is more complex than it seems at first glance and involves not only textual interference as a purely superficial phenomenon, but more deeply different levels of code-switching that may be of some relevance for the study of case systems and their evolution.

II. The Old Prussian case system

Our task here is mainly to classify all the relevant types of case disagreement in the Old Prussian Enchiridion in order to identify the main strategies followed by the translator, but first of all it is necessary to present the Old Prussian case system.

There is no consensus on the number of cases itself in Old Prussian. On the basis of the Enchiridion, it seems clear that we are dealing with a system that had at least four cases: nominative, accusative, genitive and dative⁷. This is shown in particular by the definite article, for which we find, for example in the masculine singular:

- (a) a nominative *stas* (e.g. *stas Rikijs ast polaipinnons / der HERR hat befohlen* “the Lord has ordered” III 87₁₉);

⁶ For a discussion of mixed constructions in Old Prussian see especially Euler (1985, 170–179). See also Trautmann (1910, 207–210), Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 70–71 [1943]), Euler (1988, 31) and more recently Zigmantavičiūtė and Zigmantavičiūtė (2000, 34–38).

⁷ See e.g. Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 72 [1943]).

- (b) an accusative *stan* (e.g. *mes turrimai Deiwan stan Rikijan... biātwei / wir sollen GOTT den HERREN... fürchten* “we must fear God the Lord” III 27₉);
- (c) a genitive *stesse* (e.g. *esse stesse Rikijas paggan / umb des HErrn willen* “in the name of the Lord” III 91₂₄), with various allomorphs e.g. *stessei* (e.g. III 51₁₇), *steise* (III 63₂), *steisei* (III 73₉) or *stēisan* (e.g. III 117₈);
- (d) a dative *stesmu* (e.g. *dīnkauti stesmu Rikijan / dancket dem Herrn* “thank the Lord!” III 85₁), with an allomorph *steismu* (e.g. III 57₁₆), *stēismu* (e.g. III 115₇) or *stēismu* (III 117₃₋₄).

Feminine forms of the article present a similar distribution, at least in the singular, but the facts are obscured by a high degree of allomorphy, especially in the oblique cases:

- (a) nominative *sta* (e.g. III 61₁₈) or *stai* (e.g. III 47₁₄);
- (b) accusative *stan* (e.g. III 29₈);
- (c) genitive *stesses* (e.g. III 111₁₆), *steises* (III 115₂₃₋₂₄), *steisei* (III 93₈), *stessei* (III 59₂) or *stēison* (e.g. III 107₂₃);
- (d) dative *stesmu* (e.g. III 17₂₀), *stessei* (III 85₅₋₆), *steisei* (III 89₁₇), *stēisei* (III 133₃) or *steise* (III 91₂₁).

Allomorphy is less frequent in the plural of the definite article:

- (a) nominative *stai* (masc. e.g. III 27₁ or fem. e.g. III 93₁₂);
- (b) accusative *stans* (masc. e.g. III 17₁₄ or fem. e.g. III 123₂₀);
- (c) genitive *stēison* (masc. e.g. III 75₁₂);
- (d) dative *steimans* (masc. e.g. III 67₂), *stēimans* (masc. e.g. III 37₁₅) or *steimans* (fem. III 93₁₁, probably misprint for **stēimans*).

We probably need to reconstruct a similar system with four cases for nouns as well. In the examples given above, we can identify a nominative *Rikijs* “Lord” (III 87₁₉), an accusative *Rikijan* (III 27₉) and a genitive *Rikijas* (III 91₂₄), but the last sentence (III 85₁) shows that an accusative (*Rikijan*) could stand instead of a dative. Strikingly enough, very few dative forms are attested in nominal declensions⁸. The noun *malniks* “child” presents not only

⁸ See e.g. Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 73 [1943]), Stang (1966, 181, 198), Kaukienė (1995, 20–22; 2004, 43–44); on the origin of Old Prussian dative forms see also van Wijk (1918, 86–98), Mažiulis (1970, 106–127), Schmalstieg (1976, 146f.). The existence of dative forms in the Old Prussian nominal declensions has been contested by Smoczyński (1992, 57–58; 1994, 235), who operates with a denasalisation rule

a nominative *malnijks* (e.g. III 115₂₃), an accusative *malnijkan* (III 131₇, 133₂) and a genitive *malnijkas* (III 115₂₇, 121₁₈, *malnikas* III 119₂₂), but also a dative *malnīku* once in III 131₁₇:

bhe schismu Malniku polikins assei, kai... / vnd diesem Kind verliehen hast, das... “(that) you have granted to this child that...”.

From the noun **waldnīks* “sovereign”, attested in the acc. pl. *wāldnikans* (III 91₁₅), we have a dative *waldniku* in III 91₂₅:

sta bousei stesmu Waldniku / es sey dem Kōnige “(be submitted to the authorities) either to the sovereign (or to somebody else)!”.

Another example could be the noun *grīks* “sin”, otherwise attested in the accusative *grīkan* (III 79₁₅₋₁₆), in the genitive *grīkas* (III 117₉) and in several plural forms. A dative *grīku* is documented in III 115₂:

empolijgu grīku / mit gleicher Sūnde “with a similar sin”.

In the plural, a system with four cases can be reconstructed as well. See, for example, the plural forms of the masculine *o*-stem nouns *grīks* “sin” and *waiks* “servant”:

- (a) nom. pl. *grīkai* “sins” (e.g. *stai grīkai ast prastan etwierpton / die sūnde seien dadurch vergeben* “the sins may therefore be forgiven” III 65₁₂₋₁₃), *waikai* “servants” (e.g. *stai waikui* [probably a mistake for **waikai*] *Christi / die knechte Christi* “the servants of Christ” III 95₁₃, cf. the vocative plural *waikai* in III 95₈);
- (b) acc. pl. *grīkans* (e.g. *tāns... wissans grīkans laimintiskai etwiērpei / er... alle sūnde reichlich vergibt* “(that) he widely forgives all the sins” III 45₂₀);
- (c) gen. pl. *grīkan* (e.g. *etwerpsenninn steison grīkan / vergebung der Sūnden* “forgiveness of [the] sins” III 75₁₇₋₁₈);
- (d) dat. pl. *waikammans* (e.g. *steimans Waikammans / den Knechten* “to the servants” III 95₅).

In feminine declensions (*ā*- and *ē*-stem nouns), the picture is similar. Very few dative forms are documented⁹. From a noun **nautē* “misery”, attested in

to explain forms like *nautei* “misery” (III 29₅) or *malnīku* “child” (III 131₁₇) traced back to accusative forms **nauten* and **malnīkun* (< **-kan*). The problem with this account is that it can hardly explain why these denasalized forms should be attested precisely only in dative function. For a critical view on Smoczyński’s denasalisation rule see Mažiulis (1994).

⁹ Contra Smoczyński (1992, 55), the dative *sendraugiwēldnikai / Miterben* “to a co-heir” (III 93₈) does not go back to a denasalized accusative form **sendraugiwēldnikan*

the acc. sg. *nautin* (III 91₄) and pl. *nautins* (III 31₁₅), a dative singular *nautei* is used once in III 29₅:

en wissai nautei / in allen nôthen “in every misery”.

From **gennā* “woman, wife”, otherwise attested in the acc. sg. *gennan* (e.g. II 37₃), gen. sg. *gennas* (III 87₂, 103₂₂), nom. pl. *gennai* (III 93₁₂) and acc. pl. *gennans* (III 93₅), we have a dative plural *gennāmans* in III 93₁₁:

steīmans Sallūbi gennāmans / Den Ehefrawen “To the wives”.

The following table provides a simplified overview of case endings in the definite article and in nominal declensions (masc. *a*-stems, fem. *ā*- and *ē* stems)¹⁰:

Case	Singular		Plural	
	Definite article	Noun endings	Definite article	Noun endings
Nominative	<i>stas</i> (masc.)	-s (masc.)	<i>stai</i> (masc.)	- <i>ai</i> (masc. or fem.)
	<i>sta</i> or <i>stai</i> (fem.)	- <i>o</i> or - <i>i</i> (fem.)	<i>stai</i> (fem.)	- <i>as</i> (fem.)
Accusative	<i>stan</i> (masc.)	- <i>an</i> (masc.)	<i>stans</i> (masc.)	- <i>ans</i> (masc.)
	<i>stan</i> (fem.)	- <i>n</i> (fem.)	<i>stans</i> (fem.)	- <i>ns</i> (fem.)
Genitive	<i>stesse</i> (masc.)	- <i>as</i> (masc.)	<i>steison</i> (masc.)	- <i>an</i> (masc.)
	<i>stesse</i> (fem.)	- <i>s</i> (fem.)	<i>steison</i> (fem.)	- <i>n</i> (fem.)
Dative	<i>stesmu</i> (masc.)	- <i>u</i> (masc.)	<i>steimans</i> (masc.)	- <i>amans</i> (masc.)
	<i>stesmu</i> or <i>stessei</i> (fem.)	- <i>i</i> (fem.)	<i>steimans</i> (fem.)	- <i>mans</i> (fem.)

Finally, one should note that personal pronouns also present a system with four cases, as shown by the following survey:

Case	1 st singular	2 nd singular	1 st plural	2 nd plural
Nominative	<i>as</i> (e.g. III 37 ₁₂)	<i>tu</i> (e.g. III 47 ₆), <i>toū</i> (e.g. III 67 ₅)	<i>mes</i> (e.g. III 27 ₉)	<i>ioūs</i> (e.g. III 89 ₅)
Accusative	<i>mien</i> (e.g. III 27 ₇)	<i>tien</i> (e.g. III 79 ₂)	<i>mans</i> (e.g. III 47 ₈)	<i>wans</i> (e.g. III 67 ₁₄)
Genitive	<i>maisei</i> (III 69 ₄)	[<i>twaisei</i>]	<i>noūson</i> (e.g. III 33 ₉)	<i>ioūson</i> (e.g. III 95 ₈)
Dative	<i>mennei</i> (e.g. III 41 ₃)	<i>tebbei</i> (e.g. III 71 ₉)	<i>noūmans</i> (e.g. III 49 ₁₀)	<i>ioūmans</i> (e.g. III 69 ₁₀)

used in dative function, but is probably a dative singular feminine form. The context is not entirely clear. Mažiulis’ idea (PKEŽ 4, 99), according to which *sendraugiwēldnikai* could be a nominative plural masculine, seems to me even less satisfactory.

¹⁰ See Toporov (2006, 72f.) for a similar overview.

From all the data collected, we may quite safely infer the existence of four cases in Old Prussian (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative), each of them characterized by clearly distinctive endings. The existence of other cases is debated. There are grounds for believing that Old Prussian still had a vocative case, as shown by the form *deiwe* (from *deiws* “god”) in the formula *O Deiwe Rikijs / Herr Gott* “O God the Lord!” attested twice in the Enchiridion (III 83₁₄, 109₆). There is also a variant *deiwa* (III 67₂₁, 117₂₈), probably a recent creation due to the influence of other cases (for ex. acc. *deiwan*) by suppressing the inherited alternation of the thematic vowel **e* (voc.) ~ **o* (elsewhere)¹¹. We find a similar variation in the vocative *tawe* (III 81₈, 85₁₀, 121₂₂) or *tawa* (III 47₁, 47₆, 49₁₂, 65₁₉, 79₈, 83₁₂) of the noun *tāws* “father”; both forms *tawe* and *tawa* are in particular attested in the first line of the Lord’s Prayer (e.g. *Tawa noūson / Vater unser*). But, apart from these isolated forms, which may have been preserved by their formulaic character in religious speech, the vocative is always identical with the nominative, e.g. *mes dīnkaumai tebbe Rikijs Deiws Taws / wir dancken Dir Herr Gott Vater* “we thank Thee, Lord God Father” (III 85₁₂).

An instrumental case has been postulated on the grounds of the pronominal form *sen māim / mit mir* “with me” (III 79₁₉, cf. *sen maim / mit mir* III 81₁₉). The traditional account for this form is that it should be read **manim* (with <ā> = /an/) and compared to Lithuanian *manimì* (instr. sg. of *àš* “I”)¹². The problem is that the preposition *sen* “with” regularly governs the dative (e.g. *sen stawīdsmu / damit* “with that” III 47₈), the accusative (e.g. *sen senditans rānkans / mit gefalten henden* “with folded hands” III 83_{19–20}) or sometimes both cases together (e.g. *sen swaiāsmu Swinton tēmpran krawian / mit seinem heyligen theuren blut* “with his dear holy blood” III 43₁₇), but never the instrumental, which does not exist as an independent case in Old Prussian. Another problem is that the same form is attested once in a context which clearly requires a dative (III 107₁₅):

As N. inma tin N. māim prei ainan Salūbin / Ich N. neme dich N. mir zu einem Ehelichen “I N. take you N. for myself as a wife.”

¹¹ For Schmalstieg (1976, 149), the vocative ending *-a* is “merely a scribal error”.

¹² Thus e.g. Rosinas (1995, 35f. with literature).

This problem has been resolved in different ways in the scholarly literature¹³. It seems, however, that the reconstruction of an instrumental case in Old Prussian is rather dubious¹⁴.

Finally, a locative case has been also reconstructed, in particular on the basis of a masculine *o*-stem form *wirdai* (from *wirds* “word”) in the phrase *en stesmu wirdai / in dem wort* “in the word” (III 97_{16–17}). The ending *-ai* of *wirdai* (instead of an expected accusative **wirdan* or dative **wirdu*) could reflect an old locative **-ai* (< PIE **-oi*, cf. Gr. *οἶχοι* “at home”) that would find a perfect match in the Lithuanian adverb *namiẽ* “at home” (*-ie* < **-ai* < **-oi*)¹⁵. But other explanations are possible. The form *wirdai* could be merely a scribal error for **wirdan*, taking into account the more frequent phrase *en stesmu wirdan*. Or, alternatively, one might suppose that the ending *-ai* comes from the feminine *ā*-stem nouns, where a dative *-ai* is expected (and actually attested in the First and Second Catechisms: *preitickray Deiwas* I 9₂, *preytickaray deywas* II 9₂ / *zur rechten Gottes* “to the right of God”, with **tickrai*, dative of *tickra* “the right [hand]”). Confusions between masculine and feminine nouns in Old Prussian are quite frequent and have probably been caused by the fact that, in the German linguistic system, which constitutes the background on which all the Old Prussian forms are based, gender distinctions were rather evanescent in nouns. An opposite case could be the feminine *ē*-stem noun **pīrē* “community” (cf. acc. sg. *pijrin / Gemeine* III 103₁₁) which appears once in the dative with the masculine ending *-u*: *steismu Piru / der Gemeine* (III 97₁₅). In this particular case, a contamination with the preceding article (*steismu*) may also have played a role.

It is no real surprise that the Old Prussian case system with four basic cases (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative) corresponds exactly to the

¹³ See e.g. Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 110f. [1943]), Smoczyński (1989, 134–141; 1991, 44–47).

¹⁴ It is also possible that *stu* (in *stu ilgimi / biß* “so far, until” III 105₁₅) and *ste* (in *ste mijls / deste lieber* “all the dearer” III 89₈) reflect old instrumental forms (respectively **stō* and **stē*) of the definite article, but from a synchronic point of view they are adverbs, not case forms. Compare also *sēnku / damit* “so that” (< “with what”, III 113₁₂, 125₇)? For a discussion see e.g. Stang (1966, 177f.), Mažiulis (1970, 163); cf. also van Wijk (1918, 81–86).

¹⁵ Thus e.g. Mažiulis (1970, 224, note 1). Differently, Smoczyński (1992, 52; 2005, 361, note 837) assumes that *wirdai* goes back to **wirdan* with denasalisation. Benveniste (1934–1935, 73) considers *wirdai* to be a scribal error for **wirdan*. For further discussion on alleged “locative” forms in Old Prussian, see e.g. Stang (1966, 176f.).

original case system of the German language; the influence of German on Old Prussian is obvious. It seems to me, however, that this influence has not yet rightly received the attention it deserves and has sometimes even been misunderstood. I think it can involve three different levels, which may perhaps play a crucial role, but must be dealt with differently:

(1) influence through borrowing: the linguistic material itself is modified through direct borrowing of German endings into Old Prussian;

(2) influence on the use of case forms: due to German influence the use of the linguistic material is modified;

(3) influence on agreement properties: agreement rules in Old Prussian are modified due to imitation of structural features proper to German.

In the following lines I shall try to examine these three levels of German influence and to determine criteria that could help decide whether they affect Old Prussian as a whole or only the particular context of the *Enchiridion*.

III. Borrowing of case endings in Old Prussian?

Borrowing of case endings is not a trivial issue; it presupposes a situation of deep interlinguistic contamination. For Old Prussian it has been assumed by Wojciech Smoczyński (1992, 63; 1998, 105), who for example tries to derive the Old Prussian genitive ending *-as* from the corresponding German genitive ending *-es*. There are to be sure many contexts in the *Enchiridion* in which we can observe an equation of the type Old Prussian *-as* = German *-(e)s*, as in *Deiw-as* / *Gott-es* “of God” (e.g. III 27₁₃₋₁₄), *mens-as* / *Fleisch-es* “of the meat” (III 45₆) or *Pjckul-as* / *Teuffel-s* “of the devil” (e.g. III 43₁₆), *Tāw-as* / *Vatter-s* “of the father” (III 59₁₆), *Saūn-as* / *Son-s* “of the son” (e.g. III 59₁₆), *geijw-as* / *leben-s* “of life” (III 63₁), *dīl-as* / *werck-s* “of work” (III 89₈), etc. Similarly, Smoczyński assumes that the Prussian ending *-n* which sometimes appears in genitive forms has been influenced by the genitive *-n* of the German weak declension (e.g. *des Herr-en*), e.g. *stēisei prābutsk-an gijw-an* / *des ewigen Lebens* “of eternal life” (III 63₉)¹⁶.

¹⁶ A similar contamination (Prussian *-n* influenced by German *-n*) might also explain certain discrepancies in number observed elsewhere in the *Enchiridion* between German and Old Prussian, such as *wird-an* “word” [acc. sg.] / *Wortten* [dat. pl.] (III 77₆), *kaul-an* “bone” [acc. sg.] / *Beinen* [dat. pl.] (III 85₇), *rānkān* “hand” [acc. sg.] / *hend-en* [dat. pl.] (III 83₅), *Hōfftmann-in* “captain” [acc. sg.] / *Heubtleut-en* [dat. pl.] (III 91₂₆), *vrais-in* “parent” [acc. sg.] / *Elter-n* [dat. pl.] (III 93₂₄), *Wēis-in* [acc. sg.] “fruit” / *Frūcht-en* [dat. pl.]

The problem with this account is twofold. First of all, we have to exclude a large number of counterexamples, for which the postulated equations (German $-s$, $-n \rightarrow$ Prussian $-s$, $-n$) simply do not work. Prussian genitives in $-as$ often correspond to German forms that present either a different case-marker or are unmarked, e.g. *twaisei Tawisch-as* / *deines Nechst-en* “of your fellow man” (e.g. III 35₆₋₇) or *stessei swīt-as* / *der welt* “of the world” (III 51₁₇). Or conversely a German genitive in $-(e)s$ can correspond to a Prussian form with a different ending or no ending at all, e.g. *deines Angesicht-s* / *twaise prosn-an* “of your face” (III 105₁₄), *deines Weibs* / *twaiasei genn-an* “of your wife” (III 105₇₋₈), *des Keyser-s* / *steisei Keiser-in* “of Caesar” (III 91₂)¹⁷. Significantly enough, the genitive of the German definite article *des* corresponds to an Old Prussian form which regularly presents an asigmatic ending, cf. *steise* / *des* (e.g. III 43₁₆, etc.), *stēisei* / *des* (e.g. III 35₁₃, etc.), etc.¹⁸ Similar problems arise when one considers the equation postulated between the Old Prussian (genitive) ending $-n$ and the German weak declension $-n$. In many cases, the Prussian ending $-n$ corresponds to German forms that show a different ending (or no ending at all) and are by no means limited to the weak declension. Particularly illustrative is the phrase *Noūs-on Rikij-as* / *vnser-s Herr-n* “of our Lord” (III 73₁₆), in which endings ($-n + -s$ / $-s + -n$) are apparently reversed. Such

(III 109₈), *dijlan* [acc. sg.] “work” / *wercken* [dat. pl.] (III 125₁₄), *gallan* [acc. sg.] “death” / *Todten* [dat. pl.] “dead” (III 127₁₃), *etnīst-in* [acc. sg.] / *Genad-en* [dat. pl.] (III 131₁₂), cf. also *grēiwakauli-n* “rib” [acc. sg.] / *Rieben* [gen. pl.] (III 101₁₄), *etnīst-in* [acc. sg.] / *Gaben* [gen. pl.] (III 119₅), assuming that the German plural nasal ending was directly borrowed into Old Prussian. Note, however, that the same kind of number discrepancy is to be found also where the German form has no nasal ending, e.g. *rānkan* “hand” [acc. sg.] / *hend-e* [acc. pl.] (III 113₇). See also *wissas etnīstis* [gen. sg.] “of every favour” / *aller Gnaden* [gen. pl.] (III 115₆).

¹⁷ In the latter case, however, the “genitive” *Keiserin* could merely be a scribal error, assuming a reiteration of the preceding (unspecified) accusative *Keiserin* (cf. *dāiti stesmu Keiserin ka steisei Keiserin ast = gebet dem Keyser was des Keysers ist* “give Caesar what belongs to Caesar” III 91₂).

¹⁸ Note, however, the allomorph *steises* (e.g. III 63₁) or *stesses* (e.g. III 111₁₆) with a sigmatic ending that could be due to the influence of the corresponding German *des*. But, even if one accepts this idea, the question is whether this influence took place in Old Prussian itself or only in the Enchiridion. It should be noted that this sigmatic form does not necessarily correspond to German *des* in the Enchiridion (see for ex. *stesses Crixtnas* / *der Tauff* III 111₁₆).

discrepancies between case endings of both languages are quite numerous, so that one cannot simply transpose the German case system into the Old Prussian of the Enchiridion.

The second problem with Smoczyński's account is that it is not clear in his view whether one is dealing here with real linguistic contamination or with textual interference. As far as I can see, Smoczyński claims borrowing of case endings to be a linguistic phenomenon, characteristic of Old Prussian as a recessive language, and indeed he must do so, if he wants to establish that the Prussian genitive ending *-as* was borrowed from German, because this ending is not limited to the Old Prussian Catechisms: it occurs in the Elbing Vocabulary (e.g. EV 484: *silkasdrûb' / sydenslewir* "silk veil", with a gen. *silkas*) and in various toponyms (e.g. *Wilkaskaymen* "Kreis Pr. Eylau" < "wolf's village", with a gen. *wilkas*) as well¹⁹. By this account Smoczyński can apparently rule out all discrepancies observed in the Enchiridion by assuming that, once the new ending has been introduced into the Prussian linguistic system, it does not need to correspond to a precise German counterpart in the particular translation context of the Enchiridion.

Borrowing of case endings seems to me as a rule quite unlikely, unless there is no other way to explain case forms – either through direct inheritance or by secondary morphological processes. Now it is by no means impossible to derive the genitive endings of Old Prussian from PIE or Baltic prototypes. An ending *-n* is exactly what one expects for the accusative from PIE **-m*. It corresponds quite well to the Lithuanian accusative singular ending *-q* (< **-an*, **-ān*), *-ę* (< **-ēn*), etc. Its use in genitive function must be connected with the well-known phenomenon of "mixed constructions" in Old Prussian, which I will discuss at length later in this paper. The feminine genitive *-as* (e.g. *gennas* "of the woman" III 87₂, 103₂₂) probably reflects **-ās* like Lithuanian *-os* (e.g. *rañkos* "of the hand") and may be traced back to PIE **-ās* (< **-eh₂es*, cf. Greek *ἡμέρας*). Only the masculine and neuter ending *-as* (e.g. *deiwas* "of God" III 43₅, etc.) appears to be problematic²⁰. The traditional account is that it comes from PIE **-o-so* like Greek *-ov* (< **-o-so*) beside **-e-so* (in Goth. *dagis*), but this implies assuming a curious difference with East Baltic

¹⁹ See e.g. Mažiulis (2004, 38).

²⁰ For a discussion see e.g. van Wijk (1918, 77), Kazlauskas (1968, 173), Mažiulis (1970, 88–106), Schmalstieg (1976, 144ff.).

and Slavic, which for this case have an ending **-ā*, probably of ablative origin (Lith. *diėvo*, Latv. *dieva*, OChSl. *boga* “of God”). This is perhaps the reason why Smoczyński looked for a German origin, thus eliminating this West Baltic peculiarity. Now one must recognize that other explanations are conceivable. My own view on this matter is that the Old Prussian genitive ending *-as* is analogical to feminine *ā*-stems; in the latter the relationship between an accusative *-ān* and a genitive *-ās* may have provided a model for the spread of a new ending *-as* in the genitive of thematic stems (acc. *-ān* : gen. *-ās*, hence acc. *-an* : x = gen. *-as*). In any case, it is obvious that a configuration acc. *-an*, gen. **-ā* in thematic stems (corresponding to Lith. acc. *-ą*, gen. *-o*) was anomalous: the thematic genitive ending was the only asigmatic genitive ending. Taking this into account, one does not need to explain the ending *-as* by assuming a foreign origin.

In addition, Smoczyński’s account does not explain why the genitive singular *alone* would have been borrowed from German, whereas for the other endings Old Prussian preserved – more or less directly – PIE prototypes; the motivation for such an unusual process is clearly lacking. I thus consider that borrowing of case endings in Old Prussian is unlikely. This does not mean that no textual interference occurred in the Enchiridion between similarly sounding endings of both languages, but this is a different matter I will endeavour to deal with later.

There is, in my opinion, only one context in which case endings seem to have been directly borrowed from the German original text into the Old Prussian Enchiridion. According to a tradition widespread at that time, Latin words preserved in German their Latin endings; this use has been consequently imitated in Old Prussian, e.g. nom. sg. *Jesus Christus* (III 43₁₀, cf. III 61₉, 65₂, 75₁, 103₇, 103₂₂, 113₁₁, 121_{15–16}, cf. *Jesus* III 113₁), *Marcus* (III 73₂₂), acc. sg. *Jesum Christum* (III 45₁₀, cf. III 41₂₁, 63₇, 79₁₂, 81₁₂, 83₁₇, 85₁₃, 109₁₇, 113₂₆, 119_{5–6}, 121₁₃, 127₇, 133₉, cf. *Jesum* III 111₂₁), gen.sg. *Jesu Christi* (III 71₁₈, cf. III 73₁₆, 95₁₃, 109₁₀, 111₁₀, 115₂₈, 117₁₇, 123₁₁, 129₁₅, 131₈), *Marci* (III 61₉), dat. sg. *Christo* (III 63₂₄, 95₁₀), abl. sg. *sen Christō* (III 63₂₄), *esse Christo* (III 73₁₈), *en Christo* (III 123₈, 131₆), *po Pontio Pilato* (III 43₁, cf. III 127₁₁). Adaptation of Latin words to the Old Prussian case system is relatively rare, though one may encounter a few examples such as nom. sg. *Christs* (III 59₁₂), *Marx* (III 111₁₉), *Adams* (III 63₁₄), acc. sg. *Christon* (III 45₁₇, cf. III 115₇, 119₂₃, 129₁₈), *Marcon* (III 59₁₃), acc. sg. masc.-

nt. *Ebangelion* (III 87₂₀, 111₁₈), acc. sg. fem. *Arcan* (III 121₆). Sometimes foreign words are left without any case ending, especially those of Hebrew origin, e.g. *Adam* (III 113₂₀, 121₃), *Sara*, *Abraham* (III 93₁₃), *Moises* (III 101₇), *Noe* (III 119₁₃), *Pharao* (III 119₁₅), *Jsrail* (III 119₁₇), *Salomon* (III 107₅). And, finally, there are occasionally mistakes in the transposition of Latin words: for instance, in III 63₃ and 103₅, the nominative *Sanct Paulus* is mistranslated as a phrase with a Prussian nominative and a Latin genitive *Swints Pauli*. This is perhaps due to a contamination with the well known title *Sancti Pauli Epistulae* “Epistles of Saint Paul”, where the proper name stood in the genitive.

Apart from this particular context we have no clear instance of direct borrowing of case endings in the Old Prussian Enchiridion.

IV. Uses of case forms in Old Prussian

Another level of German influence on Old Prussian affects the uses of case forms. It was already noted that the number of cases is the same in German and in Old Prussian (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative), leaving aside a few relics of vocative forms in the frozen religious phraseology of Old Prussian. In other words, case syncretism in Old Prussian was largely conditioned under the pressure of the German case system. The question is whether this syncretism is proper to the Old Prussian language itself or limited to the particular context of the Enchiridion.

The evidence of the first two Catechisms remains here inconclusive, since they are similarly based on a German original and may have been influenced by German in the same way as the Enchiridion. And indeed we find in both texts exactly the same case system with four basic cases (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative), as in the Enchiridion. Apart from the Catechisms we have very few fragments that could shed some light on the Old Prussian case system. From Elbing and Simon Grunau’s Vocabularies the existence of an independent genitive case can be reconstructed, as already pointed out, e.g. *silkasdrûb’ / sydenslewir* “silk veil” (EV 484, gen. *silkas*) or *Mangos Sones / ein huren kindt* “son of a whore” (GrG 98, gen. *mangos*). A vocative case can be recognized in various fragments recorded by Hieronymus Maletius in his book *Warhafftige Beschreibung der Sudawen auff Samland* (middle of the 16th century), e.g. *ocho moy myle schwante panicke / o mein liebes heiliges*

fewerlein! “o my dear holy little fire!”²¹. Finally, a postpositive locative (or inessive) has been postulated for Old Prussian on the grounds of a fragment of the Lord’s Prayer dating from the beginning of the 15th century: *Towe Nūsze kâß esse andangonsōn* “Our Father, who art in heaven”²². A precise analysis of this form, however, is rather problematic and there is no basis for the claim that the Old Prussian language of the 16th century preserved postpositive locatives.

We must thus limit ourselves to the Enchiridion. In this respect, a few methodological remarks are to be made. First, if we try to distinguish linguistic reality from textual contamination, we have to look for every kind of discrepancy between the German and the Old Prussian texts in the hope that it may reveal peculiarities of the Old Prussian language²³. For instance, it is clear that the construction of the preposition *pagār* with the accusative in the meaning “next to, beside” must be genuine in Old Prussian, because no German influence could have taken place (German has here *neben* + dat.): compare *pagār mien* / *neben mir* “beside me” (III 27₆₋₇). The same kind of discrepancy is to be found between Prussian *no* (+ acc.) and German *nach* (+ dat.) in the meaning “according to”, e.g. *no twaian debijkan engraudisnan* / *nach deiner grossen Barmhertzigkeyt* “according to your great mercy” (III 119₁₄). Similarly, in the First and Second Catechisms, the Prussian preposition *po* (or *pho*) “after” stands with the accusative, whereas German has *nach* with the dative, e.g. *pho stan betten eden* / *nach dem Abendmal* (I 13₁₃), *postan bitans ydi* / *nach dem Abendmal* (II 13₁₃) “after the evening meal”²⁴. See also Prussian *prei* (+ acc.) corresponding to German *zu* (+ dat.), e.g. *preistan Rīkijan* / *zu dem HERRN* “to the Lord” (III 93₂₀, cf. also 107₁₅), or Prussian *no* (+ acc.) corresponding to German *auf* (+ dat.), e.g. *nostan laukan* / *auff dem Felde* “in the field” (III 105₁₃). Since no German influence can be postulated, one must assume that these constructions reflect an authentic use in Old Prussian.

This procedure however is limited, because it does not enable us to observe rightly features of Old Prussian that are by chance (or by common

²¹ For further relics of vocative forms see Mažiulis (PKP 2 63f.).

²² Cf. Mikalauskaitė (1938, 105), Stang (1966, 230f.), Mažiulis (1970, 224f.; 2004, 51), Schmalstieg (1976, 163).

²³ For this methodological principle see e.g. Ambrazas (2006, 15).

²⁴ Compare also *pōmien* “after me” (III 107₁₄, 131₁₃).

inheritance) identical to German features. For example, using such a method, we could hardly say anything positive about the uses of the nominative in Old Prussian, because it regularly concurs with the German nominative: it expresses the subject (as in *stas Swints Nosēilis / der Heylige Geyst* “the Holy Spirit” III 45₁₂) or its predicates (as in *tāns ast nouson tickars Tawas / er sey vnser rechter Vatter* “he is our true Father” III 47_{9–10}). Similarly, it is no surprise that we find in Old Prussian accusative forms in the function of direct object (e.g. *twaian Tāwan bhe Mūtien smūnint / dein Vater vnd dein Mutter ehren* “to honor your father and your mother” III 29₁₇), genitive forms for the possessor (e.g. *Deiwas wirdan / Gottes Wort* “the word of God” III 113₁₈) or dative forms for the beneficiary (e.g. *dai swaimans maldaisimans / gabs seinen Jūngern* “he gave it to his disciples” III 75_{3–4}). In all this, we have only a clear testimony that Old Prussian was an Indo-European language, like German.

The same holds true for the use of cases with prepositions. It is possible that the construction of the Prussian preposition *pra* “through” with the accusative (e.g. *pra swaian etnīstin / durch seine gnade* “through his mercy” III 51₁) is authentic, although it corresponds to German *durch* (+ acc.), because we have the same construction in Lithuanian (e.g. *prō vartūs* “through the gate”). There is no reason to ascribe the construction of Prussian *no* “on, towards” with the accusative (e.g. *no dins / auff sie* “towards them” III 113₇) specifically to a German influence (*auf* + acc.), because it could well be inherited: compare Old Church Slavic на горѣ *na gorę* “towards the mountain” (Mt 4, 8 Zogr.). In such cases, inheritance and secondary contamination with German cannot be distinguished.

One must also take into account the fact that we are dealing with a closed corpus of texts: it is often difficult to affirm beyond any doubt that a given feature did not exist in Old Prussian. This does not mean, however, that no conclusion can be drawn from the available data. If we try to answer the question whether Old Prussian preserved a given case, we must not only investigate whether forms of this case are actually attested in the Enchiridion, but also look at all the contexts where for historical reasons this case is expected. If it appears to have been regularly displaced by the same case in all these contexts, we may safely conclude that the case has disappeared through a syncretic process; the regularity of its displacement testifies that syncretism took place.

This method, however, is not always reliable. Let us examine some examples. The Old Prussian preposition *sen* “with”²⁵, which seems at first glance predisposed to govern the instrumental, as does its Lithuanian counterpart *sù* “with”, governs in Old Prussian the dative (sometimes, the accusative or both cases together), but no form that could be identified as an instrumental (even the problematic *māim*). Similarly, it is noteworthy that we do not find any instance of predicative instrumental in the Enchiridion: we always have a nominative, e.g. *tāns turei twais rikijs bout / er soll dein Herr sein* “he must be your Lord” (III 105₅), or a prepositional construction imitated from German, e.g. *prei semmien postātwei / zur Erde werden* “to become earth” (III 105₁₇)²⁶. Based on these facts, one could conclude that there was no longer an instrumental case in Old Prussian. Similarly, where a locative is expected (in the inessive function), Old Prussian quite regularly presents a dative, with the preposition *en* “in”, as in *en wissai nautei / in allen nôthen* “in all the misery” (III 29₅) or *en wirdemmans / inn worten* “in words” (III 33₂). Here again, we can assume that there was no longer a locative in Old Prussian. But, in both cases, the difficulty is that an influence of German, either linguistic or textual, can always be assumed, considering that Old Prussian *sen* (+ dat.) corresponds to German *mit* (+ dat.) and Old Prussian *en* (+ dat.) to German *in* (+ dat.). We can hardly decide whether these syntactic uses are genuine or due to interference with German.

Let us consider another instance. Given the fact that the Lithuanian preposition *iš* “from” governs the genitive (probably syncretic for an inherited ablative), one may wonder why its Old Prussian counterpart *is* regularly governs the dative, e.g. *isstesmu / daraus* “from it” (III 75₉). Is this use authentic? Or, in other words, does this mean that the genitive has been displaced by the dative? Certainly not, because in other contexts the genitive is widely attested (for example as the case of the possessor). The construction *is* (+ dat.) can therefore hardly be the result of a syncretic pattern; it must have another source, probably based on a foreign model, and indeed the influence of the German preposition *von* (+ dat.) is obvious. Similarly, it is striking that the Prussian preposition *bhe* “without” governs the accusative (e.g. *bhe nou̯son madlan / on vnser Gebet* “without our prayer” III 49₁₇), whereas its East

²⁵ Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 125 [1943]).

²⁶ See Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 72 [1943]).

Baltic counterpart governs the genitive (Lithuanian *bè*, Latvian *bez*, dial. *be* “without” + gen.); this may be in Old Prussian the result of a contamination with German *ohne* (+ acc.).

The result of these considerations may be, I think, of some relevance from a methodological point of view. The distribution of a given case in the Enchiridion must be considered as significant for the reconstruction of Old Prussian only if it fulfils at least one of the following two requirements: (1) it occurs where it is expected from a historical point of view or (2) it may be shown to have displaced the expected case according to a normal evolution (either due to syncretic pattern, syntactic process or foreign influence). Based on these principles, one may suppose, for instance, that the use of the accusative for the direct object was a linguistic reality in Old Prussian, because it corresponds to a widespread use in other Indo-European languages (in particular in East Baltic): thus, it fulfils the first requirement formulated above and there is no reason to deny its existence nor to suppose in this case a German influence. Conversely, we may suppose that the construction of *is* (+ dat.) is not authentic in Old Prussian, because it fulfils neither requirement: it is historically unexpected and can hardly be due to a usual form of syncretism or to normal evolution.

To be sure, the data sometimes remain inconclusive. I do not see how one could decide whether the constructions of *sen* (+ dat.) “with” or *en* (+ dat.) “in” are authentic in Old Prussian or due to contamination with German. In both cases, syncretism may have taken place, but the possibility of a German influence cannot be so easily ruled out. At least, one can note that a syncretic pattern [instrumental > dative] (in *sen* “with”) or [locative > dative] (in *en* + dative) is not typologically unparalleled (cf. Greek), whereas a syncretism [genitive > dative] (in *is* “from”) is by nature highly suspect, not to mention the fact that it does not explain why the genitive would have remained unchanged in its other uses.

Based on these considerations, one can in most cases distinguish what is genuine in Old Prussian from what is due to German influence. But, if a German influence is assumed, the question remains whether we should ascribe it to Old Prussian as a whole or to the particular context of the Enchiridion? There is no indisputable answer to this question, but some general principles may be drawn: this will be the issue of the following section.

V. Agreement properties

1. Case disagreement in the Enchiridion

To begin with, let us examine why connected forms sometimes stand in different cases in the Old Prussian Enchiridion, as in *sen stesmu wirdan* “with the word” III 61₂₁, 87₂₂ (dat. + acc.). Such mixed constructions are widely attested; they have hitherto been considered merely translation mistakes, but it can be shown that their distribution is not as capricious as it appears at first glance. In what follows I will give a large, although certainly incomplete, set of examples to illustrate disturbed case agreement in the Enchiridion. The following basic patterns are attested (I shall concentrate first on sequences of nouns with determinants)²⁷:

With a determinant in the accusative:

(1) [Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *stan emnan / den Namen* (III 27₁₃), *ēn stan gallan / in den Todt* (III 65₁), *nostan wirdan / ob dem wort* (III 87₈), *stan smunentin / den Menschen* (III 105₂₂), *twaian Tāwan / dein Vater* (III 29₁₇), *prijki twaian tawischan / wider deinen Nechsten* (III 33₁₆), *en twaians rānkans / inn deine Hende* (III 79₁₉, 81₁₈), *kittans Deiwans / andere Götter* (III 27₆), *prijki wissan wargan / für allem Vbel* (III 41₁₁);

(2) [Det. Acc.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *schlāit wissan maian perschlūsisan / ohn all mein Verdienst* (III 41₁₄).

With a determinant in the dative:

(3) [Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Dat.]:

e.g. *stesmu waldniku / dem Kōnige* (III 91₂₅), *enstesmu wirdai / jn dem wort* (III 97₁₇), *steismu Piru / der Gemeine* (III 97₁₅), *steīmans Sallūbi gennāmans / Den Ehefrawen* (III 93₁₁), *steimans Waikammans Mergūmans Deināalgenikamans / Den Knechten Megden Taglōnern* (III 95₅₋₆), *steimans widdewūmans / den Widwen* (III 97₉), *steimans malnijikamans / den Kindlein* (III 115₈), *schismu Malnīku / diesem Kind* (III 131₁₇), *en swaiiai pērgimie / in seiner Natur* (III 115₂), *swaimans maldaisimans / seinen Jūngern* (III 75₃₋₄), *swaimans wijrimans / jren Mennern* (III 103₂₆), *en wissai nautei / inn allen nōthen* (III 29₅), *sen wissamans Druwīngimans / mit allen Glaubigen* (III 121₁₀);

²⁷ For further examples see Euler (1985, 171f.).

(4) [Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *sen stesmu wirdan / mit dem wort* (III 61₂₁, 87₂₂), *en stesmu kūkis teikūsnan / in der Kirchenordnung* (III 17₂₀), *stesmu vndan / dem Wasser* (III 61₁₇), *postesmu nadruwīsnan / nach der Hoffnung* (III 63₁₀), *esse stesmu klausīwingin vom Beichtiger* (III 65₁₀, cf. 65₂₀), *prīki stessemu Klausīweniki / gegen / dem Beichtiger* (III 71₅), *po stesmu geitin bhe wijnan / vnter dem Brodt vnnnd Wein* (III 73₁₆), *stesmu Rikijan / dem Herrn* (III 85₁, cf. 89₇, 93₁₃, 95₁₅, 103₂₁, 117₂₋₃, 117₄), *stesmu Pecku / dem Vihe* (III 85₃), *stesmu kurwan / dem Ochsen* (III 89₁), *stesmu Keiserin / dem Keyser* (III 91₂), *stesmu Mistran / dem Fürsten* (III 91₂₀), *stesmu tārin / der Stimme* (III 105₇), *esse stesmu garrin / von dem Baum* (III 105₈), *stesmu madlin / dem Gebet* (III 111₈), *stesmu prēisiki / dem Feinde* (III 117₁₁), *stesmu gīrbīn / der Zal* (III 121₄), *steismu Tāwan / dem Vatter* (III 57₁₆), *esse stesmu smunentin / von dem Menschen* (III 101₁₆), *steismu genneniskan / dem weibischen* (III 93₆), *stēismu Pikullan / dem Teuffel* (III 125₁₀), *ēnstēimans malnijkans / an den Kindern* (III 37₁₅), *stēimans wirdans / diesen Wortten* (III 77₁₆), *steimans Bīskopins, Pappans bhe Preddikerins / den Bischoffen, Pfarherrn vnnnd Predigern* (III 85₂₃), *esse steimans Poklusmingins / von den Unterthanen* (III 91₁), *steimans labbans / den fromen* (III 93₂), *steimans Sallūbaiwīrins / den Ehemennern* (III 93₄), *stēimans Vraisins / Den Eltern* (III 93₁₇, cf. 97₂), *esse steimans Malneijkans / von den Kindern* (III 93₂₁), *steimans smunentins / den Menschen* (III 95₁₅, cf. 95₁₁₋₁₂), *steimans Butta Rikians / Den Haußherrn* (III 95₁₉), *steimans labbatīngins / den hoffertigen* (III 97₄), *steimans Lāustingins / den demütigen* (III 97₅), *stawidsmu wirdan / solchem wort* (III 61₁₈), *is schismu Ebangelion / auß diesem Euangelio* (III 113₉), *entennēismu rīkin / in seinem Reyh* (III 43₂₀), *en kawijdsmu Christiāniskan / jn welcher Christenhey*t (III 45₁₉), *sen ainesmu swāigstan / mit Schein* (III 35₁₃), *en antersmu sklaitinsnan / am andern Capitel* (III 101₈), *maiāsmu Rikijan / meinem Herrn* (III 67₂₂), *maiāsmu kaimīnan / meinem Nachbar* (III 69₁₄₋₁₅), *is twaiāsmu Lastin / auß dem Bette* (III 79₁), *twaiāsmu wijran / deinem Manne* (III 105₄), *twaismu emnen / deinem Namen* (III 121₉), *swaiāsmu seimīnan / seinem gesinde* (III 27₃₋₄), *en swaiāsmu kermnen / an seinem Leib* (III 31₁₂), *en swaiāsmu gennan / an seinem Weib* (III 101₂₃), *swāimans Mukīnnewingins / jren Lernern* (III 87₁₄), *noūsesmu Tawischen / unserm Nechsten* (III 31₁₂, 35₁₁, 37₃), *nousesmu pogālbenikan / vnserm Heylandt* (III 91₁₉), *wismu mensen / allem Fleisch* (III 85₃), *wissamans druwīngins / allen Glaubigen* (III 45₁₉), *sen wissamans grikans / mit allen Sünden* (III 63₁₆);

(5) [Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *sen stesma Swintan Scrīsin / mit dem Heiligen Creutz* (III 79₃), *stesmu vcka kuslaisin dijlapagaptin / dem schwechesten werckzeug* (III 93₇), *sen stesmu wargan noseilien / mit dem bösen Geist* (III 123₁₉), *steismo Perōnin Maldūnin / Der gemeinen Jugent* (III 97₁), *stēismu gāntsas swītan / der gantzen Welt* (III 115₇), *stēimans maldans Warnins / den jungen Raben* (III 85₄), *en schisman ackewijstin Krixtiāniskan astin / in dieser öffentlichen Christlichen Handlung* (III 125₄₋₅), *kawīdsu [sic] debijkan powargsennien bhe nautien / was grossem Jammer vnnd Noth* (III 115₂₀), *en ainesmu nawnan gijwan / inn einem neuen Leben* (III 65₄), *twaiāsmu mīlan Soūnan noūsmu Rikijan / deinem lieben Sohn vnserm Herrn* (III 131₁₉), *sen swaiāsmu swinton tēmpran krawian / mit seinem heyligen theuren blut* (III 43₁₈), *swaismu swintan wirdan / seinem heyligen Wort* (III 49₂₁), *wissai smūnenisku enteikūsnan / aller menschlicher Ordnung* (III 91₂₃), *wissamans wargans smunentins / allen bösen Menschen* (III 53₅).

With a determinant in the genitive:

(6) [Det. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.]:

e.g. *stessei swītas / der Welt* (III 51₁₇), *stesse kermenes / des Leibes* (III 109₈), *stesses Crixtnas / der Tauff* (III 111₁₆), *steisei Gennas / des Weibs* (III 103₂₂), *steise Pjckulas / des Teuffels* (III 43₁₆, etc.), *steise Tāwas / des Vatters* (III 59₁₅, cf. 65₃, 71₁₉, 109₁, 129₁₁), *steise Saūnas / des Sons* (III 59₁₅, cf. 71₂₀, 109₁, 129₁₁), *steises geijwas / des Lebens* (III 63₁, cf. 93₈), *steises nierties / des Zorns* (III 115₂₃), *steiseisei [sic] russas / des Rosses* (III 85₆), *stēisan pikullis / des Teufels* (III 117₈), *stēison malnijkas / des Kindes* (III 121₁₈), *schīēise kermenes bhe gīwas / diß Leibes vnnd Lebens* (III 41₉), *ainassei gennas / eines Weibes* (III 87₂), *ainassei malnijkas / eines Kindes* (III 115₂₇), *twaisei Deiwas / deines Gottes* (III 27₁₃), *twaisei tawischas / deines Nechsten* (III 35₁₇), *swaisei ālgas / seines Lohns* (III 87₁₈, 89₃), *swaise kermenes / seines Leibs* (III 103₂₄), *swaias prēigimnis / seiner Art* (III 115₂₁), *wissas etnīstis / aller Gnaden* (III 115₆);

(7) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.]:

e.g. *stesse gāntsas swītas / der gantzen Welt* (III 115₁₀), *twaise mijlas Soūnas / deines lieben Sons* (III 109₉), *twaias Dengniskas spagtas / deines himlischen Bades* (III 119₃), *twaias mijlas malnikas / deines lieben Kindes* (III 119₂₂);

(8) [Det. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *stēisei tickrōmiskan / des Rechtens* (III 35₁₃), *steisei Aucktimmiskan / der Obrigkeit* (III 89₁₇, cf. 91₂₀), *steisei Keiserin / des Keysers* (III 91₂), *steisei*

etnīstin / der Gnade (III 93₈), *steisei kīrki / der Kirchen* (III 109₁₀), *steise powaisennen / des Gewissens* (III 73₂), *steise Salaūban / der Ehe* (III 99₆), *stessei deicktan / seiner stat* (III 125₆), *steison smūni / der Person* (III 95₂₄), *steison wirdan / des Worts* (III 100₃), *steison perōniskan / der Gemeinde* (III 103₂₃), *stēison Crixtiāniskun / der Christenheit* (III 121₆), *twaiasei Gennan / deines Weibs* (III 105₇), *twaise prosnan / deines Angesichts* (III 105₁₄), *twaisai Crixtisnan / deiner Tauff* (III 117₂₀);

(9) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.]:

e.g. *steise wissemusīngin Tawas / des Allmechtigen Vaters* (III 43₅, cf. 127₁₄), *steise Swintan Noseilīs / des Heyligen Geists* (III 59₁₆, 109₁, 129₁₁₋₁₂);

(10) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *stessei swintan crixtisnan / der heyiligen Tauffe* (III 59₂), *steise naunangimsenin / der newen geburt* (III 63₂), *stēise Swintan Noseilie / des heyiligen Geists* (III 63₅, cf. 71₂₀), *stēisei prābutskan gijwan / des ewigen Lebens* (III 63₉), *prei stēisei pogauton labbanseggīsnan / bey der empfangenen wolthat* (III 133₃), *stēison prābutskan gallan / des Ewigen Todes* (III 115₄), *twaisai Swintan Crixtisnan / deiner Heiligen Tauff* (III 119₁₉), *twaisei Dengenninikans labbans / deiner himlischen Güter* (III 131₂₁₋₂₂), *twaias Swintan Emnen / deines heiligen Namens* (III 133₅).

Based on the collected data the following remarks can be made. First of all, it should be noted that the only cases the use of which is sometimes subject to disagreement are the dative and the genitive, displaced by the accusative, e.g. *sen stesmu wirdan / mit dem wort* III 61₂₁ (type 4) or *steisei Aucktimmiskan / der Obrigkeit* III 89₁₇ (type 8). The opposite situation – that is, a dative or a genitive instead of an accusative – is, so far as I can see, never attested in the Enchiridion. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that case disagreement is not documented in contexts with nominative forms: they are always used consistently, e.g. *as stas Rikijs twais Deiws asmau ains Stūrintickrōms Deiws / Jch der HERR dein Gott bin ein eiueriger Gott* “I, the Lord, your God, am a severe God” (III 37₁₂₋₁₃), *stas swints Nosēilīs / der Heylige Geist* “the Holy Spirit” (III 45₁₂), *ains nauns smūnets / ein newer Mensch* “a new man” (III 63₁₉), *twais swints Engels / Dein heylicher Engel* “your Holy Angel” (III 79₁₉, 81₁₉), see also III 63₃, 73₁₅, 85₁, 87₁, 95₁₇₋₁₈, and so on. The same holds true for the accusative, which is used consistently in all contexts that obviously require an accusative, see e.g. *Deiws teikū stan smumentin / Gott Schuff den*

Menschen “God created man” III 105₂₂ (type 1)²⁸. Nominative and accusative are always well distinguished in the Old Prussian Enchiridion. It should be noted that this applies also to the only word class that did not originally distinguish nominative and accusative, that is the neuter class. Neuter forms are apparently well preserved in the Elbing Vocabulary, but in the Enchiridion they tend to become masculine; this evolution is partly based on the necessity of distinguishing nominative and accusative. As I tried to show elsewhere (Petit 2001), this distinction was so strong that it was introduced by Abel Will even in neuter pronoun forms, where a nominative and an accusative were secondarily opposed (nom. *sta* / acc. *stan* “this”).

All this means that case disagreement is not entirely arbitrary in the Enchiridion, but follows some kind of directionality. This could be interpreted in two ways, either as a linguistic or as a textual matter. If we consider the extension of the accusative at the expense of the dative and the genitive to be a linguistic process, we may assume that Old Prussian was on the way toward a radical simplification of its case system and becoming a two-case system, opposing a direct and an oblique case, as did for example Old French (*cas sujet* / *cas régime*). This opinion has been apparently upheld by some scholars who see the accusative in Old Prussian as a “casus generalis”²⁹. But this account can hardly explain why dative and genitive forms are nevertheless attested in the Enchiridion, in substantive forms as well, e.g. *stesmu waldniku* / *dem Kōnige* III 91₂₅ (type 3) or *stessei swītas* / *der Welt* III 51₁₇ (type 6). This cannot reflect different chronological layers in the language of the Enchiridion, the composition of which must be viewed as strictly synchronic. We thus need to look for another explanation.

²⁸ Interestingly, contrary to the Lithuanian use, we have in Old Prussian the accusative, not the genitive, as direct object after negative verb, e.g. *Tou niturri kittans Deiwans pagār mien turritwei* / *du solt nicht andere Götter neben mir haben* (III 27₆₋₇). Compare the same sentence in Old Lithuanian *ne turek kitu Diewu prieg manes* VE 116, *neturek Diewu kitu poakim mano* PK 46 (with the genitive *kitu Diewu* or *Diewu kitu* “other Gods”). This may be due in Old Prussian to a German influence (either a linguistic or a textual one) or this may reflect a trivial evolution (generalisation of the object accusative). Latvian presents here both possibilities, e.g. with the genitive *es neredzu neviena cilvėka* or with the accusative *es neredzu nevienu cilvėku* “I don’t see anybody”.

²⁹ Thus e.g. Trautmann (1910, 207) or more recently Toporov (2006, 67).

It is striking that the different word classes are differently affected by case disagreement. Thus, determinants are more consistently used in the dative and genitive than substantives. We have a very large number of instances of the type [Det. Dat./Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.], such as *sen stesmu wirdan* (type 4) or *steisei Aucktimmiskan* (type 8). To be sure, there are also a large number of contexts where all forms display case disagreement, including determinants. Frequently, we have an entire sequence of accusatives instead datives (e.g. *sen wissans pērgimmans / sampt allen Creaturen* “with all creatures” III 41₃ in comparison with *sen + dat.* e.g. in *sen wissamans Druwīngimans / mit allen Glaubigen* “with all believers” III 121₁₀)³⁰ or, more rarely, instead genitives (I have found only one instance: *wissans grikans skellants / aller Sūnden schuldig* “guilty of all sins” III 67₁₉). Significantly enough, the opposite situation to types 4 and 8 – that is a determinant in the accusative with a substantive in the dative or genitive – is almost never attested. I have found only one example (III 53₂₁), which, however, might receive a straightforward explanation³¹:

Bhe etwerpeis noūmas nousons āuschautins kai mes etwērpimai noūsons auschautenikamans / Vnnd verlasse ons vnser schulde als wir verlassen vnsern Schuldigern “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors!”

We have here in *noūsons āuschautenikamans* “our debtors” a mixed construction [Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.] in a clearly dative function. The crucial point here is, I think, the nature of the possessive *noūsons* “our” in Old Prussian. In the German text we have a possessive adjective *vnsern* (dative

³⁰ Other examples with prepositions regularly governing the dative: 1. *en* “in” (e.g. *ēnstan nacktien / inn der Nacht* III 75₁, *enstan kērdan / zu der zeit* III 111₂₀, *ēnstan Swintan Arcan / inn der heiligen Archa* III 121₆, *ēnstan Emnan / in dem Namen* III 123₁₀, 129₁₀, *ēnschien madlin / inn diesem Gebet* III 49₂, etc., *en maian krawian / inn meinem Blut* III 75₁₀₋₁₁, *en wissans kermeniskans nautins / in allen leibs nōthen* III 31₁₅); 2. *esse* “from” (e.g. *essestan Teikūsā / von der Schöpfung* III 39₁₇, *esse stans Gallans / von den Todten* III 65₂, *esse stans malnijikans / von den Kindlein* III 111₁₈, *esse maian mensan / von meinem fleisch* III 101₁₉, *esse wissans grikans / von allen Sūnden* III 43₁₅, *esse wissans schins Pal-lai-psans / von diesen Gebotten* III 37₉, *en wissans poweistins / in allen dingen* III 103₂₆); 3. *is* “from” (e.g. *is kalsīwingiskan Tawiskan Deiwūtiskan labbiskan / aus lauter Vatterlicher Göttlicher Güte* III 41₁₂), 4. *sen* “with” (e.g. *sen wissan preweringiskan bhe maitāsnan / mit aller Notturfft vnd Narung* III 41₈, *sen wissan auschādīsnan / mit aller zuuersicht* III 47₁₁, *sen swaians Dāians / mit seinen Gaben* III 45₁₃).

³¹ See Kaukienė (2004, 127).

plural). I assume that Old Prussian used, like Lithuanian, in plural forms of personal pronouns a pronominal genitive “of us”, which was something like **nūsōn* (cf. Lith. *mūsų* “our” with *m-* from *mēs* “we”). In the Enchiridion there is some evidence that such a form actually did exist, especially when it clearly disagrees with the head noun in case marking, as in *tāns ast nouson tickars Tawas / er sey vnser rechter Vatter* “he is our true Father” III 47₉₋₁₀ (**nūsōn* + nom. sg.), or in number-marking, as in *noūsan Rikijas / vnser Herrn* “of our Lord” III 129₁₄ (**nūsōn* + gen. sg.). But, perhaps because of a contamination with German, Old Prussian also developed possessive adjectives of the type **nūsas* “our”, agreeing in case, number and gender with the head noun, e.g. *nousā mensai / unser Fleisch* “our flesh” III 55₁₉ (nom. fem. sg. *nousā* + head noun *mensai*)³². The problem with the genitive plural form **nūsōn* > *noūson*, *noūsan* is that it sounded much like an accusative singular (with a similar ending *-an*, *-on*). And, indeed, when we find for example *nouson Rikijan / vnsern Herrn* “our Lord” (III 109₁₇₋₁₈, 119₆, 121₁₃, 127₈, cf. also III 113₂₅), we can hardly decide whether *nouson* is a pronominal genitive (**nūsōn* “of us”) or a possessive adjective in the accusative singular (**nūsan* “our”). The translator may have been confused in much the same way by such a form, especially when the head noun was a plural form: the connection with a possessive form that looked like an accusative singular was then inconceivable. Taking this difficulty into account, one might suppose that in *noūsons āuschautenikamans* “our debtors” (III 53₂₁) we have the genitive plural **nūsōn*, misunderstood as a possessive adjective because of the German model and then pluralized by the addition of *-s* (**nūsōn* → **nūsōn-s*) in order to regularize its occurring with a plural head noun; the influence of preceding *nousons* might also have played a role.

Apart from this unique context, there is thus no evidence of case disagreement affecting a determinant and leaving its head noun unaffected: we find sometimes [Det. Dat./Gen. + Subst. Dat./Gen.] (types 3 and 6), sometimes [Det. Dat./Gen. + Subst. Acc.] (types 4 and 8), but never *[Det. Acc. + Subst. Dat./Gen.]. This fact has, to my knowledge, so far not received the attention it deserves and yet it needs some explanation.

³² Sometimes, we find secondary case disagreement, as in *noūsesmu Tawischen / unserm Nechsten* “to our fellow man” III 31₁₂, 35₁₁, 37₃, etc. (dative *noūsesmu* + accusative *Tawischen*).

Concerning adjective forms, we obtain the following picture. I shall first concentrate on contexts of the type [Det. + Adj. + Subst.]. Complete case agreement is regular in the accusative (type 2: e.g. *schlāit wissan maian perschlūsisnan / ohn all mein Verdienst* III 41₁₄)³³, sporadically found in the genitive (type 7: e.g. *stesse gāntsas switas / der gantzen Welt* III 115₁₀)³⁴, but, so far as I can see, never attested in the dative. Here again, this absence must receive an explanation. Several subtypes of case disagreement are attested. In the dative we find quite frequently a type [Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.] (type 5: e.g. *stēismu gāntsan switan / der gantzen Welt* III 115₇), and similarly in the genitive we have [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.] (type 10: e.g. *stessei swintan crixtisnan / der heyligen Tauffe* III 59₂). But, in the genitive, an intermediary subtype [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] is also found, although very sporadically (type 9: e.g. *steise wissemusingin Tawas / des Allmechtigen Vaters* III 43₅); there is no such example in the dative. This difference between genitive and dative is curious. Structures like [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 7) or [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 9) are found in the Enchiridion, whereas we have no trace of *[Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Dat.] + [Subst. Dat.] or even *[Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.]. From this we may conclude that genitive forms are used more consistently than dative forms; this once again requires an explanation. Furthermore, it should be noted that adjective forms are more affected by case disagreement not only than pronominal forms, but also than substantives as well (cf. for example type 9). It is significant that a subtype [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 9) is attested in the Enchiridion, but, as far as I can see, not a single instance of a subtype *[Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.] is to be found³⁵. Obviously, we are dealing here with a hierarchical case-marking system where determinants

³³ I have quoted just one example, but this is very frequent.

³⁴ Other examples: *twaise mijlas Soūnas / deines lieben Sons* (III 109₉), *twaias Dengniskas spagtas / deines himlischen Bades* (III 119₃), *twaias mijlas malnikas / deines lieben Kindes* (III 119₂₂).

³⁵ In III 63₈ *prei stessei supsas etnīstin / durch desselbigen gnade*, the structure is not *[Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.], as mistakenly assumed by Zigmantavičiūtė and Zigmantavičiūtė (2000, 36), but *prei... etnīstin* “through the favour” (*prei* + acc.), modified by the genitive *stessei supsas / desselbigen* “of the same (person)”. The phrase *stessei supsas* is an instance of my subtype 6.

are ranked over substantives and substantives over adjectives. Whether this reflects the Old Prussian linguistic system or interference from German, remains for the time being still doubtful.

We will now examine contexts where no determinants are used. In such contexts we find a large number of instances of substantive forms consistently marked in the accusative (e.g. *prei Pickullien / zur Hellen* “to Hell” III 43₂), in the dative (e.g. *en wirdemmans / in worten* “in words” III 33₂) or in the genitive (e.g. *Deiwas / Gottes* “of God” III 49₇, etc.); occasionally they occur with an adjective form (even in the dative: *sen reddisku perdāsai / mit falscher wahr* “with a false truth” III 33₁₀). Case disagreement is however found there as well. The following subtypes may be distinguished:

(11) [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:

e.g. *en prabutskan / in Ewigkeyt* (III 43₂₅), *Endangon / im Himel* (III 47₆, 49₈, 51₅), *en Emnen / im Namen* (III 59₁₅, 107₂₄, etc.), *en Rikijan / inn dem Herren* (III 93₂₄), *en iürin / im Meer* (III 107₁), *en noūson gijwin / an vnserm Leben* (III 113₁₉), *en wirdans bhe dīlans / in wortten unnd wercken* (III 69₃), *en grikans / inn Sünden* (III 113₂₀), *esse sīran / von hertzen* (III 95₁₄), *esse Rickijan / vom Herrn* (III 107₈), *esse... warrin / von... Gewalt* (III 117₈), *is Deiwas wirdan / auß Gottes Wort* (III 113₁₈), *nosemien / im land* (III 29₁₉, cf. 107₃), *pobītas īdin / nach dem Abendmal* (III 75₈), *sen wīngriskan / mit list* (III 35₁₁), *sen tuldīsnan / mit freuden* (III 89₁₃), *sen Ausin / mit Goldt* (III 43₁₆), *sen wirdans / mit wortten* (III 69₂₆);

(12) [Adj. Dat. for Dat.] + [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:

e.g. *en prabuskai tickrōmiskan / in ewiger Gerechtigkeit* (III 43₂₁₋₂₂), *is supsai ispresnā / aus eigener Vernunft* (II 45₉), *sen... wargasmu kāupiskan / mit... bösem handel* (III 33₁₁);

(13) [Adj. Acc. for Dat.] + [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:

e.g. *en Prūsiskan tautan / in Land zu Preussen* (III 17₂₁); *esse Swintan Noseilien / vom Heyligen Geist* (III 41₂₃, cf. III 63₂); *en tirtan deinan / am dritten Tage* (III 43₃); *en maldaisin deinan / am Jüngsten tage* (III 45₂₁); *sen niteisīwingins wirdans bhe seggisans / mit unzūchtigen wortten und wercken* (III 69₁₃); *sen labban quāitin / mit gutem willen* (III 95₁₄); *en vrminan iürin / im Roten Meer* (III 119₁₆); *sen senditans rānkans / mit gefalten henden* (III 83₁₉); *en tirtian deinan / am dritten Tage* (III 127₁₂).

Once again, case disagreement is attested mostly in dative functions, where we find accusative forms instead of datives; I did not find any instance

in genitive function. An important difference, however, may be seen between definite and indefinite structures. In the former, adjectives are clearly more affected by case disagreement than substantives, as shown by type 9 in the genitive (e.g. *steise wissemusingin Tawas* III 43₅), whereas in the latter this is the opposite, as shown by type 12 in the dative (e.g. *en prabusakai tickrōmiskan* III 43₂₁₋₂₂). This difference is not to be explained, I think, mainly by the case (dative in type 12, vs. genitive in type 9), but probably by the presence, vs. absence of a determinant. Whether we consider this to be a structural feature of Old Prussian or due to the influence of German, we must find an explanation for this curious discrepancy.

Be that as it may, it is clear that case disagreement should not be seen merely as a translation mistake. On the contrary, it follows certain rules, the motivation of which, to be sure, remains for the time being largely obscure. Let us now present a brief summary of these rules:

Rule 1. Case disagreement occurs only in one direction: [Gen.] or [Dat.] → [Acc.].

Rule 2. The dative is more affected by case disagreement than the genitive, while the nominative and the accusative are always used consistently.

Rule 3. Among all word classes, determinants are the most resistant to case disagreement.

Rule 4. In the genitive, substantives are more resistant to case disagreement than adjectives.

Rule 5. Without determinants, adjectives are more resistant to case disagreement than substantives.

It should be said that these “rules” are by no means absolute; variations are quite frequent, even in identical contexts. To give just one example, the same formula “of the Holy Spirit” occurs sometimes as *steise Swintan Noseilīs* [Det. Gen. + Adj. Acc. + Subst. Gen.]³⁶, sometimes as *steise Swintan Noseilin* [Det. Gen. + Adj. Acc. + Subst. Acc.]³⁷. It is also significant that we occasionally find different cases in coordinate structures where we would expect case forms to be consistently marked. The model is then always [Dat.] or [Gen.] first, followed by [Acc.], as in e.g. *sen wirdemmans adder dīlins /*

³⁶ In III 59₁₆₋₁₇ (cf. also III 109₂, 129₁₁).

³⁷ In III 71₂₀ (the form *Noseilie* in III 63₆ is ambiguous, because it could be */-ien/, see Smoczyński 1992, 54). This does not mean, however, that Old Prussian possessed a genitive ending *-n* (pace Smoczyński 1992, 63).

mit wortten oder wercken “with words and deeds” III 67₇ (dat.+ acc.), *en wurdemmans dilans bhe pomijrisnans / inn worten wercken vnd gedanken* “in words, deeds and thoughts” III 33₂ (dat. + acc. + acc.), *steimans Waikammans Mergūmans Deināalgenikamans bhe Dilnikans / Den Knechten Megden Taglōnern vnd Arbeitern* “to the servants, maids, wage-earners and workers” III 95₅₋₆ (dat. + dat. + dat. + acc.) or *Kermenes bhe Daūsin / Leibs vnnnd Seele* “of body and soul” III 57₇ (gen. + acc.).

It is clear that the considerations presented above should be seen only as an attempt to classify case disagreement in the Old Prussian Enchiridion. They do not pretend to solve every difficulty. Admittedly, there are some cases I am unable to explain and which do not follow the rules I tried to establish³⁸. However, it should not be controversial that the facts observed so far are not entirely arbitrary. The question remains how one could explain them in a satisfactory way.

2. Underspecification and case disagreement

From a theoretical point of view, case syncretism may have two main sources. It may be based on formal confusion, when two case forms resembling each other merge into a single form. For example, in Latvian, the merging of the instrumental with the accusative in the singular is probably due to the similarity of both forms at least in some paradigms (e.g. in thematic stems: instr. sg. **-u*, vs. acc. sg. **-an > *-u*). Syncretism may be also based on a semantic confusion, when two cases present close semantic values. For example, the merging of the genitive and the ablative in Balto-Slavic may be due to the fact that there was originally only a slight difference between the values of both cases. Taking this into account, one could suppose that Old Prussian was progressively developing a “casus (obliquus) generalis” on the basis of the accusative as a result of the merging of the accusative, genitive and dative. This account seems to me unlikely. First of all, there was no formal motivation for such a merger, because in most paradigms each form was expected to remain clearly marked; a “casus generalis” usually

³⁸ Such cases are, for instance, *sen senditmai rānkān / mit gefalten henden* “with folded hands” (III 83₅), *swaiāsmu supsei buttan / seinem eigen Hause* “to his own house” (III 87₆), *schīēison malnijkikai / des Kindleins* “of the little child” (III 111₁₄), *stesses prabutskas Deng-niskans labbans / der ewigen Himmlischen Gūter* “of the eternal heavenly goods” (III 117₇).

results from a drastic phonetic reduction of final syllables (as in Old French). Secondly, there could not be any semantic confusion, because in a large number of contexts we still find a correct use of correctly marked accusative, genitive and dative forms. As I have often pointed out, case disagreement in the Enchiridion is frequent, but not absolute. It thus follows that the concept of syncretism as a linguistic process can hardly be useful to explain the position of oblique cases in the Old Prussian case system.

Let us now examine if this rather awkward configuration of Old Prussian can be due to German influence. As is well known, German is characterized by a four-case system, but case-marking is rather deficient in a large number of word classes. For example, in phrases like *dem guten Mann* (dat. sg.), vs. *den guten Mann* (acc. sg.), the distinction of dative and accusative is provided only by the definite article (*dem*, vs. *den*); the adjective and the substantive are ambiguous. In the scholarly literature, this phenomenon is sometimes called “underspecification”³⁹: in the German phrase, the definite article is case-specified, whereas the substantive *Mann* and the adjective *guten* are underspecified. The extent of underspecification in German is complex, because it depends not only on word classes, but also on number, gender and finally on the case forms themselves. For example, the definite article is normally specified in the masculine singular (nom. *der*, vs. dat. *dem*, vs. gen. *des*, vs. acc. *den*), but remains underspecified in some plural forms (nom.-acc. *die*, vs. gen. *der*, dat. *den*) and in the feminine singular (nom.-acc. *die*, vs. gen.-dat. *der* each respectively underspecified). Masculine substantives are underspecified in the entire singular paradigm except for the genitive (nom.-acc.-dat. *Mann*, vs. gen. *Mannes*), in the entire plural except for the dative (nom.-acc.-gen. *Männer*, vs. dat. *Männern*). I think this general feature of the German case system played a crucial role in the question of case-marking and case disagreement in Old Prussian. More precisely, I assume that the five rules I have established above directly reflect the influence of German underspecification on the Old Prussian language.

To begin with, one may argue that the second rule, according to which the dative is more affected by case disagreement than the genitive, is due to the fact that, in German masculine substantives, the genitive singular is better

³⁹ On underspecification in German see e.g. Bayer (2001, 465–514) and Lühr (2004, 129–147).

marked than the dative singular (*Mann-es*, vs. *Mann*). This may explain why dative singular forms of substantives are so rare in Old Prussian (type 3, e.g. *stesmu waldniku* III 91₂₅) and so often replaced by the accusative (type 4, e.g. *sen stesmu wirdan* III 61₂₁), whereas we find more genitive singular forms of substantives (type 6, e.g. *stessei swītas* III 51₁₇). This of course is not true in German feminine stems, where the substantive is not inflected in the entire singular paradigm (*Frau*), nor in plural stems, where, on the contrary, dative forms are better marked in masculine stems than genitive forms (*Männer*, vs. *Männer-n*). Significantly enough, in Old Prussian, dative forms of substantives are somewhat more frequent in the plural (e.g. *swaimans wijrimans* III 103₂₆) than in the singular.

The third rule, according to which, among all word classes, determinants are the most resistant to case disagreement, is closely linked with the fact that, in German, determinants – and especially definite articles – are better case-marked than substantives and adjectives. This explains the hierarchical system we have found in Old Prussian, where, for example, structures like [Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Acc.] are attested (type 4, e.g. *sen stesmu wirdan* III 61₂₁ corresponding to German *mit dem Wort*), but not structures like *[Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.].

The fourth rule, according to which, in the genitive, substantives are more resistant to case disagreement than adjectives, is due to the fact that, in German masculine stems, the genitive is marked in substantives, whereas adjectives are underspecified. This explains why the German structure *des Allmechtigen Vaters* “of the Almighty Father” is translated in III 43₅ as *steise wissemusīngin Tawas* (gen. + acc. + gen.). Specified genitives of the German text (*des, Vaters*) are rendered in Old Prussian by genitive forms (*steise, Tawas*), whereas the ambiguous genitive *Allmechtigen* is rendered by an accusative form *wissemusīngin*, that functions here as a default form.

The fifth rule, according to which, without determinants, adjectives are more resistant to case disagreement than substantives, is based on German structures where no determinant is used and therefore case-marking is shifted onto the adjective form, e.g. *in ewiger Gerechtigkeit* III 43₂₁₋₂₂, *aus eigener Vernunft* II 45₉, *mit...bösem handel* III 33₁₁, etc. (dat. + acc.). It is not surprising that this feature has been imitated in the Old Prussian translation: *en prabuskai tickrōmiskan* III 43₂₁₋₂₂, *is supsai ispresnā* II 45₉, *sen... wargasmu kāupiskan* III 33₁₁ (dat. + acc.).

The most interesting rule is certainly the first one, according to which case disagreement takes place only in one direction: [Gen.] or [Dat.] → [Acc.]. In underspecified contexts – that is when a given form was ambiguous and could be interpreted in different ways –, the default reading was always the accusative, not the dative, or the genitive. Thus, having to render German datives like *der gantzen Welt* “to the whole world” (III 115₇) or genitives like *der heyligen Tauffe* “of [the] Holy baptism” (III 59₂), the translator might have hesitated as to whether the adjectives *gantzen*, *heylichen* and the substantives *Welt*, *Tauffe* were accusatives, datives or genitives; in all instances, he chose to interpret them as accusatives. In other words, the accusative case appeared to him as representative for the entire set of oblique cases.

Now we may finally answer the question of whether case disagreement resulting from German influence is proper to Old Prussian or only to the translation of the Enchiridion. Both approaches have been upheld in the scholarly literature: the extension of the accusative in Old Prussian is seen by Trautmann (1910, 207) and Mažiulis (1968, 24) to be a feature of Old Prussian; but, according to Berneker (1896, 92), it is merely translation error.

At first glance, one might be inclined to think that Old Prussian imitated the most salient structural property of the German case system, i.e. underspecification. But, if it appears that some of the observed features are typologically inconceivable, they will be ascribed to translation strategies proper to the Enchiridion. Obviously, the final word here belongs to diachronic typology: a typologically implausible evolution is hardly to be supposed for Old Prussian as for any other language and must therefore be suspected as resulting from textual interference, which sometimes does not follow the rules of ordinary typology.

Based on this methodological principle, one can formulate two remarks. First of all, we must remember that case disagreement in the Enchiridion is not absolute. One may compare for example type 7 (e.g. *stesse gāntsas switas* / *der gantzen Welt* III 115₁₀) and type 10 (e.g. *stessei swintan crixtisan* / *der heyligen Tauffe* III 59₂). In the former, Old Prussian obviously behaves like every inflected language (e.g. like Lithuanian), where each form is case-marked (here in the genitive). In the latter, it behaves like German, with a kind of Gruppenflexion: one form is marked (in the genitive), the rest remaining underspecified (in the accusative). Considering that the translation

of the Enchiridion is strictly synchronic, such doublets are incompatible with the reconstruction of a real language. One is forced to admit that one of these constructions is not genuine; since it cannot be the former (type 7), because one does not see how it would have been produced, it must be the latter (type 10). There is thus some evidence that Old Prussian, like Lithuanian, regularly inflected each member of a sequence [Det. + Adj. + Subst.] in the same case; case disagreement cannot be ascribed to Old Prussian, but only to the erroneous translation of the Enchiridion.

However, it is noteworthy that case disagreement is not always directly caused by imitation of a particular passage of the German text. For example, a German genitive can occasionally be translated by a Prussian accusative, even if it was not underspecified in the German text (compare e. g. *des Gewissen-s* / *steise powaisemnen* III 73₂, cf. also *deines Weib-s* / *twaiasei Gennan* III 105₇, *deines Angesicht-s* / *twaise prosnan* III 105₁₄, etc.). This means that, even if case disagreement is due to textual interference, as I assume, it does not necessarily follow the principle of a word-for-word translation. My view on this matter is based on the idea that the translator tried not only to render the German text unit by unit, but also to identify some general rules that could help him record Prussian case forms in other contexts as well. It is possible that Paul Megott's pronunciation of Prussian did not allow for a clear recognition of final syllables (this in turn being perhaps a feature of 16th century Old Prussian) and that Abel Will had to establish rules – rather artificially in some cases – in order to write them in a satisfactory way. As I already tried to show elsewhere (Petit 2001), Abel Will's work was sometimes creative.

VI. Conclusion

The facts described in this paper allow for a few useful generalizations. It is obvious that the Old Prussian translation of the Enchiridion was deeply influenced by German. On this matter, there is a broad consensus. Any attempt at reconstructing the Old Prussian case system must therefore keep in mind that we are dealing here with distorted linguistic evidence. The problem is whether this distortion is a feature of Old Prussian as a whole or is due in more limited fashion to translation pressure in the Enchiridion. In this paper, I have tried to classify different levels of German influence on the

Old Prussian case system (direct borrowing, modifications of the use of case forms, influence on agreement properties) and to show to what extent they played a role in Old Prussian. Whereas there is no basis whatsoever for the claim that Old Prussian directly borrowed German case endings, the German model may nevertheless have played a crucial role in renewing syntactic uses and/or in limiting agreement properties. I assume that, in some cases, German influence on Old Prussian syntactic uses may reflect the authentic evolution of Prussian as a dying West Baltic language; for example, case syncretism should probably be seen as a linguistic reality in Old Prussian. On the other hand, some uses seem rather aberrant from a typological point of view and may be considered to be due merely to textual interference. The crucial point therefore is that linguistic typology may provide a suitable criterion for determining whether a given feature is authentic in Old Prussian or limited to the Enchiridion. I am aware, of course, that this account might sound desperately programmatic; the evidence often remains ambiguous. Finally, I assume that case disagreement, particularly well documented through the so-called “mixed constructions” of Old Prussian, does not reflect any kind of linguistic reality, but was caused by direct imitation of the German agreement properties. In this respect, German underspecification might have constituted the basis for this curious development. In any case, the Old Prussian Enchiridion is a fascinating document: it provides interesting clues on the question how the case system of a dying language can be recorded through the filter of a deeply different linguistic system.

PRŪSŲ *ENCHIRIDIONO* LINKSNIAVIMO SISTEMA IR VERTIMO STRATEGIJA

Santrauka

Prūsų kalbos paminkluose, ypač *Enchiridione* (1561), linksnių formos dėl vokiečių kalbos įtakos yra labai dažnai painiojamos, todėl linksniavimo sistemą rekonstruoti sunku. Šio straipsnio tikslas – aptarti įvairiopą vokiečių kalbos įtaką prūsų kalbos linksnių formoms ir aprašyti vadinamąsias „mišriąsias konstrukcijas“ (pvz., *sen stesmu* [D] *wirdan* [A] „su žodžiu“).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DI = Endzelīns 1971–1982.
EV = *Elbing Vocabulary*, edited by V. Mažiulis in PKP.
Gr = *Grunau's Vocabulary* (G = Göttingen), edited by V. Mažiulis in PKP.
PK = Petkevičius 1598.
PKEŽ = Mažiulis 1988–1997.
PKP = Mažiulis 1966–1981.
VE = Vilentas 1579.

Ambrazas, Vytautas 2006, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Bayer, Josef 2001, Morphological underspecification meets oblique case: Syntactic and processing effects in German, *Lingua* 111, 465–514.

Benveniste, Emile 1934–1935, Questions de morphologie baltique, *Studi Baltici* 4, 72–80.

Berneker, Erich 1896, *Die preussische Sprache*, Strassburg: Trübner.

Bezenberger, Adalbert 1907, Studien über die Sprache des preussischen Enchiridions, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 41, 65–127.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1943, *Senprūšu valoda. Ievads, Gramatika un leksika*, Rīga (= DI 4(2), 9–351).

Endzelīns, Jānis 1971–1982, *Darbu izlase (DI)* 1–4(2), Rīga: Zinātne.

Euler, Wolfram 1985, Zur Frage der Mischkonstruktionen im Altpreußischen, In Bernfried Schlerath, Veronica Rittner (eds.), *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte, Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20–25. Februar 1983*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 170–180.

Euler, Wolfram 1988, *Das Altpreußische als Volkssprache im Kreise der indogermanischen und baltischen Sprachen*, Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 39).

Hermann, Eduard 1916, Wills Kenntnis des Preußischen, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 47, 147–158.

Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Kaukienė, Audronė 1995, Prūsų kalbos linksniavimo sistema ir jos kitimas, *Baltistica* 30(2), 17–24.

Kaukienė, Audronė 2004, *Prūsų kalbos tyrinėjimai*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universitetas, Baltistikos centras.

Levin, Jules F. 1976, Toward a graphology of Old Prussian monuments: the Enchiridion, *Baltistica* 12(1), 9–22.

Lühr, Rosemarie 2004, Unterspezifikation in der germanischen Nominalmorphologie, In Matthias Fritz, Ilse Wischer (eds.), *Historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft und ger-*

manische Sprachen, Akten der 4. Neulandtagung der Historisch-Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft in Potsdam 2001, Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 113), 129–147.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1968, Zum preußischen, bzw. baltischen Instrumental Singular, *Baltistica* 4(1), 23–29.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai (Deklinacija)*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1966–1981, *Prūsų kalbos paminklai (PKP)* 1–2, Vilnius: Mintis (1); Mokslas (2).

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1988–1997, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas (PKEŽ)* 1–4, Vilnius: Mokslas (1); Mokslo ir enciklopedijų l-kla (2, 3); Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas (4).

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1994 (rev.), Smoczyński Wojciech, Holvoet Axel (eds.), Colloquium Pruthenicum Primum, Papers from the First International Conference on Old Prussian held in Warsaw, September 30th–October 1st, 1991, 1992, *Baltistica* 28(2), 121–124.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 2004, *Prūsų kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Mikalauskaitė, Elzbieta 1938, Priešreformacinių laikų prūsiško Tėve Mūsų nuotrūpa, *Archivum Philologicum* 7, 102–106.

Petit, Daniel 2001, Pronoms neutres et règle SVO en vieux prussien, *Baltistica* 36(2), 173–188.

Petkevičius, Merkelis 1598, *Polski z Litewskim Katechism wydany nakładem Malchera Pietkiewicza (PK)*, Vilnius.

Rosinas, Albertas 1995, *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai: morfologijos raida*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Rysiewicz, Zygmunt 1938–1940, L'accentazione dell' antico prussiano, *Studi Baltici* 7, 88–147.

Schmalstieg, William R. 1976, *Studies in Old Prussian. A Critical Review of the Relevant Literature in the Field since 1945*, University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1989, Prussiano māim III 107₁₅ 'mir', *Baltistica* 25(2), 134–141.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1991, Zur Schreibung in apr. Enchiridion II. Nochmals apr. māim 'mir', *Baltistica* 27(1), 44–47.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1992, Die altpreussische Entnasalisierung und ihre Folgen für die Deutung der Deklinationsendung, In Wojciech Smoczyński, Axel Holvoet (eds.), *Colloquium Pruthenicum Primum, Papers from the First International Conference on Old Prussian held in Warsaw, September 30th–October 1st, 1991*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 47–83.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1994, Wpływ niemiecki w deklinacji staropruskiej, In Stanisław Dubisz, Alicja Nagórko (eds.), *Granice i pogranicza, język i historia*, Warszawa: Elipsa, 229–239.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1995, Das altpreußische Enchiridion: Zur Deutung einiger strittigen Kasusformen, *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 173–184.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 1998, Zur Morphologie des altpreussischen Artikels, In Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*, Heidelberg: Winter, 89–114.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2005, *Lexikon der altpreussischen Verben*, Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 117).

Stang, Christian S., 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

Топоров, Владимир Н., 2006, Прусский язык, In В. Н. Топоров, М. В. Завялова, А. А. Кибрик и др. (eds.), *Языки мира: Балтийские языки*, Москва: Academia, 50–93.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1910, *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Van Wijk, Nicolaas 1918, *Altpreussische Studien, Beiträge zur baltischen und zur vergleichenden indogermanischen Grammatik*, Haag: Nijhoff.

Vilentas, Baltramiejus 1579, *Enchiridion, Catechismas maszas... pergulditas per Baltramieju Willentha plebona Karalauzuie*, Königsberg.

Zigmantavičiūtė Alina, Jurgita Zigmantavičiūtė 2000, Datyvo bei genetyvo formos ir vartojimas prūsų Katekizmuose, In Audronė Kaukienė (ed.), *Vakarų baltų kalbos ir kultūros reliktai* 3, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universitetas, Baltistikos centras, 31–38.

Daniel PETIT

Ecole Normale Supérieure

Centre d'Études anciennes

45, rue d'Ulm, 75005 Paris

[daniel.petit@ens.fr]