

ERIC P. HAMP

MAŽVYDAS CATECHISM 31₂₂₋₂₃

The text has: *Prisch Dewa ij stai-tima stawij*. Gordon B. Ford's edition (Assen 1971) emends to read *ijstatima*¹. Clearly this rests internally on the related form *ijngi statitas* in the preceding line, as well as externally on the noun *ordinationi* of Willich.

We may wonder, however, what prompted the error of introducing *ai*. I submit that, given the similarity in the old typeface of *t* and *k*, the spelling was attracted by the suggestive similarity (even in semantics as well) of *įskaitymas*.

Now this in turn suggests an error not on the part of Mažvydas in the act of writing, but of a printer or typesetter, who is looking at the type faces and not keeping in mind the whole of the text. At the same time it is the kind of error that only a native speaker could make².

Here we have internal evidence that the printer of the Catechism spoke Lithuanian.

¹ Stang writes thus (*Die Sprache des lit. Kat. von M.*, 21) without mentioning the reading.

² There does not seem to be strong enough motivation in the surrounding *taip* and *betaigi* to look for contamination from these.