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 URALTISCHES Ė IM SAMLANDISCHEN

According to Van Wijk, Ė yielded Ɨ except word-finally under the stress, where it is reflected as Ė, and before a word-final nasal, where Ė-En yielded -ien, e.g. semmē 'land', wedē 'led', acc.sg. mien 'me', semmiēn 'land'. The comparison with Lith. žēmė, vēde shows that the development was posterior to the Prussian progressive accent shift (Kortlandt 1974). Van Wijk's rule is accepted by Stang (1966: 46), including the hypothesis that 2nd sg. seg̑ėseg̑ė, 1st pl. sco̱g̑ėma̱, 2nd pl. seg̑ėt̑i are built on seg̑ė 'do(es)'.
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 dīnkaumai '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 sege and segē, 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 SAMLANDISCHEN ENTWICKLUNG DES BALTISCHEN ā.

According to Van Wijk, *ā yielded o 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. mērgūmans '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 ā 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. polaiipina '(I) command', pallaips 'commandment', cf. also the recent loan word tols 'toll'. The rounded variant was generalized in the preposition, e.g. pōstan 'under the', pōmen '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. tařpti 'thrive'. The participle enkopts is better compared
with Lith. kapóti 'chop' (Sl. kopati 'dig') than with kópti 'climb' (Van Wijk 1918: 44) or kópti, kuópti 'remove' (Endzelin 1935: 137f., Vaillant 1968). Note that the accentuation of Čak. (Novi) kopá '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 enkópts.

3. ZUR SAMLÄNDISCHEN VERTRETUNG DES BALTISCHEN ŕ.

According to Van Wijk, *ń is reflected as ā in dāt 'give', acc. sg. nādewisín 'sighing', and as ō in nom.pl. tīkrōmai 'just', acc. sg. perānīn 'common', and their derivatives. He declares himself unable to explain the divergence. I think that *ā and *ń merged in early Prussian and that the reflex ō must be attributed to the combined 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 prābutkas 'eternal', as in acc.sg. prātin 'advice', which represents an old root noun. Van Wijk's hypothesis that word-final acute *-ń 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 *-ń, was evidently generalized under the influence of the pronominal ending -smu, e.g. in sīru 'heart', cf. the regular development in schismu mālnīku 'to this child', stesmu waldniku 'to the king'. The pronominal gen.pl. ending -on represents PIE. *-om, not *-ōm (Kortlandt 1978: 288).
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 wo 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', druwe- 'believe' (2x), and -sai 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 -sai was preserved under the stress (1974: 301 and 1979: 58).
4. The usual 2nd pl. ending -ti can be derived from *-tē, as suggested by Van Wijk and supported by Stang, who has clarified the distribution of the endings (1966: 418ff.). The ending -tei (9x, -te 2x) belongs to the imperative, while -ta1 is found in the verb 'to be' (5x) and in wirstai 'you will' (2x) and the imperative klumstīnaitai 'knock', which immediately follows the two occurrences of wirstai (Trautmann 1910: 73): Madlītī tījt wirstai ıous immusıs, Laukītī tījt wirstai ıous aupallusıs, klumstīnaitai tījt wirstıoumus etwiriuns "Bittet so werdet jr nemen, Suchet so werdet jr finden, Klopfet an so wirdt euch auffgethan". The ending -ta1 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', entensītēi 'couch'd', poqautei
'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 development 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. algas 'wages', Lith. algos, and the reduced ending in II. mensae beside Ench. mensas of mensa 'flesh', acc.sg. mensen beside mensan, which cannot be explained from an original stressed ending *-äs. Van Wijk regards the ending of gen.sg. deiwas 'god', which he derives 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' (Spöbeig 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 diphthongized to -ien (cf. Stang 1930: 148f.). The replacement of mergwan by mērgan 'maid' in the Enchiridion betrays the influence of case forms where *ā had been
shortened before the raising to ü. 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 mām '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 155ff.), I think that it is essentially correct. The original dat.sg. ending of the o-stems *-ōi is probably not preserved in Prussian (cf. Stang 1966: 72ff.): bītai 'in the evening' is an adverbial loc.sg. form, schīison malnijkikai 'of this little child' must be corrected to -as, enstesmu wirda 'in the word' must be emended to -an (Benveniste 1935: 72f.), and sirsdau stesmn (read -u) kērmenenīskan īstai bhe poūton 'beside the bodily food and drink' must probably be read īstwēi. It appears that the ending *-ōi was entirely replaced by inst.sg. *-ō, which yielded -u after labials and velars, and analogically elsewhere. The phonetic reflex of *-ōi is found in 1st sg. asmāi 'am', where the homophony with 1st pl. asma 'are' suggests that the two endings merged phonetically when the long diphthong was shortened. For the ā-stems I assume that the acc.sg. and inst.sg. endings merged into *-ān, which entailed the use of the accusative after sen 'with'. The original dat.sg. ending *-āi is preserved as -ai, e.g. in perdāsai 'ware', and as -ei in the demonstrative pronoun stessēi, Skt. tāsyai. The variant -u in -isku (4x) must have been taken from the o-stems. The "absonderliche Form" (Stang 1966: 70) sen akīnīskasai 'with sorrow' must probably be emended to -an.
7. DER NOMINATIV PLURAL DER ALTPREUSSISCHEN a-STÄMME.

Van Wijk argues that the ending is masc. -a₁ from *-o₁ and neuter -u in mainijkiku 'little children' (2x), Elbing -o from *-a. This is certainly most probable. The Prussian material does not elucidate the difference between the Lith. endings -af in the noun and -i, -ie-, -ië in the adjective and the pronoun. As I have indicated elsewhere (1975: 44), I think that the latter endings represent a contamination of masc. *-o₁ and neuter *-a.

8. ALTPREUSS. stas UND tans, tãns.

Van Wijk argues that the demonstrative pronoun stas is a contamination of *so and *to-, and that the personal pronoun tans 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. *e₁ (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 subjunctive 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 elsewhere (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, ymmejets 'took', which may be compared with Lith. ėmē, 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 substantiated 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
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