VAN WIJK'S *ALTPREUSSISCHE STUDIEN* REVISITED

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

This year we celebrate not only the 75th anniversary of the Leiden chair of Balto-Slavic languages, the oldest chair of Slavic studies in the Netherlands, but also the 70th anniversary of Van Wijk's *Altpreussische Studien* (1918), which represents a break in the study of the subject. While earlier investigators regarded the Prussian language primarily as a reflex of the Indo-European proto-language, Van Wijk was rather concerned with the establishment of a synchronic linguistic system before entering upon a diachronic interpretation of the Prussian material. His solutions to various problems are sometimes definitive, sometimes untenable, but always stimulating. In the following I intend to review the book from a modern point of view, profiting from the hindsight which seven decades of research have to offer. I shall not discuss all topics in detail, which would require a book-length treatment, but limit myself to the ten major issues appearing in the headings of the ten chapters which make up the main text of the book.

1   *URBALTISCHES ē IM SAMLANDISCHEN*

According to Van Wijk, *ē yielded *ī* except word-finally under the stress, where it is reflected as *-ē*, and before a word-final nasal, where *-ēn yielded *-ien*, e.g. *semmē* 'land', *weddē* 'led', acc.sg. *mien* 'me', *semmien* 'land'. The comparison with Lith. *žēmė*, *vēde* shows that the development was posterior to the Prussian pro-gressive accent shift (Kortlandt 1974). Van Wijk's rule is accepted by Stang (1966: 46), including the hypothesis that 2nd sg. *seggēsei*, 1st pl. *seggēmai*, 2nd pl. *seggēti* are built on *seggē* 'do(es)'. I

rather agree with Schmid (1963: 23) that 1st pl. -*ēmai* is the
phonetic reflex of *-*ējamai*, cf. *enwackēmai, enwackēimai* 'invoke'
(Van Wijk 1918: 135) and *dīnkaumai* beside *dinkauimai* 'thank'. I
cannot follow Schmid in his assumption that acute unstressed final
ē is reflected as -*e* in *segge* 'do(es)' (1963: 21). This assumption
presupposes the existence of an acute tone in unstressed syllables,
the presence of an acute ending in *segge*, the presence of root
stress in this word form, and its separation from *segē* and *seggē*,
which have the same meaning. None of these presuppositions can be
substantiated. The form *segge* may represent either -*ē* or -*ei* (cf.
Kortlandt 1987: 107), both with final stress. Thus, Van Wijk's rule
has stood the test and must be regarded as valid, even if we derive
-*ēmai* from *-*ējamai*.

2.   *ZUR SAMLÄNDISCHEN ENTWICKLUNG DES BALTISCHEN ā.*

According to Van Wijk, *ā* yielded *ō* or *ū* after labials and
velars and *ā* elsewhere. He declares himself unable to determine the
conditions for *ō* and *ū*: "einstweilen muss ich mich mit einem
negativen Ergebnis meiner Untersuchung begnügen" (1918: 45). I
think that the only phonetic reflex of *ā* after labials and velars
is *ū*, e.g. *mūti* 'mother', *widdewū* 'widow', dat.pl. *mergūmans*
'maids', inf. *laikūt* 'hold'. Van Wijk cites three counterexamples:
the preposition *po* 'under, after', also found as a verbal prefix,
the verb form *enterpo* 'is useful', and the participle *enkopts*
'buried', which are not written with a macron. In my view, all of
these represent a labialized variant of unstressed short *a* in a
labial environment (cf. Stang 1966: 29). The nominal prefix *pa-* was
stressed before the Prussian progressive accent shift (Kortlandt
1974), as a result of which the difference between *po-* and *pa-*
became distinctive, e.g. *polaipinna* '(I) command', *pallaips* 'com-
mandment', cf. also the recent loan word *tols* 'toll'. The rounded
variant was generalized in the preposition, e.g. *pōstan* 'under
the', *pōmien* 'after me'. I find no trace of a long vowel prefix
outside the Elbing Vocabulary, which offers *pomatre* 'stepmother',
poducre 'stepdaughter'. The verb form *enterpo* may be compared with
Lith. *tar̃pti* 'thrive'. The participle *enkopts* is better compared

with Lith. *kapóti* 'chop' (Sl. *kopati* 'dig') than with *kópti* 'climb'
(Van Wijk 1918: 44) or *kõpti, kuõpti* 'remove' (Endzelin 1935:
137f., Vaillant 1968). Note that the accentuation of Čak. (Novi)
kopâ 'digs' and its Bulgarian and Old Polish cognates (Kortlandt
1975: 39) points to a root with mobile stress, so that we expect
retraction of the stress in the participle *enkopts*.

3.   *ZUR SAMLÄNDISCHEN VERTRETUNG DES BALTISCHEN ō.*

According to Van Wijk, *ō is reflected as ā in *dāt* 'give', acc.
sg. *nādewisin* 'sighing', and as ō in nom.pl. *tickrōmai* 'just', acc.
sg. *perōnin* 'common', and their derivatives. He declares himself
unable to explain the divergence. I think that *ā and *ō merged in
early Prussian and that the reflex ō must be attributed to the com-
bined influence of the preceding *r* and the following nasal. Though
this rule is rather specific, it is not implausible phonetically
and we have 24 instances and no counterexamples in the Enchiridion.
Here again, I think that the distinction between ā and ō, as
between *a* and *o*, reappeared as a result of the progressive accent
shift. Van Wijk has convincingly argued that the preposition *no*
'on' is an innovation of the Enchiridion, as opposed to the earlier
catechisms, and replaced *na* under the influence of *po*. We find a
different distribution in the case of the preposition *pra* 'through'
and the verbal prefix *pro-, pra-*, where the rounded variant may
have arisen before certain consonants. There is an original long
vowel in *prābutskas* 'eternal', as in acc.sg. *prātin* 'advice', which
represents an old root noun. Van Wijk's hypothesis that word-final
acute *-ō always yielded *-u* cannot be maintained in view of the 1st
sg. ending *-a* (cf. Schmid 1963: 12). The dat.sg. ending *-u*, which
Van Wijk derives from the inst.sg. ending *-ō, was evidently
generalized under the influence of the pronominal ending *-smu*, e.g.
in *siru* 'heart', cf. the regular development in *schismu malniku* 'to
this child', *stesmu waldniku* 'to the king'. The pronominal gen.pl.
ending *-on* represents PIE. *-om, not *-ōm (Kortlandt 1978: 288).

4. *SAMLÄNDISCHE FLEXIONSFORMEN AUF* -ei *UND* -ai *UND DAS PROBLEM*
   VOM PREUSSISCHEN e.

The distinction between -ei and -ai is preserved in Prussian.
The rise of East Baltic ie (Van Wijk's e) must be compared with the
rise of uo from *ō (cf. Kortlandt 1977: 323ff.). Apart from the
categories where we find consistently either -ei (with its variants
-e and -i) or -ai in the Enchiridion, Van Wijk lists the following
instances of interchange:

(1) The adverb vnsei 'up' has a variant vnsai (1x), "offenbar nach
semmai" 'down'.

(2) The optative ending -sei has a variant -sai (3x), which Van
Wijk plausibly attributes to influence of the optative in -lai. The
ending -sei is best derived from the optative of the verb 'to be',
as Van Wijk has proposed in a later study (1929: 159f.).

(3) The 2nd sg. endings in the Enchiridion are -sai in the verb 'to
be' (7x) and in etskīsai '(you) rise', -sei and -se in the verb 'to
be' (6x) and after dā- 'give', wai(d)- 'know' (2x), ēi- 'go',
postā- 'become' (2x), seggē- 'do', druwē- 'believe' (2x), and -si
after the thematic stem giwa- 'live' (3x). Van Wijk attributes the
ending -sai to the influence of the athematic 1st sg. ending -mai,
which is indeed probable. Elsewhere I have argued that the thematic
2nd sg. ending -si was preserved under the stress (1974: 301 and
1979: 58).

(4) The usual 2nd pl. ending -ti can be derived from *-tē, as sug-
gested by Van Wijk and supported by Stang, who has clarified the
distribution of the endings (1966: 418f.). The ending -tei (9x, -te
2x) belongs to the imperative, while -tai is found in the verb 'to
be' (5x) and in wīrstai 'you will' (2x) and the imperative
klumstinaitai 'knock', which immediately follows the two occurrences
of wīrstai (Trautmann 1910: 73): Madliti tijt wīrstai ious immusis,
Laukijti tijt wīrstai ious aupallusis, klumstinaitai tijt wīrst
ioumus etwiriuns "Bittet so werdet jr nemen, Suchet so werdet jr
finden, Klopfet an so wirdt euch auffgethan". The ending -tai can
be attributed to the influence of the athematic endings 1st sg.
-mai, 2nd sg. -sai, 1st pl. -mai.

(5) The nom.pl. ending of the masc. adjective is -ai except in
kanxtei 'decent', wertei 'worthy', entensītei 'couched', pogautei

'received'. Van Wijk attributes the ending *-ei* to the influence of
the pronouns *dei* and *tennei* 'they', which is probable.

5. ZUM GENITIV SINGULAR DER ALTPREUSSISCHEN NOMINA.

According to Van Wijk, the nominal gen.sg. endings *-as*, *-is*,
-os are derived from the corresponding acc.sg. endings *-an*, *-in*,
-on by the substitution of *-s* for *-n*, while the converse develop-
ment must be assumed for gen.sg. *-es*, acc.sg. *-en* in the *n*-stems.
The main pieces of evidence are the retracted stress in gen.sg.
ālgas 'wages', Lith. *algõs*, and the reduced ending in II. *menses*
beside Ench. *mensas* of *mensā* 'flesh', acc.sg. *mensen* beside *mensan*,
which cannot be explained from an original stressed ending *-ās*.
Van Wijk regards the ending of gen.sg. *deiwas* 'god', which he de-
rives from PIE. *-oso*, as the source of the uniform genitive. The
crucial objection against this view is that neither gen.sg. *-as* nor
acc.sg. *-an* can be ancient in the *o*-stems. The ending *-an* replaces
earlier *-on* from Balto-Slavic *-un* from PIE. *-om* (cf. Kortlandt
1978: 288ff. and 1983b: 182f.). The ending *-as* replaces earlier *-a*
or *-ā*, which is now attested in the proverb *Deves does dantes*,
Deves does geitka 'God gave teeth, God will give bread' (Sjöberg
1969) and probably in the Basle epigram: *nykoyte pēnega doyte* 'you
do not want to give money', where an emendation to *-an* or *-as* is
unsatisfactory (cf. Mažiulis 1975: 130). We must therefore return
to the classic view that the original gen.sg. ending *-ā* adopted *-s*
from the *ā*-stems (Leskien 1876: 31ff., Berneker 1896: 186, Vaillant
1958: 30). The ending *-ās* was evidently shortened to *-as* before *ā*
yielded *ū* after labials and velars (cf. de Saussure 1892: 83fn.).
This shortening was anterior to the development of *-ān* (Stang
1966: 198), which seems to be in accordance with the reduction of
the vowel in the nom.sg. ending of the *o*-stems *-s* (Elbing *-is*).
After a velar, the acc.sg. ending *-ān* is reflected as *-uan* (*-wan*,
-un, *-on*) in the minor catechisms. I think that *-ān* was raised to
-ōn and then diphthongized to *-uan* before *ō* was further raised to
ū in the same way as *-ēn* was diphtongized to *-ien* (cf. Stang 1930:
148f.). The replacement of *mergwan* by *mērgan* 'maid' in the Enchiri-
dion betrays the influence of case forms where *ā* had been

shortened before the raising to $\bar{u}$. These must have been gen.sg.
-*as*, dat.sg. and nom.pl. -*ai*, acc.pl. -*ans*. The merger with the
corresponding case endings of the *o*-stems motivated the
generalization of the acc.sg. ending -*an*.

6. *DIE SAMLÄNDISCHEN INSTRUMENTAL- UND DATIVFORMEN.*

    Van Wijk argues that the instrumental is not preserved as a
separate case form outside the personal pronoun $m\bar{a}im$ 'me', but
merged with the dative, where the interchangeable endings -*ai* and
-*u* represent the original dat. and inst. endings, respectively.
Though his view is generally rejected by later investigators (cf.
Schmalstieg 1976: 146ff. and 155f.), I think that it is essentially
correct. The original dat.sg. ending of the *o*-stems *-$\bar{o}i$ is
probably not preserved in Prussian (cf. Stang 1966: 72f.): *bītai*
'in the evening' is an adverbial loc.sg. form, *schiēison*
malnijkikai 'of this little child' must be corrected to -*as,*
enstesmu wirdai 'in the word' must be emendated to -*an* (Benveniste
1935: 72f.), and *sirsdau stesmn* (read -*u*) *kērmeneniskan* $\bar{i}stai$ *bhe*
poūton 'beside the bodily food and drink' must probably be read
$\bar{i}stwei$. It appears that the ending *-$\bar{o}i$ was entirely replaced by
inst.sg. *-$\bar{o}$, which yielded -*u* after labials and velars, and
analogically elsewhere. The phonetic reflex of *-$\bar{o}i$ is found in 1st
sg. *asmai* 'am', where the homophony with 1st pl. *asmai* 'are' sug-
gests that the two endings merged phonetically when the long
diphthong was shortened. For the $\bar{a}$-stems I assume that the acc.sg.
and inst.sg. endings merged into *-$\bar{a}n$, which entailed the use of
the accusative after *sen* 'with'. The original dat.sg. ending *-$\bar{a}i$
is preserved as -*ai*, e.g. in *perdāsai* 'ware', and as -*ei* in the
demonstrative pronoun *stessiei*, Skt. *tásyai*. The variant -*u* in
-*isku* (4x) must have been taken from the *o*-stems. The "absonder-
liche Form" (Stang 1966: 70) *sen alkīnisquai* 'with sorrow' must
probably be emendated to -*an*.

7. DER NOMINATIV PLURAL DER ALTPREUSSISCHEN a-STÄMME.

Van Wijk argues that the ending is masc. -ai from *-oi and neuter -u in malnijkiku 'little children' (2x), Elbing -o from *-ā. This is certainly most probable. The Prussian material does not elucidate the difference between the Lith. endings -aĩ in the noun and -ì, -íe-, -iẽ in the adjective and the pronoun. As I have indicated elsewhere (1975: 44), I think that the latter endings represent a contamination of masc. *-oi and neuter *-ā.

8. ALTPREUSS. stas UND tans, tāns.

Van Wijk argues that the demonstrative pronoun stas is a contamination of *so and *to-, and that the personal pronoun tāns is a contamination of *to- and *an-. I think that this is correct (cf. Kortlandt 1983a: 311ff.). The ending of nom.pl. tennei represents PIE. *ei (cf. Beekes 1983: 209).

9. DAS ALTPREUSSISCHE MODUSSYSTEM.

According to Van Wijk, there is no reason to assume the existence of an injunctive or a subjunctive in Old Prussian. He concludes "dass Bernekers Behandlung der altpreussischen Modi dem wirklichen Tatbestand am besten gerecht wird" (1918: 130): there is an indicative, which represents PIE. indicative and injunctive forms, an imperative, which reflects PIE. optative and injunctive forms, and an optative, which has a more recent twofold origin. Stang has distinguished between a permissive optative in -sei (-se, -sai, -si), which can be regarded as a 3rd person imperative, and a conditional optative in -lai (1942: 263ff. and 1966: 440ff.). This is certainly correct. As I have indicated elsewhere (1982: 7f.), I think that the injunctive forms of the imperative represent a Balto-Slavic subjunctive which can be compared with the Vedic aorist injunctive and with an Italo-Celtic subjunctive of similar origin (cf. Kortlandt 1984).

10. DIE 1. PERSON PLURAL AUF -imai UND DER STAMMESAUSLAUT DES
INDIKATIVS.

Since I have recently dealt with this problem in detail else-
where (1987), I shall not go into the matter here. Van Wijk draws
attention to the fact that the forms of the early catechisms I.
ymmits, jmmitz, II. *ymmeits, ymmeyts* 'took', which may be compared
with Lith. *ėmė*, are replaced by the apparent present tense form
imma, immats in the Enchiridion. He also points out that *-ai* was
"eine typische Präteritalendung" and suggests that this formation
may be due to the analogy of *postāi* 'became', *dai* 'gave', cf.
postānai 'becomes', *dāst* 'gives'. This hypothesis cannot be sub-
stantiated because the material is too small and unreliable, as Van
Wijk points out himself. Both the audacious suggestion and the
reluctance to adopt it are characteristic of the great scholar
whose memory we honor with this volume.

Leiden University

REFERENCES

Beekes, R.S.P.
  1983   "On laryngeals and pronouns", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprach-*
            forschung 96, 200-232.
Benveniste, E.
  1935   "Questions de morphologie baltique", *Studi Baltici* 4, 72-80.
Berneker, E.
  1896   *Die preussische Sprache*. Strassburg.
Endzelin, J.
  1935   "Was ist im Altpreussischen aus ide. *ō* (und *ā*) geworden?", *Studi*
            Baltici 4, 135-143.
Kortlandt, F.
  1974   "Old Prussian accentuation", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprach-*
            forschung 88, 299-306.
  1975   *Slavic accentuation*. Lisse.
  1977   "Historical laws of Baltic accentuation", *Baltistica* 13, 319-330.
  1978   "On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic,
            and Indo-European", *Lingua* 45, 281-300.
  1979   "Toward a reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system",
            Lingua 49, 51-70.
  1982   "Innovations which betray archaisms", *Baltistica* 18, 4-9.
  1983a   "Demonstrative pronouns in Balto-Slavic, Armenian, and Tocharian",
            Dutch contributions to the 9th international congress of slavists:
            Linguistics, = Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 3,
            311-322.

(Kortlandt, F.)
    1983b   "On final syllables in Slavic", *Journal of Indo-European Studies*
                 11, 167-185.
    1984   "Old Irish subjunctives and futures and their Proto-Indo-European
                 origins", *Ériu* 35, 179-187.
    1987   "The formation of the Old Prussian present tense", *Baltistica* 23,
                 104-111.
Leskien, A.
    1876   *Die Declination im Slavisch-Litauischen und Germanischen*.
                 Leipzig.
Mažiulis, V.
    1975   "Seniausias baltų rašto paminklas", *Baltistica* 11, 125-131.
Saussure, F. de
    1892   "Varia", *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 7, 73-93.
Schmalstieg, W.R.
    1976   *Studies in Old Prussian*. University Park.
Schmid, W.P.
    1963   *Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum*. Wiesbaden.
Sjoberg, A.
    1969   "Ob odnoj drevneprusskoj poslovice", *Scando-Slavica* 15, 275-276.
Stang, C.S.
    1930   "Altpreussisch *quai, quei, quendau*", *Norsk Tidsskrift for
                 Sprogvidenskap* 4, 146-155.
    1942   *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*. Oslo.
    1966   *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo.
Trautmann, R.
    1910   *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Göttingen.
Vaillant, A.
    1958   *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves* II: *Morphologie*. Lyon.
    1968   "Vieux-prussien *enkopts* 'enterré'", *Baltistica* 4, 253.
Van Wijk, N.
    1918   *Altpreussische Studien*. Haag.
    1929   "Zu den altpreussischen Personalendungen *-ai, -ei*", *Indogermanische
                 Forschungen* 47, 148-160.