F. KORTLANDT

THE FORMATION OF THE OLD PRUSSIAN PRESENT TENSE

The obvious limitations which the character of the Old Prussian texts imposes on our knowledge of the language have given rise to two lines of investigation. Some authors have interpreted the material chiefly on the basis of evidence from cognate languages (e. g., Bezzenberger, 1907, Trautmann, 1910, Schmalstieg, 1974), while others have tried to start from the forms as they appear in the available material (e. g., Van Wijk, 1918, Schmid, 1963, Levin, 1976). There can be no doubt that I subscribe to the second approach. The two lines of thought are complementary, however, and the difference between them must not be exaggerated. As long as one is willing to take both the texts and the comparative evidence seriously, agreement can often be reached. The main objection to faithful reliance on the comparative evidence is that it automatically leads to a bias in the direction of the cognate languages. The history of Indo-European scholarship can properly be described as a gradual shift away from the languages which served as the primary basis for the reconstruction of the proto-language (cf. Mayrhofer, 1983). Under these circumstances, it would be unwise to base oneself primarily on evidence from cognate languages in the interpretation of the Old Prussian material.

The main piece of evidence for the flexion class of an Old Prussian verb in the present tense is the vowel before the 1st pl. ending *-mai*. The Enchiridion contains the following 1st pl. forms (cf. Van Wijk, 1918, 133ff):

(1) athematic forms in *-mai*: *asmai* ʽsind', *et-skīmai* ʽauferstehen', *per-ēimai* ʽkommen', *wīrstmai* ʽwerden'. The attested 2nd pl. forms of these verbs are *astai* (4x, *asti* 2x in contiguous lines, *estei* 1x), *wīrstai*;

(2) forms in *-āmai, -ūmai*: *waitiāmai* ʽreden', *quoitāmai* ʽwollen', *lāikumai* ʽhalten', *po-lāikumai* ʽbehalten', *en-laikūmai* ʽanhalten' (read *-lāiku-*). The attested 2nd pl. forms of these verbs are *quoitēti*, imperative *lāikutei, en-lāikuti*;

(3) forms in *-ē(i)mai*: *billēmai* ʽsagen', *druwēmai* ʽglauben', *seggēmai* ʽtun', *stallēmai* ʽstehen', *klausēmai* ʽhören', *au-paickēmai* ʽabdringen', *en-wackēmai* ʽanrufen', *en-wackēimai* ʽid', *waidleimai* ʽzaubern'. The attested 2nd pl. forms of these

verbs are *druwētei, seggēti, stallēti,* imperative *billītei, seggītei* (3x, once used as an indicative, *seggīta* 1x, *segijtei* 1x used as an indicative), *klausieiti;*

(4) forms in *-au(i)mai: dīnkaumai* 'danken', *dinkauimai* 'id', 2nd pl. imperative *dīnkauti* (cf. *rikauite* 'herrschet');

(5) thematic forms in *-ammai, -emmai: per-weckammai* 'verachten', *giwammai* 'leben', *giwemmai* 'id', *klantemmai* 'fluchen', *per-klantemmai* 'verraten', *paikemmai* 'trügen', *po-prestemmai* 'fühlen', *wertemmai* 'schwören'. No 2nd pl. forms of these verbs are attested;

(6) forms in *-imai.* These forms belong to the following categories:

(a) optative *turrīlimai* 'müssten';

(b) preterito-present *waidimai* 'wissen', 2nd pl. *waiditi,* athematic 2nd sg. *waisei, waisse,* infinitive *waist;*

(c) verbs in *-īt: kīrdimai* 'hören', *mēntimai* 'lügen', *ep-mēntimai* 'belügen', *er-nertimai* 'erzürnen', *turrimai* 'haben', 2nd pl. *turriti,* imperative *kīrdeiti* (cf. *crixteiti* 'taufet'), *kirdijti* (cf. *laukijti* 'suchet', *milijti* 'liebet'), infinitive *kirdīt, kirdītwei, turīt, turrit, turrītwei;*

(d) loan words: *grīkimai* 'sündigen', *madlimai* 'bitten', *schlūsimai* 'dienen', *per-schlūsimai* 'verdienen', *massimai* 'mögen', *au-schpāndimai* 'abspannen', 2nd pl. *schlūsiti,* imperative *madliti,* 3rd person *grīki-si, madli, massi,* optative *musīlai,* infinitive *madlit, madlīt, madliton, madlitwei, schlūsitwei;*

(e) simple verbs: *galbimai* 'helfen', *girrimai* 'loben', *gunnimai* 'treiben', *immimai* 'nehmen', *en-immimai-sin* 'annehmen', *pīdimai* 'bringen', *pidimai* 'id', *ser-rīpimai* 'erfahren', *et-wērpimai* 'vergeben', 2nd pl. *immati,* imperative *immaiti, imaiti, rīpaiti* 'folget', *po-wiērptei* 'lasset', infinitive *girtwei, guntwei, īmt, pijst, et-wiērpt* (1x, *et-wīerpt* 1x, *etpwērpt* 1x), *po-wiērpt;*

(f) nasal presents: *au-gaunimai* 'gewinnen', *po-gaunimai* 'empfangen', *po-stānimai* 'werden', *er-sinnimai* 'erkennen', *po-sinnimai* 'bekennen', 2nd pl. *er-sinnati,* infinitive *po-gaūt, po-stāt, po-stātwei, er-sinnat, po-sinnat;*

(g) forms in *-innimai: bebinnimai* 'spotten', *brewinnimai* 'fördern', *mukinnimai* 'lehren', *prei-stattinnimai* 'vorstellen', *tickinnimai* 'machen', *teckinnimai* 'id', 2nd pl. imperative *-inaiti, -innaiti, -inneiti, -ineiti,* infinitive *-int.*

It is clear from this list that the regular 1st pl. ending *-imai* ousted other endings under conditions which remain to be specified. I claim that this ending has a threefold origin. In the following I shall not go into a discussion of the points which have been clarified by V a n W i j k (1918).

The forms in *-ē(i)mai* can be compared with Lith. *-ėjame.* W. P. S c h m i d distinguishes between the type *seggīt* 'tun' and the type *druwīt* 'glauben', but derives both *seggēmai* and *druwēmai* from *-ējamai* (1963, 16ff). I think that this is correct. The difference between the two singular paradigms will be discussed below.

Van Wijk reads *au-paickẹmai* as *-emmai* and identifies it with *paikemmai*, which is in my view incorrect: the difference can be compared with the one between *en-wackẹ(i)mai* and *per-weckammai*. Both of these present tense formations are related to the infinitive *wackītwei* 'locken' (cf. *giwīt, giwammai, per-klantīt, per-klantemmai*). The form *po-paikā* 'betrügt' must not be corrected to *-paikū* (Trautmann, 1910, 405) but to *-pāika* (Van Wijk, 1918, 135), a view which is unjustly disregarded by Schmid (1963, 30).

As I have argued elsewhere (1974), we must assume final stress in the thematic forms in *-ammai, -emmai*: these verbs belong to the type with Balto-Slavic mobile accentuation (type *c* of Stang, 1957). The accentual mobility is best preserved in *giwīt, giwammai, giwemmai*, 2nd sg. *giwassi* (with final stress) and analogical *gīwasi, gīwu* (with lst sg. ending, cf. Old Russian *žívu*, Stang, 1957, 109), 3rd. sg. *giwa*. The retracted stress was generalized in the present tense of *kirdīt* 'hören' and *laikūt* 'halten', as is clear from lst pl. *kīrdimai, lāikumai*. The 2nd pl. imperative forms *kīrdeiti* and *kirdijti* represent different formations: the former contains the stem of the present tense and the ending of the PIE. optative, whereas the latter is derived from the stem of the infinitive (cf. Kortlandt, 1982, 7). The difference can be compared with the one between 2nd sg. imperative *dereis* 'siehe' and *en-dirīs* 'siehe an'.

If the forms in *-ē(i)mai* and *-au(i)mai* can be derived from *-ējamai* and *-aujamai*, it is reasonable to suppose that *girrimai* 'loben' continues *-jamai* (cf. Van Wijk, 1918, 136, Schmid, 1963, 6). Unfortunately, the *ja*-flexion cannot be identified on the basis of the Old Prussian material alone, and it cannot be excluded that these verbs had joined another flexion class in prehistoric times. In any case we have to assume at least three different flexion types with a lst pl. form in *-imai* which cannot be identified with the *ja*-flexion.

The verb *waist* 'wissen' has an athematic flexion in the singular, but the plural forms *waidimai, waiditi* differ from the athematic plural forms *asmai, astai, wīrstmai, wīrstai*. The obvious source of the linking vowel in this paradigm is the 3rd pl. ending *-int*, which must be assumed for Balto-Slavic on the basis of the Slavic evidence (cf. Endzelin, 1944, 162). Since the athematic lst and 2nd pl. forms were preserved in Slavic, the ending *-int* must have been preserved in Prussian at a stage which was posterior to the separation between them.

The plural forms *turrimai, turriti* 'haben, sollen' resemble *waidimai, waiditi*, not *druwēmai, druwētei* or *seggēmai, seggēti*. Similarly, the 2nd sg. form *tur*, which is found in the catechisms I and II, is quite unlike *druwēse* or *seggēsei*. In the Enchiridion we find the following forms:

lst sg. *turri* 1x

2nd sg. *turri* 14x, *turei* 6x

3rd sg. *turri* 18x, *turei* 8x, *turrei* 1x

1st pl. *turrimai* 20x

2nd pl. *turriti* 3x

3rd pl. *turri* 10x, *turei* 1x, *ture* 1x

On the basis of these forms it seems probable to me that we have to start from a 3rd sg. form *turei* and a 3rd pl. form *turri*, the latter of which was in the process of being generalized in historical times. The motivation for this generalization can be found in the *ja*-flexion, where *-i* is the expected 3rd person ending both in the singular and in the plural. The analogical introduction of *-ei* in the *ja*-flexion is found in 3rd sg. *et-wiērpei* 'vergibt' (infinitive *et-wiērpt*, 1st pl. *et-wērpimai*).

In this connection we may reconsider the paradigms of *seggīt* and *druwīt* in the Enchiridion. The following list does not contain the 2nd pl. imperative forms of *seggīt* (5x, twice used as an indicative).

1st sg. *druwē* 6x, *druwe* 2x, *segge* 1x

2nd sg. *druwē* 3x, *druwēse* 2x, *seggēsei* 1x

3rd sg. *druwē* 2x, *druwe* 2x, *segē* 1x, *segge* 4x

1st pl. *druwēmai* 1x, *seggēmai* 2x

2nd pl. *druwētei* 1x, *seggēti* 1x

3rd pl. *druwē* 1x, *seggē* 1x, *segge* 2x

I agree with Schmid (1963) that the paradigm of *druwīt* reflects the *ēja*-flexion, which was at least partly adopted by *seggīt*. The form *segge* is ambiguous: it may represent either *-ē* or *-ei*.

The other verbs which may belong to the same flexion class are even more difficult to interpret. The following forms of the verb *billīt* 'sagen, sprechen' are attested in the Enchiridion:

1st sg. *billi* 3x, *bille* 1x, preterit *billai* 1x

2nd sg. *blli* 1x (read *billi*)

3rd sg. *billē* 4x, *bille* 2x, *billi* 2x, *billā* 3x, *billa* 1x, preterit *billa* 4x, *billā-ts* 4x, *billē* 1x

1st pl. *billēmai* 1x

3rd pl. *billē* 2x

In the other catechisms we find the 3rd sg. preterit forms I *bela, bela-ts* 2x, II *byla, byla-czt, bila-ts*. I assume that *billā* is the regular preterit form, whereas the correct present tense form is *billē*. The 3rd sg. form *billi* translates the German subjunctive 'spreche' (2x) and appears to belong to the same paradigm as the 2nd pl. imperative form *billītei*. Thus, the present tense of this verb does not seem to differ from that of *druwīt* outside the 1st and 2nd sg. forms, which end in *-i*.

The attested forms of *stallit* 'stehen' are the following:

3rd sg. *stallā* 1x, *stallaē* 1x, *stallē* 1x, *stalle* 2x, *stalli* 1x, *per-stallē* 1x

1st pl. *stallēmai* 1x
2nd pl. *stallēti* 1x
3rd pl. *stallē* 1x, *stalle* 1x, *per-stallē* 1x, *per-stalle* 1x
Here again, I assume that *stallā* represents the preterit and *stallē* the regular present
tense form.

We may now reconsider the following paradigm:
1st sg. *quoi* 'will' 3x
2nd sg. *quoi* 2x, *i-quoi-tu* 2x
3rd sg. *quoi* 1x, *quoitē* 1x, *po-quoitē-ts* 1x
1st pl. *quoitāmai* 1x
2nd pl. *quoitēti* 2x
3rd pl. *quoitē* 1x, *quoitā* 1x
The form *quoitā* is found in the following context: *Kadden Deiws wissan wargan
prātin bhe quāitan lemlai bhe kūmpinna quai noūmans stan emnan Deiwas niswintinai
bhe swaian rīkin niquoitā daton perēit kāigi stwi ast stēisi pickullas stessei Swītas
bhe noūson kermeneniskan quāits schlāit schpartina bhe polāiku mans drūktai en
swaiāsmu wirdan bhe Druwien er prei noūson wangan sta ast swais Etneīwings labs
quāits.* „Wenn GOTT allen bösen Rath vnnd willen bricht vnd hindert so vns den
Namen Gottes nicht heiligen vnd sein Reich nicht komen lassen wöllen Als da ist
des Teuffels der Welt vnd vnsers fleisches wille Sondern stercket vnd behelt vns fest
in seinem Wort vnd Glauben bisz an vnser ende das ist sein gnediger guter wille."
I think that *quoitā* is a preterit form used in the function of a subjunctive. The same
can be maintained for the 1st pl. form *quoitāmai*. The form *quoitē* represents the
regular present tense indicative.

In conclusion, I regard the following forms as regular:
1st sg. *turri, druwē, billi, quoi*
2nd sg. *turri, turei, druwē, druwēse, quoi*
3rd sg. *turri, turei, druwē, billē, stallē, quoi, quoitē,* preterit *billā, stallā*
1st pl. *turrimai druwēmai, seggēmai, billēmai, stallēmai,* preterit *quoitāmai*
2nd pl. *turriti, seggēti, stallēti, quoitēti*
3rd pl. *turri, druwē, seggē, billē, stallē, quoitē,* preterit *quoitā*
For early Prussian I tentatively reconstruct the following paradigms on the basis of
the comparative evidence (cf. Kortlandt, 1979):

1st sg.	*giriā*	*tur(e)iā*	*druwēiā*	*esmā*
2nd sg.	*girie(s)i*	*turei(s)ei*	*druwēie(s)i*	*essei*
3rd sg.	*girie*	*turei*	*druwēie*	*esti*
1st pl.	*giriama*	*turima*	*druwēiama*	*esmai*
2nd pl.	*giriete*	*turite*	*druwēiete*	*estei*
3rd pl.	*giria*	*turi*	*druwēia*	?

108

The paradigm of *turīt* appears to reflect an extremely ancient flexion type which underlies the East Baltic and Slavic *i*-flexion.

The remaining verbal class with a 1st pl. ending *-imai* are nasal presents, which have a 2nd pl. ending *-ati*. The verbs *īmt* 'nehmen' and *pijst* 'tragen, bringen' appear to belong to the same class. Their flexion is exemplified by the following forms:

1st sg. *imma* 1x, *po-sinna* 4x

3rd sg. *eb-immai* 'begreift' 1x, *pīdai* 1x, *po-stānai* 6x, *en-gaunai* 1x, *en-gaunei* 1x, *po-gaunai* 1x, *po-gauni* 1x

1st pl. *immimai* 2x, *en-immimai-sin* 1x, *pīdimai* 1x, *pidimai* 1x, *er-sinnimai* 1x, *po-sinnimai* 1x, *po-stānimai* 1x, *au-gaunimai* 1x, *po-gaunimai* 1x

2nd pl. *immati* 1x, *er-sinnati* 1x

3rd pl. *po-sinna* 1x, *po-stānai* 1x, *po-stanai* 1x, *po-gāunai* 1x

This type is distinct from the *āja*-flexion:

3rd sg. *peisai* 'schreibt' 1x

3rd pl. *peisāi* 1x, *ettrāi* 'antworten' 1x, *kelsāi* 'lauten' 1x, *kaltzā* 'id' 1x

For early Prussian I tentatively reconstruct the following paradigm:

1st sg.   **zinā*
2nd sg.   **zinā(se)i*
3rd sg.   **zināi*
1st pl.   **zinima < *zininma*
2nd pl.   **zinte < *zinnte*
3rd pl.   **zina < *zinna*

The difference between the 1st and 2nd pl. forms must have arisen as a result of the different chronological order of syllabification and simplification of the respective consonant clusters. The 2nd pl. form was subsequently remodeled to **zinate* on the basis of the 3rd pl. form. When final long diphthongs were shortened, stem-stressed thematic verbs apparently adopted the paradigm reconstructed here. The frequent *ina*-flexion may have been instrumental in this analogical development. The attested forms of this class are the following:

1st sg. *-inna* 2x, *-inai* 1x, *-inne* 1x

2nd sg. *-inai* 1x, *-inei* 1x

3rd sg. *-inna* 9x, *-ina* 4x, *-inno* 1x, *-inai* 4x, *-innei* 1x, *-inne* 1x

1st pl. *-innimai* 6x

3rd pl. *-inna* 3x, *-ina* 2x, *-inai* 1x, *-inne* 1x

As in the case of *turei* and *turri*, I think that we have to start from 3rd sg. *-inai* and 3rd pl. *-inna*, the latter form being generalized because it could be identified as the bare present tense stem with a zero ending. This generalization evidently did not reach the nasal presents of simple verbs.

The analysis of the Old Prussian material presented here disposes of the identification of the *a/i*-alternation with the flexion of the Old Indic 9th present class (e. g., Trautmann, 1910, 280, Van Wijk, 1918, 140), an identification which is incompatible with the laryngeal theory (cf. Stang, 1942, 145). It implies that the *ina*-flexion, like the *i*-flexion, must have preserved the apophonic alternation in the early Prussian paradigm and that, consequently, the thematic *ina*-flexion of Lithuanian is an innovation. This is in accordance with the fact that the Latvian verbs in *-inât* are not thematic. There is no sufficient reason to assume that Latvian and Lithuanian have preserved different flexion types, as Stang proposes (1942, 182; 1966, 369). I rather assume that the 3rd person ending *-ina* continues the singular in Latvian and the plural in Lithuanian, just as the characteristic vowel of the *i*-flexion stems from the singular in Slavic and from the plural in East Baltic. Indeed, the different generalization in the *ina*-flexion of Latvian and Lithuanian suggests that the difference between 3rd sg. and 3rd pl. forms was preserved in this flexion type at the time when the East Baltic dialects arose. In the thematic flexion, the difference had disappeared as a consequence of the neutralization between *e* and *a* after *j* (cf. Kortlandt, 1979, 62f). The relation between the *ina*-flexion and nominal *n*-stems (Fraenkel, 1938) must be due to a secondary development.

In conclusion, it is probable that Prussian preserved an apophonic alternation between singular and plural forms both in the *i*-flexion and in nasal presents, an alternation which was lost in East Baltic and Slavic in prehistoric times. The reconstructed *i*-flexion offers a basis from which both the East Baltic and the Slavic paradigms can be derived. The direct identification of the *ina*-flexion with nasal presents of roots in an obstruent allows the derivation of the Latvian and Lithuanian paradigms from a single flexion type. These considerations support the view that the Old Prussian texts are an imperfect representation of a remarkably archaic variety of Balto-Slavic.

REFERENCES

Bezzenberger A., 1907 — Studien über die Sprache des preussischen Enchiridions. — —KZ 41, 65—127.

Endzelin J., 1944 — Altpreussische Grammatik. — Riga.

Fraenkel E., 1938 — Zur Herkunft der litauischen Verba auf *-inti* und der Adjektiva auf *-intelis*. — APh 7, 17—39.

Kortlandt F., 1974 — Old Prussian Accentuation. — KZ 88, p. 299—306.

Kortlandt F., 1979 — Toward a Reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic Verbal System. — Lingua, vol. 49, p. 51—70.

Kortlandt F., 1982 — Innovations which Betray Archaisms. — Baltistica, vol. 18 (1), p. 4—9.

Levin J. F., 1976 — Toward a Graphology of Old Prussian Monuments: The Enchiridion. — Baltistica, vol. 12(1), p. 9—24.

Mayrhofer M., 1983 — Sanskrit und die Sprachen Alteuropas: Zwei Jahrhunderte des Widerspiels von Entdeckungen und Irrtümern. — Göttingen.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1974 — An Old Prussian Grammar. — University Park.

Schmid W. P., 1963 — Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum. — Wiesbaden.

Stang C. S., 1942 — Das slavische und baltische Verbum. — Oslo.

Stang C. S., 1957 — Slavonic Accentuation. — Oslo.

Stang C. S., 1966 — Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen. — Oslo.

Trautmann R., 1910 — Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler. — Göttingen.

Van Wijk N., 1918 — Altpreussische Studien. — Haag.

SMULKMENA LXIV

Senosios Lietuvos kanceliarijoje vartotose svetimose kalbose, kaip žinoma, aptikta nemaža lietuviškų žodžių. Daugiausia jų prirankiojo K. Jablonskis iš tekstų, rašytų kanceliarine slavų kalba ir lenkiškai[1]. Iš lotyniškų tekstų turime aikštėn iškeltą tik vieną kitą lituanizmą. Neseniai Vilniaus universiteto klasikinės filologijos katedros doc. B. Kazlauskas atkreipė šių eilučių autoriaus dėmesį į lietuvišką žodį *kušlikas* (*kušlėkas*?) 'silpnų akių, žlibas', vartojamą 1690 m. Vilniaus jėzuitų išleistoje lotyniškoje knygelėje „Theatrum Perennantis Gloriae... Michaeli Dowmont Siesicki... Anno 1690 Vilnae. Typis Academicis Soc. Iesu". Jos p. 31 (pažymėtas G₂), eil. 23 rašoma: *Kuszliki...facta Ducis Mavortia promant* 'kušlikai...karo vado žygius teiškelia', o eil. 28 — *Kuszlicij sensere graves* 'žiaurūs kušlikai pajuto'. Šio žodžio lietuviškumas nekelia abejonių, plg. *kùšlas* 'silpnų akių, žlibas', *kušlỹs*, *kùšlius* 'kas neprimato, spangys, žabalas', *kùšlinti* 'prisikišus žiūrėti, žabalinėti'. Panašus žodis (pakitusia reikšme) yra patekęs ir į baltarusių tarmes: *кýшла, кýшлы, кушлы́, кушлáты* 'nevalyvas, netvarkingas; gauruotas; nevykęs, silpnas'[2]. Lotyniško teksto *kušlikui* visiškai tikslaus atitikmens lietuvių kalbos akademinis žodynas nepateikia, tačiau jame yra *kušlėkas* 'kas neprimato, aklys, spangys, žabalis'. Gal *kušlikas* perdirbta iš *kušlėkas*?

Z. Zinkevičius

---

[1] Jablonskis K. Lietuviški žodžiai senosios Lietuvos raštinių kalboje. K., 1941.

[2] Слоўнік беларускіх гаворак поўночна-заходняй Беларусі і яе пагранічча. Мінск, 1980. Т. 2. С. 595.