Eighty years ago, Nicolaas van Wijk tried to identify Baltic ē- and ī/jā-stems in the Old Prussian catechisms (1918, 29–32). This resulted in the following classification of the evidence (acc sg forms unmarked)

1) ē-stems
- I semmin, II semmien, E semmen (8x), semien (2x), semman, dat I semmey, II semmey, nom E semmē, EV same, Lith žeme, Latv zeme
- I muttin, II mutien, E mütten, mutien, mütin, nom müti, EV mothe, Lith mote, Latv mäte
- I genwin, II geywien, E geywin, gen gywis, nom gweti, Latv dzīve
- E perönien (3x), perönin (2x), nom peronī
- E warrien, warrin (2x), warein (2x), nom Latv vara, vare
- E peisāln, nom peisālei
- E teisin (5x), teischin, gen teisis, nom teisi, Lith teise, tesa

2) possible ē-stems
- E sāln, nom EV soalis, Lith žole, Latv zāle
- II druwin, E drūwien (3x), druwien (7x), nidruwien, nom druwi, druwis, I drofis
- E düsin, dusin, doüsin, daüsin (2x), nom EV dusi < Polish dusza
- E tickrōmi (2x)

3) ī-stems
- I nactin, II naktin, E naktin, naktin, naktien (2x), nom Lith naktis
- E nautin (2x), nautien, dat nautei

4) ī/jā-stems
- E mārtin, mārtan, nom Lith marti
- E waispattin (2x), nom Lith viešpati
- E maldūnin (2x)

5) ja-stems
- I rekian, II rekyjen, E rikjyan (31x), rickjyan, gen rikjas (6x), nom I rekis, rickis, II rykies, reykeis, E rikys (24x), rıkys, rikeis
- I tawischen, II tauwyschen, E tawischen (4x), tawischen, tawisen, gen I tawischis (2x), II tauwyschis, tauwyschies, E tawischas (3x)
Most acc sg forms in -in, -ien cannot be identified as belonging to the i-, ja- or ë-stems (van Wijk, 1918, 37-39) If we eliminate the less reliable instances, the evidence for the acc sg endings can be summarized as follows

ë-stems I -in (3x), II -ien (3x), E -ien (12x), -m (2x)
i-stems I -in, II -in, E -in (4x), -ien (3x)
ï/jä-stems E -in (5x)
ja-stems I -jan, -en, II -yen, -en, E -yan (32x), -an (4x), -en (2x)

On the basis of the evidence I reconstruct for the ë-stems */-ien/; for the i- and ï/ ja-stems */-in/, and for the ja-stems */-jen/ (cf Kortlandt, 1998a, 1998b) The ending */-ien/ was written -in in the First catechism, was corrected to -ien in the Second, and became mixed up with the ending */-in/ in the Enchiridion before the generalization of the ending */-an/ of the a-stems Accordingly, the expected acc sg ending is for the ë-stems -ien (written -in in the First catechism), for the i- and ï/jä-stems -in (all sources), and for the ja-stems -(i)an, -(i)en (which may be written -in in I and E) This leads me to disagree with van Wijk's identification of the stem formation in the following instances

- E nom teisi, acc -in (6x) is probably an ï/jä-stem
- EV nom soalis, E acc sälis is probably a ja-stem
- I nom droffs, II acc druwín, E nom druvis suggests an i-stem, whereas E nom druwi, acc -ien (11x) points to an ë-stem This word will be discussed below
- EV nom dusí, E acc -in (5x) is probably an ï/jä-stem
- I naseilen (2x), II naseylién (2x) is definitely a ja-stem

I etwerpsannan, attwerpsannan may belong either with II etwerpsennian (2x), which is a ja-stem like E nom bousennis, acc -ien (8x), or with E nom etwerpsnä (2x), etwerpsna (2x), which is an ä-stem

We now turn to the Elbing Vocabulary In an important but neglected article (1973), Jules Levine has identified 137 ë-stems (47 of which have an equivalent in Lithuanian)
and 25 ĭ/jă-stems He makes clear that the difference cannot be attributed to phonological variation or dialect mixture but represents a genuine morphological distinction. While 35% of the ĭ-stems have East Baltic equivalents, the ĭ/jă-stems have East Baltic cognates which are jă-, ja- or i-stems. While almost a third of the ĭ-stems represent suffixal or prefixal derivations or compounds, derived ĭ/jă-stems are few and semantically detached. Levin points out that over 60% of the ĭ/jă-stems belong to three out of eleven semantic groups (landscape and natural phenomena, body parts and diseases, agriculture and related terms), whereas none is found in the group denoting wildlife, which contains 34 ĭ-stems. He argues that among the loanwords from Slavic, the ĭ-stems medmice, nadele, calene represent an older stratum than the ĭ/jă-stems dusi, garkity, knapios, evidently as a result of the rise of new */j/ in Proto-Lekitic (cf Kortlandt, 1979b, 271). The Prussian ĭ/jă-stems have recently been discussed by Kaukiene (1996), who unfortunately disregards most of the scholarly literature.

The morphological distinction between ĭ- and ĭ/jă-stems is found not only in Prussian, but also in Lithuanian, where the latter type is preserved in marti, gen marčios, and patti, gen pačios. We may therefore look for correspondences in Slavic and other Indo-European languages. The classic study on the subject is by Holger Pedersen (1926). In his discussion of the Lithuanian ĭ-stems, Pedersen distinguishes between the following types:

1. žvake, mente, gire, Latin facēs, Vedic mānthās, girlīs, Slavic gora. These are eH₁-stems.
2. arklde, avide, alude, pelude, also žvaigžde, Prussian EV umnode, Slavic zvězda, Vedic -dhā, Latin -dēs. These are compounds of the root *dheH₁- 'put'.
3. šlove, Slavic slava, Latin cluēre, which may also be an eH₁-stem.
4. gerve, Latin grūs, which may be an uH₁-stem.
5. žeme, Slavic zemľa, which is an extension of a root noun, like upe, saule, muse, pele. Besides, there are two types which represent Proto-Indo-European iH₁-stems.
6. vilke, nepte, Vedic vrkīs, napāts. This type is usually represented by Slavic -ica (cf Lohmann, 1932, 21, 24).
7. devē, Vedic devē. This type can easily have replaced the flexion of marti and patti on the analogy of the preceding type.

It thus appears that the ĭ-stems represent original hysterodynamic eH₁- and iH₁-stems (with accentual mobility between the stem and the ending), whereas the ĭ/jă-stems directly continue proterodynamic iH₂-stems (with accentual mobility between the root and the suffix), cf. Vedic vrkīs, gen vrkīs < *-iH₁os, versus devē, gen devyās < *-iH₂s. The two types of iH₁-flexion are attested in Slavic, e.g. in sodī, sodī, gen sodyē 'judge' and mlēnī, mlēni, gen mlēnyę 'lightning' versus bogynjī, gen bogynję 'goddess' (cf especially Lohmann, 1932, 60–62). It has long been recognized that as a rule the former type is found in derivations from o-stems and the latter type in derivations from consonant stems (e.g. Lohmann, 1932, 22, 67). This explains the ending of Prussian EV sansy as op-
posed to the 34 e-stems denoting wildlife, including 19 species of wild birds, which cor-
respond to the regular type of Lith. vilkė, cf. žasís, gen. pl. žasu, versus vilkas.

The distinction between hysterodynamic and proterodynamic iH-stems has a perfect
analogue in the distinction between hysterodynamic and proterodynamic uH-stems.
Pedersen reconstructs a proterodynamic paradigm *pledhü, gen. *pledhues < *-ueHís
for Latin plèbês and Greek plèthūs, and similarly for Lith. gervé and Latin grús (1926, 63,
71). There is no reason to reconstruct an original hysterodynamic paradigm on the basis of
Greek gen. plèthūs (thus Beekes 1985, 39 and Schrijver, 1991, 380f.) because the latter
can easily be analogical. Note that Latin -b- represents intervocalic *-dhw-, not
intervocalic *-dh- (as in vidua ‘widow’), and cannot therefore be derived from *-dhuH-.
Similarly, I reconstruct a proterodynamic paradigm for Avestan hizü-, hizvā-, Vedic juhū-,
jihvā-, Prussian EV insuwis, in spite of Gāthic gen. hizvō < *-uHós, which can easily have arisen on the basis of the original accusative *-uHm, cf. Gāthic acc. tanvēm, which is
trisyllabic like gen. tanvō < *-uHós. The motivation for the restoration of the laryngeal in
the oblique cases of the Avestan word for ‘tongue’ was probably the phonetic develop-
ment of *-zv- to *-zb- in Iranian, which gave rise to a paradigm *hizū, *hizu’ám, *hizbā-, with an oblique stem which is preserved in later Iranian languages. In the Rgveda we find
acc. juhuām beside jihvām, inst. juhūā beside jihvā and jihvāyā, gen. and abl. jihvāyās,
nom. pl. juhuās beside jihvās, inst. pl. juhābhīs beside jihvābhīs, and the compound
juhu-āsyas beside nom. sg. jihvā. This points to a paradigm *juhū, *juhu’ám, obl. jihvā-,
in accordance with the Iranian forms. Note that Vedic acc. devām must be analogical in
view of the root aorist Ist sg. ābhuvām < *-uHm, with vocalization of the final nasal, as
opposed to monosyllabic -ām < *-eHm, with compensatory lengthening of the vowel.

The flexion of the hysterodynamic uH-stems is best preserved in Slavic svekry, gen.
svekrōve ‘mother-in-law’. Jan Rozwadowski has shown that the original accusative is
svekrovę < *-euHm, not -svę (1914, 14–18). This must be a highly archaic form because there is no model for an analogical origin. The elimination of the isolated full grade
suffix in other Indo-European languages is a trivial development. The antiquity of the
Slavic paradigm is corroborated by the regular loc. sg. and nom. acc. pl. endings -i, which
are identical with the i-stem endings and differ from the endings of both the ā-stems and
the consonant stems. This is especially remarkable because we find the ā-stem endings in
the dat., inst. and loc. pl. forms. I conclude that we have to reconstruct loc. sg. *-euHi,
nom. pl. *-euHes, acc. pl. *-euHns, which yielded the attested loc. sg. and acc. pl. endings.
The nom. pl. form adopted the acc. pl. ending, as happened with all feminine nouns in
Slavic. The early introduction of the ā-stem endings in the oblique plural cases suggests
the previous existence of *-H2es in the nom. pl. ending. Thus, everything seems to point to
an original hysterodynamic paradigm *suekruHi, *-euHu, *-H2os, as opposed to
proterodynamic *pleH1duHi, *-ueH1, and comparable with the nt-participle *H1eints,
The Latin material has been discussed in detail by Peter Schrijver (1991, 363-390). He argues that hysterodynamic e-stems like vātēs joined the third declension whereas root nouns such as spēs became the core of the fifth declension. Furthermore, he tentatively distinguishes between four types of iH-stems:

(1) proterodynamic iH₂-stems, which are reflected in the formations of genetrīx, rēgīna, avia, and denominial abstracts like militia.

(2) proterodynamic iH₁-stems, which are reflected in deverbal abstracts of the fifth declension such as aciēs.

(3) hysterodynamic iH₂-stems, which are reflected in denominial abstracts and collectives like māterīēs, gen. māteriae.

(4) hysterodynamic iH₁-stems, in particular neptis, which may be compared with socrus.

In order to explain the iē/iā-flexion of māterīēs, Schrijver assumes that original *-iH₂m yielded Latin -iem which then served as a basis for the creation of a nominative in -iēs. This is highly improbable in view of the subjunctive ending 1st sg. -im < *-īm < *-iH₁m. It follows that the flexion of the types represented by militia and aciēs is based entirely on the proterodynamic oblique cases. The iē/iā-flexion of māterīēs, gen. dat. -iae now offers independent evidence for the reconstruction of an accusative in *-eiH₂m, the phonetic reflex of which was *-ēm, cf. trēs < *treies, in agreement with the Slavic evidence for hysterodynamic *-euHm. Note that Slavic antevocalic *-ei- yielded *-ij-, e. g. in trije < *treies, so that the full grade suffix was lost phonetically in the hysterodynamic iH-flexion.

Schrijver's evidence for reconstructing *-H₁- instead of *-H₂- in neptis and socrus is delicate, as he points out himself (1991, 365). Moreover, it seems to be contradicted by the ā-stem endings in the Slavic oblique plural cases of svekry. If the suffix was *-uH₁-, we would expect i-stem endings here. However, it must be recalled that Baltic e-stems are usually reflected as ā-stems in Slavic, e. g. zvēza 'star'. I therefore see no cogent objection to the view that the Slavic evidence for the color of the laryngeal can be disregarded.

Note that we have *-H₂- in Old Polish kry 'blood', cf. Greek krēas. Besides, I find it very difficult to see how Latin neptis and socrus could avoid becoming ā-stems if they had an a-coloring laryngeal. I therefore subscribe to Schrijver's view that these two nouns represent hysterodynamic iH₁- and uH₁-stems.

The reconstruction of a hysterodynamic accusative in *-euHm provides an elegant solution for the coexistence of *vidhū- and *vidheva- in the word for 'widow', Prussian widdewū (cf. B e e k e s, 1992, 184). This word evidently represents the hysterodynamic uH₂-stems and thereby supports the reconstruction of *-H₁- in the word for 'mother-in-law'. The preservation of the front vowel in the medial syllable of Prussian widdewū, as opposed to the regular development of heterosyllabic *-eu- in Slavic vědova (cf. K o r t l a n d t, 1979a, 57), suggests that *-eu- spread to the nominative at an early stage and that we have to reconstruct a Balto-Slavic nom. sg. form *videuH.
Now we return to the Prussian material. The reconstruction of acc sg *-eHm for the hysterodynamic iH-flexion offers a straightforward explanation for the peculiar accusative warein (2x) and the nominatives giwei and pisäleí. It appears that there was a paradigm with nom -et and acc -em besides the dominant paradigm with nom -ē and acc -ien and the proterodynamic i/ā-flexion with nom -i and acc -in. The type in -et, -em evidently represents the original iH₁-stems reflected in the Latin deverbal abstracts like acius. Interestingly, Slavic neti, netu, Old Polish niec, Czech net', gen netere, Slovak neter (but cf Vaillant, 1958, 258) shows that the flexion of this hysterodynamic iH₁-stem remained distinct from the flexion of the proterodynamic iH₂-stems even if the latter adopted the acc sg ending *-eHm in Prussian. It follows that all of the reconstructed types must have existed side by side in Balto-Slavic. The proterodynamic iH₁-stems can now be identified with the Slavic type volja 'will' (cf S t a n g, 1957, 57). The corresponding type of proterodynamic uH₁-stems is reflected in kletva 'oath'. It appears that the proterodynamic iH₁-stems joined the proterodynamic iH₂-stems in Lithuanian, e.g. valia, gen valios, cf also Latvian vara beside vare. In Slavic, the hysterodynamic type sodi(i) may include original iH₁- as well as iH₂-stems while nominal nouns like koža 'skin', which belong to the same type as volja, may represent earlier proterodynamic iH₂-stems. Note that from a semantic point of view Vedic rathūs 'charioteer', like the Slavic word for 'judge', fits Latin vātēs better than māterēs and may therefore contain *-iH₁- whereas *-iH₂- is probable for feminines such as Slavic mlēni(i), Prussian EV mealde. This leads us to the following tentative classification of the Balto-Slavic material (Prussian unmarked).

1. hysterodynamic eH₁-stems and original root nouns umnode, Lith gire, žvaigžde, Russ gora, zvezda
2. hysterodynamic uH₁-stems and original root nouns Lith šlove, Russ slava, svekrov'
3. hysterodynamic uH₂-stems and original root nouns wddewū, Russ vāvā, krov'
4. proterodynamic uH₁-stems gerwe, Lith gerve, Czech ķerav, Russ kljetva
5. proterodynamic uH₂-stems insuwis, Lith liežvivis, Russ jazyk
6. hysterodynamic iH₁-stems Lith nepete, Russ sud'ja
7. hysterodynamic iH₂-stems mealde, Lith vilke, Russ moljniə, volčica
8. proterodynamic iH₁-stems giwei, Lith valia, Russ volja
9. proterodynamic iH₂-stems sansy, Lith pati, Russ bogynja, koža

Most important is that in Prussian, unlike East Baltic and Slavic, the proterodynamic iH₁-stems adopted the flexion of the hysterodynamic iH₁-stems and thereby remained distinct from the proterodynamic iH₂-stems. This points to an early split. Also noteworthy is that in Slavic the H₁-stems were evidently redistributed according to animacy and gender Russian gora, zvezda, slava, kletva, volja versus sud'ja versus svekrov', Czech net', ķerav, similarly in the Slavic proterodynamic iH₂-stems koža versus bogynju. The ā-stem flexion of the type sodi(i) is therefore remarkable and must probably be attributed to a compara-
tively recent phonetic development. This supports the reconstruction of \*-iH₁ in \$\text{sd}(i) versus \*-iH₂ in m\$\text{dm}(i)

Apart from the \$H₁-stems, which remained a distinct category in Prussian but joined the corresponding \$H₂-stems elsewhere, it appears that the West and East Baltic reflexes are usually in agreement. We often find a neuter in -jan beside a collective in -ē or -jā, e.g., EV gari\text{jan}, Ė gari\text{rin} ‘tree’ beside Lith gire, gira ‘forest’, further Ė kra\text{ugen}, Ė kra\text{wia} beside kra\text{wia}, EV kra\text{uvo} ‘blood’, also EV so\text{alis}, Ė sā\text{lin} ‘herb’ beside Lith žole ‘grass’. This model can hardly account for Istas dro\text{ff}, corrected in Il stan dru\text{win}, Ė (istas) dru\text{wia} beside sta dru\text{wi}, acc -ien (11x), which points to an original neuter r-stem beside the feminine ū-stem. Similarly, we find a neuter nom gy\text{wan}, gi\text{wan}, gen gī\text{was} (2x), ge\text{ywas}, acc -an (9x), beside the feminine gi\text{wei}, gen gy\text{wis}, acc gy\text{win}, I ge\text{iwin}, Il ge\text{ywi}n. As these deverbal abstracts fit the \$H₁-stems semantically, it seems probable to me that the neuter r-stem, which could either become masculine or adopt a-stem endings, was created on the basis of the oblique cases with zero grade suffix \*-i- of the feminine nouns in -ei, acc -ein. This again confirms the paradigms of Latin mā\text{teriēs} and Slavic sve\text{kre} discussed above.
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