

Frederik KORTLANDT

Leiden University

## THE LINGUISTIC POSITION OF THE PRUSSIAN SECOND CATECHISM

Elsewhere I have argued that the three Old Prussian catechisms reflect consecutive stages in the development of a moribund language (Kortlandt 1998a, 1998b, 2001a). After first eliminating the orthographical differences between the three versions of parallel texts while maintaining the distinction between linguistic variants and then assigning separate phonemic interpretations to the three versions on the basis of the historical evidence I listed the following phonological differences between the three catechisms:

		I		II		E
*ē	=	ē	>	ie	>	ī
*ēi	=	ēi	>	iei	=	iei
*ēn	=	ēn	>	ien	=	ien
*ī	>	ei	=	ei	>	ī
*ā > *ō	>	uo	>	ū	=	ū
*ōi	>	uoi	>	ūi	>	oui
*ōn	>	uon	>	uan		
*ū	=	ū	>	ou	=	ou
*wu	=	wu	>	u	=	u

Since the Second Catechism is meant to be a corrected version of the First, we should now be able to specify the differences not only as orthographical, phonological, grammatical or lexical, but also as real linguistic differences or idiosyncratic changes. As a working hypothesis, I shall take discrepancies between the First and the Second Catechism to be real corrections when they are maintained in the Enchiridion and to be idiosyncratic when the latter text returns to the standard of the First Catechism. Leaving the orthographical and phonological differences aside, I shall concentrate on the grammatical and lexical changes attested in the parallel texts (which I listed already in Kortlandt 1998b, 125–128). I shall quote the relevant forms in the phonemic transcription which I introduced earlier (Kortlandt 1998a, 67–73).

The declensional system was simplified by the elimination of irregular stem forms and endings:

- (1) Replacement of *i-*, *u-* and consonant stems by *a-*stems.  
acc.sg. I, II /emnen/, E /emnan/.  
gen.sg. I, II /tawišis/, E /tawišas/. (2x)

acc.sg. I, II /peku/, E /pekan/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /tirtien/, E /tīrtan/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /geiwien/, E /gīwan/.  
 nom.sg. II /reiki/, E /rīks/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /šien/, E /šan/.  
 acc.pl. I, II /dins/, E /tenans/.  
 gen.sg. I /sūnos/, II /sounos/, E /soūnas/.

In all of these instances the Second Catechism like the First preserves the old form while the innovation is limited to the Enchiridion.

(2) Regularization of *a*-stem endings.

acc.sg. I, II /mergwan/, E /mērgan/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /krikstiāniskwan/, E /krikstiāniskan/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /perōniskwan/, E /perōniskan/.  
 gen.pl. I /grēkon/, II /griekon/, E /grīkan/. (2x)  
 gen.sg. I /menšon/, II, E /mensas/.  
 acc.sg. I, II /prābutskwan/, E /prābutskan/.

The form /menšon/ or perhaps rather /menson/ appears to be an original plural (cf. Derksen 1998, 134) and was corrected to /mensas/, which is adopted in the Enchiridion. In the other instances the Second Catechism agrees with the First while the Enchiridion eliminated the paradigmatic alternation.

(3) Elimination of the neuter gender.

nom.sg. I /sta tāwe nūson/, II /stan tāwe noūson/, E /stas tāwa noūson/.  
 nom.sg. I /sta nawans testamentan/, II /sta nawanan testamentan/, E /stas nauns testaments/.  
 nom.sg. I, II /ka/, E /kas/.

These forms suggest that the neuter was first eliminated in the adjective, then in the noun, and finally in the pronoun. The forms I /nawans/, II /nawanan/, E /nauns/ look like an artificial formation on the basis of an original acc.sg. /nawan/ but may be real (cf. Kortlandt 2002, 43).

The conjugational system was simplified by a reduction of verbal categories:

(1) Replacement of the imperative by the indicative.

I, II /tur/, E /turi/. (10x)

(2) Replacement of the infinitives in *-twei* and *-ton* by *-t*.

I, II /swintintwei/, E /swintint/.

I /zmuonintwei/, II /zmūnintwei/, E /zmūnint/.

I /prei leigintwei/, II /leiginton/, E /prei līgint/.

The last example appears to be a real correction in the Second Catechism which was not maintained in the Enchiridion because the forms in *-twei* and *-ton* were already archaic (cf. Kortlandt 1990).

(3) Elimination of the nasal infix.

I, II /sindans/, E /sīdons/.

The present participle was replaced by the past participle in the Enchiridion because the former category was lexicalized and did not function as a participle any more (cf. K o r t l a n d t 2000, 70).

(4) Replacement of the optative by the indicative.

I /perjeis/, II /pereisei/, E /perēit/.

I, II /audāsei sien/, E /audāst sien/.

The replacement of the old optative /jeis/ by the new optative /eisei/ appears to be a real correction (cf. K o r t l a n d t 1982, 8) while the replacement by the indicative is limited to the Enchiridion.

(5) Replacement of the preterit by the present tense.

I, II /bilā/, E /bilē/.

I, II /imēts/, E /ima tans/.

I, II /imēts/, E /imats/.

Elsewhere I have argued that we must reconstruct a preterit I, II /imī/ rather than /imē/ (K o r t l a n d t 1998c, 145). The replacement by the present tense is limited to the Enchiridion.

(6) Replacement of the active by the passive preterit.

I, II /prawilā din/, E /tans prawilts postāi/.

(7) Replacement of the optative by the imperative (cf. K o r t l a n d t 1982, 7).

I, II /segeiti/, E /segītei/. (2x)

Thus, I find two real corrections of inflected verb forms in the Second Catechism, /leiginton/ and /pereisei/, both of which were again replaced in the Enchiridion.

There are various discrepancies in the numerals, pronouns and adverbs:

I, II /desimts/, E /desīmton/.

I /pirmas/, II, E /pirmois/.

I /tirts/, II /tirtis/, E /tīrts/.

I /šan/, II, E /stan/. (2x)

I, II /dins/, E /tenans/.

I, II /imēts/, E /ima tans/.

I, II /stwendau/, E /iskwendau/.

I, II /preiken/, E /prīki/.

I, II /unsei/, E /unsai/.

It appears that II /pirmois/, /tirtis/, /stan/ are real emendations of I /pirmas/, /tirts/, /šan/. For the numerals I refer to K o r t l a n d t 2002. The prefix and preposition *na* of the First and Second Catechism was replaced by *no* after *po* in the Enchiridion (5x). The main syntactic innovations are the following:

- (1) Introduction of the definite article in the Enchiridion. (8x)
- (2) Introduction of a possessive pronoun in the Enchiridion.  
acc.pl. I, II /n(o)uson aušautins/, E /nousons āušautins/  
dat.pl. I, II /n(o)uson aušaut(i)neikamans/, E /nousons aušautinīkamans/.
- (3) Loss of inflection in the adjective in the Enchiridion.  
gen.sg. I /wismusingis tāwas/, II /wisemūkis tāwas/, E /steise wisemusīngin tāwas/  
gen.sg. I, II /swintas naseilis/, E /steise swintan noseilis/.

The genitive was replaced by the accusative in the adjective, but not in the following noun.

Lexical changes comprise the following:

- I /ni enterpinskwan minintwei/, II, E /ni enbāndan westwei/.
- I /patiniskwan/, II /saloubiskwan/, E /salouban/.
- I /falš/, II, E /redi/.
- I, II /waitiāton/, E /dātwei/.
- I /wismusingin/, II /wisemūkin/, E /wisemusīngin/.
- I /pateikuots/, II /pagauts/, E /pogauts/.
- I, II /prei tikrai/, E /prei tikrōmien/.
- I /wismusingis/, II /wisemūkis/, E /wisemusīngin/.
- I /etwerpsnan/, II, E /etwerpsenien/. (2x)
- I /laims/, II /reiki/, E /rīks/.
- I /perbandan/, II, E /perbandāsnan/.
- I, II /minīsnan/, E /pominīsnan/. (2x)

Here I see real corrections in /redi/ for /falš/ and in /reiki/ for /laims/, also in /enbandan/ for /enterpinskwan/ and in /perbandāsnan/ for /perbandan/, and perhaps in /pagauts/ for /pateikuots/. The forms /wisemūkin/ and /wisemūkis/ appear to be idiosyncratic. The form /saloubiskwan/ may be a partial correction of /patiniskwan/ because it was itself corrected to /salouban/ in the Enchiridion. The form /etwerpsenien/ is the correct accusative of /etwerpsnā/ (cf. Kortlandt 2001b, 138).

I conclude that the grammatical system of the Second Catechism is identical with that of the First Catechism and is much more archaic than that of the Enchiridion. The consistent nature of the observations presented here demonstrates that we must take the Old Prussian texts seriously as the 16<sup>th</sup> century record of a living though moribund language.

# PRŪSŲ ANTROJO KATEKIZMO KALBINIS STATUSAS

## *Santrauka*

Prūsų antrojo katekizmo gramatinė sistema yra tapati pirmojo katekizmo gramatinei sistemai ir laikytina daug archajiškesne už trečiojo katekizmo (Enchiridiono) gramatinę sistemą. Straipsnyje pateikiamų duomenų nuoseklus pobūdis rodo, kad prūsų kalbos tekstus reikia vertinti kaip rimtus gyvos, nors ir mirštančios, kalbos XVI a. paminklus.

## REFERENCES

- Derksen R., 1998, Lithuanian *mėsà*, – *Res Balticae*, IV, 131–137.
- Kortlandt F., 1982, Innovations which Betray Archaisms, – *Baltistica*, XVIII (1), 4–9.
- Kortlandt F., 1990, Old Prussian Infinitives in *-ton* and *-twei*, – *Symposium Balticum* [Fs. Rūķe-Draviņa], 213–218.
- Kortlandt F., 1998a, The Development of the Prussian Language in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, – *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*, 55–76.
- Kortlandt, 1998b, The Language of the Old Prussian Catechisms, – *Res Balticae*, IV, 117–129.
- Kortlandt, 1998c, The Old Prussian Preterit, – ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΙΟΝ [Fs. Toporov], 144–147.
- Kortlandt, 2000, Old Prussian Participles, – *Res Balticae*, VI, 69–75.
- Kortlandt, 2001a, Diphthongization and Monophthongization in Old Prussian, – *Res Balticae*, VII, 57–65.
- Kortlandt, 2001b, OPr. *-snā*, Lith. *-sena*, Latv. *-šana*, – *Munera linguistica et philologica* [Fs. Hasiuk], 137–139.
- Kortlandt, 2002, Old Prussian Numerals, – *Baltu filologija*, XI (1), 43–46.