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CASE SYSTEM AND TRANSLATION STRATEGY IN THE OLD PRUSSIAN ENCHIRIDION

I. Introduction

The position of Old Prussian in the Baltic language family is relatively precarious. It is the only attested West Baltic language and can therefore only indirectly be compared to East Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian), with which it presents several crucial differences. Furthermore, it is documented only through very few sources, namely: (1) the so-called Elbing Vocabulary (EV), a German-Old Prussian vocabulary of approximately 800 items, which dates from around 1400, but must be a copy of a text written at the beginning of the 14th or the end of the 13th century; (2) Simon Grunau’s Vocabulary (Gr), a vocabulary of about 100 Prussian and German words included by Grunau in his Preussische Chronik (1517–1526); (3) three Lutheran Catechisms (Cat. I, II, III) published in Königsberg, the first and the second dating from 1545, the third from 1561. Old Prussian, formerly spoken in East Prussia around the city of Königsberg (today Kaliningrad), went out of use around 1700.

Among the major documents of Old Prussian, the three Catechisms are of great importance: they are the only sources we can use to reconstruct the Old Prussian linguistic system, since both the Elbing Vocabulary and Simon Grunau’s Vocabulary are merely words lists. Yet they are far from being reliable documents of the Old Prussian actually spoken at that time. Besides the numerous misprints they are filled with, it is obvious that they represent a word-for-word translation of German original texts. Furthermore, it has been claimed that they were written by German-speaking clerics who had no

1 I am deeply indebted to Steven Young (Baltimore) for having revised my English and to Claire Le Feuvre (Strasbourg) for her comments on an earlier draft of this paper. However, they are not responsible for the textual interpretations or morphological analyses proposed here, some of which they may not endorse. Needless to say, any shortcomings are my own.
knowledge, or a very weak knowledge, of Old Prussian. One should probably assume a complex diglossia, with a poorly educated Prussian flock and a German clergy that usually did not speak Old Prussian\(^2\).

The Third Catechism or Enchiridion (1561) – the longest document in Old Prussian – is a translation of Martin Luther’s Enchiridion by a German cleric named Abel Will, who was assisted by a Prussian informant, Paul Megott. We have very little information on how Abel Will prepared his translation, but, as far as we can see, the situation can be summarized thus: Abel Will knew, if some, very little Old Prussian\(^3\) and his Prussian interpreter, Paul Megott was probably illiterate, but knew spoken German and Old Prussian quite well\(^4\). One can imagine that Abel Will read single German words and Paul Megott provided an oral translation into Old Prussian, which was then phonetically written down by Will as he heard it\(^5\). In any case, it seems clear that the text was composed as a word-for-word translation.

Due to the special circumstances of its composition, the Old Prussian Enchiridion presents, especially in the use of case forms, a large number of

\(^2\) In the preface to the Third Catechism (1561), the Duke of Prussia Albrecht explains that there were at that time very few preachers who had any knowledge of Old Prussian (das wenig prediger so solcher sprachen kündig III 7.4–5), so that the clergy had to conduct the service through interpreters (durch Tolcken III 7.7). This was the reason why he ordered a Prussian translation of Luther’s book for use in preaching.

\(^3\) On Abel Will’s knowledge of Old Prussian, see e. g. Bezzenberger (1907, 127), Hermann (1916, 14–158), Rysiewicz (1938–1940, 92–101) or Smoczyński (1995, 173).

\(^4\) In a letter to the cleric Johann Funken (26. July 1554), Abel Will explains that he is working with a translator (tolken), but he does not mention his name. He writes that this translator, who knew Old Prussian quite well, had to work at the same time as a serf for the Hauptmann in Grünhoff and therefore had little time to work with him. Since Will could not translate the text alone, he asked for some help to relieve his translator from servile work. In a request to the Duke of Prussia forty years later (3. February 1595), written in German probably by a third person, a Prussian called Paul Megott claims to be the translator of the Old Prussian Catechism; he complains he is now an old poor man and needs some help. Such is our information about the authorship of the Old Prussian Enchiridion. For further details see Mažiulis (PKP 2, 244–248).

\(^5\) Cf. Berneker (1896, 99): “Will fragte Wort für Wort, der Preusse antwortete wie es traf, einmal richtig, einmal falsch”. A different position has been assumed by Levin (1976, 13), who argues that the Enchiridion was recorded on the basis of a spelling tradition already existing at that time in Old Prussian.
irregularities that still require an explanation. The most striking difficulty one has to deal with is the fact that, for example in a sequence of a definite article and a head noun, the different elements can occasionally stand in different cases and show no agreement in case-marking. This of course is at variance with usual agreement principles that appear to be regular in most of the Indo-European languages. As an illustration of this fact one could quote, for instance, the phrase *sen stesmu wirdan* “with the word” (III 61\textsubscript{21}, 87\textsubscript{22}), in which the article stands in the dative (*stesmu*), and the noun in the accusative (*wirdan*). Such mixed constructions are usually considered to have resulted from interference of the German original text (*mit dem Wort*), where the article was clearly a dative (*dem*), but the noun was ambiguous (*Wort* can be either accusative or dative). This matter has long been recognized by Balticists and the main facts are already well known\textsuperscript{6}. Still, there remain some difficulties I will try to solve in this paper. As we shall see, the problem is more complex than it seems at first glance and involves not only textual interference as a purely superficial phenomenon, but more deeply different levels of code-switching that may be of some relevance for the study of case systems and their evolution.

II. The Old Prussian case system

Our task here is mainly to classify all the relevant types of case disagreement in the Old Prussian Enchiridion in order to identify the main strategies followed by the translator, but first of all it is necessary to present the Old Prussian case system.

There is no consensus on the number of cases itself in Old Prussian. On the basis of the Enchiridion, it seems clear that we are dealing with a system that had at least four cases: nominative, accusative, genitive and dative\textsuperscript{7}. This is shown in particular by the definite article, for which we find, for example in the masculine singular:

(a) a nominative *stas* (e.g. *stas Rikijs ast polaipinnons / der HERR hat befohlen “the Lord has ordered” III 87\textsubscript{19});


\textsuperscript{7} See e.g. Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 72 [1943]).
(b) an accusative stan (e.g. mes turrimai Deiwan stan Rikijan... biātwei / wir sollen GOTT den HERREN... főrchten “we must fear God the Lord” III 279);

(c) a genitive stesse (e.g. esse stesse Rikijas paggan / umb des HERrn willen “in the name of the Lord” III 9124), with various allomorphs e.g. stessei (e.g. III 5117), steise (III 632), stisei (III 739) or stēison (e.g. III 1178);

(d) a dative stesmu (e.g. dīnkauti stesmu Rikijan / dancket dem Herrn “thank the Lord!” III 851), with an allomorph steismu (e.g. III 5716), stēismu (e.g. III 1157) or steismu (III 1173–4).

Feminine forms of the article present a similar distribution, at least in the singular, but the facts are obscured by a high degree of allomorphy, especially in the oblique cases:

(a) nominative sta (e.g. III 6118) or stai (e.g. III 4714);

(b) accusative stan (e.g. III 298);

(c) genitive stesses (e.g. III 1116), steises (III 11523–24), steisei (III 938), stessei (III 592) or stēison (e.g. III 10723);

(d) dative stesmu (e.g. III 1720), stessei (III 855–6), steisei (III 8917), stēisei (III 1333) or steise (III 9121).

Allomorphy is less frequent in the plural of the definite article:

(a) nominative stai (masc. e.g. III 271 or fem. e.g. III 9312);

(b) accusative stans (masc. e.g. III 1714 or fem. e.g. III 12320);

(c) genitive stēison (masc. e.g. III 7512);

(d) dative steimans (masc. e.g. III 672), stēimans (masc. e.g. III 3715) or steimans (fem. III 9311, probably misprint for *stēimans).

We probably need to reconstruct a similar system with four cases for nouns as well. In the examples given above, we can identify a nominative Rikijs “Lord” (III 8719), an accusative Rikijan (III 279) and a genitive Rikijas (III 9124), but the last sentence (III 851) shows that an accusative (Rikijan) could stand instead of a dative. Strikingly enough, very few dative forms are attested in nominal declensions8. The noun malnīks “child” presents not only

---

8 See e.g. E n d z e l ī n s (DI 4(2), 73 [1943]), S t a n g (1966, 181, 198), K a u k i e n ė (1995, 20–22; 2004, 43–44); on the origin of Old Prussian dative forms see also van W i j k (1918, 86–98), M a ž i u l i s (1970, 106–127), S c h m a l s t i e g (1976, 146f.). The existence of dative forms in the Old Prussian nominal declensions has been contested by S m o c z y ń s k i (1992, 57–58; 1994, 235), who operates with a denasalisation rule
a nominative *malnijks* (e.g. III 115\textsubscript{23}), an accusative *malnijkan* (III 131\textsubscript{17}, 133\textsubscript{2}) and a genitive *malnijkas* (III 115\textsubscript{27}, 121\textsubscript{18}, *malnikas* III 119\textsubscript{22}), but also a dative *malni\textsubscript{k}u* once in III 131\textsubscript{17}:

*bhe schismu Malniki polikins assei, kai... / vnd diesem Kind verliehen hast, das... “(that) you have granted to this child that...”.

From the noun *waldni\textsubscript{k}ks* “sovereign”, attested in the acc. pl. *w\textsuperscript{a}ldnikans* (III 91\textsubscript{15}), we have a dative *w\textsuperscript{a}ldni\textsubscript{k}u* in III 91\textsubscript{25}:

*sta bousei stesmu Waldniku / es sey dem K\text{"o}nige “(be submitted to the authorities) either to the sovereign (or to somebody else)!”.

Another example could be the noun *gri\textsubscript{k}ks* “sin”, otherwise attested in the accusative *gri\textsubscript{k}kan* (III 79\textsubscript{15}-16), in the genitive *gri\textsubscript{k}kas* (III 117\textsubscript{9}) and in several plural forms. A dative *gri\textsubscript{k}ku* is documented in III 115\textsubscript{2}:

*empolijgu gri\textsubscript{k}ku / mit gleicher S\text{"u}nde “with a similar sin”.

In the plural, a system with four cases can be reconstructed as well. See, for example, the plural forms of the masculine o-stem nouns *gri\textsubscript{k}ks* “sin” and *waiks* “servant”:

(a) nom. pl. *gri\textsubscript{k}ai* “sins” (e.g. *stai gri\textsubscript{k}ai ast prastan etwierpton / die s\text{"u}nde seien dadurch vergeben “the sins may therefore be forgiven” III 65\textsubscript{12-13}), *waikai* “servants” (e.g. *stai waikui* [probably a mistake for *waikai*] *Christi / die knechte Christi* “the servants of Christ” III 95\textsubscript{13}, cf. the vocative plural *waikai* in III 95\textsubscript{8});

(b) acc. pl. *gri\textsubscript{k}ans* (e.g. *t\text{"a}ns... wissans gri\textsubscript{k}ans laimintiskai etwi\text{"e}rpei / er... alle s\text{"u}nde reichlich vergibt “(that) he widely forgives all the sins” III 45\textsubscript{20});

(c) gen. pl. *gri\textsubscript{k}an* (e.g. *etwepsenninn steison gri\textsubscript{k}an / vergebung der S\text{"u}nden “forgiveness of [the] sins” III 75\textsubscript{17-18});

(d) dat. pl. *waikammans* (e.g. *steimans Waikammans / den Knechten “to the servants” III 95\textsubscript{5}).

In feminine declensions (*\~{a}- and \~{e}-stem nouns), the picture is similar. Very few dative forms are documented\textsuperscript{9}. From a noun *naute\textsuperscript{\text{"e}}* “misery”, attested in

\textsuperscript{9} Contra Smoczy\text{\"{n}}ski (1992, 55), the dative *sendraugi\textsuperscript{\text{"e}}lt\textsuperscript{\text{"n}}\textsuperscript{\text{"i}}kai / Miterben “to a co-heir” (III 93\textsubscript{8}) does not go back to a denasalized accusative form *sendraugi\textsuperscript{\text{"e}}lt\textsuperscript{\text{"n}}\textsuperscript{\text{"i}}lt\textsuperscript{\text{"n}}\textsuperscript{\text{"i}}kan
the acc. sg. *nautin* (III 91₄) and pl. *nautins* (III 31₁₃), a dative singular *nautei* is used once in III 29₅:

*en wissai nautei* / *in allen nōthen* “in every misery”.

From *gennā* “woman, wife”, otherwise attested in the acc. sg. *gennan* (e.g. II 37₃), gen. sg. *gennas* (III 87₂, 10₃₂₂), nom. pl. *gennai* (III 93₁₂) and acc. pl. *gennans* (III 93₅), we have a dative plural *gennāmans* in III 93₁₁:

*steimans Sallūbi gennāmans / Den Ehefrauen* “To the wives”.

The following table provides a simplified overview of case endings in the definite article and in nominal declensions (masc. *a*-stems, fem. *ā*- and *ē* stems)¹⁰:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>Noun endings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td><em>stas</em> (masc.)</td>
<td><em>-s</em> (masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sta</em> or <em>stai</em> (fem.)</td>
<td><em>-o</em> or <em>-i</em> (fem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td><em>stan</em> (masc.)</td>
<td><em>-an</em> (masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>stan</em> (fem.)</td>
<td><em>-n</em> (fem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><em>stesse</em> (masc.)</td>
<td><em>-as</em> (masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>stesse</em> (fem.)</td>
<td><em>-s</em> (fem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td><em>stesmu</em> (masc.)</td>
<td><em>-u</em> (masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>stesmu</em> or <em>stessei</em> (fem.)</td>
<td><em>-i</em> (fem.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, one should note that personal pronouns also present a system with four cases, as shown by the following survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>1ˢᵗ singular</th>
<th>2ⁿᵈ singular</th>
<th>1ˢᵗ plural</th>
<th>2ⁿᵈ plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td><em>as</em> (e.g. III 37₁₂)</td>
<td><em>tu</em> (e.g. III 47₆)</td>
<td><em>mes</em> (e.g. III 27₉)</td>
<td><em>ioūs</em> (e.g. III 89₅)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td><em>mien</em> (e.g. III 27₇)</td>
<td><em>tien</em> (e.g. III 7₉₂)</td>
<td><em>mans</em> (e.g. III 47₈)</td>
<td><em>wans</em> (e.g. III 6₇₁₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><em>maisei</em> (III 6₉₄)</td>
<td>*[twaisei]</td>
<td><em>noūson</em> (e.g. III 3₃₉)</td>
<td><em>iouson</em> (e.g. III 9₅₉)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td><em>mennei</em> (e.g. III 4₁₃)</td>
<td><em>tebbei</em> (e.g. III 7₁₉)</td>
<td><em>noūmans</em> (e.g. III 4₉₁₀)</td>
<td><em>iousmans</em> (e.g. III 6₉₁₀)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—are used in dative function, but is probably a dative singular feminine form. The context is not entirely clear. Mažiulis’ idea (PKEŽ 4, 99), according to which *sendraugiweldnikai* could be a nominative plural masculine, seems to me even less satisfactory.

¹⁰ See T o p o r o v (2006, 7₂f.) for a similar overview.
From all the data collected, we may quite safely infer the existence of four cases in Old Prussian (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative), each of them characterized by clearly distinctive endings. The existence of other cases is debated. There are grounds for believing that Old Prussian still had a vocative case, as shown by the form deiwe (from deiws “god”) in the formula O Deiwe Rikijs / Herr Gott “O God the Lord!” attested twice in the Enchiridion (III 83₁₄, 109₆). There is also a variant deiwa (III 67₂₁, 117₂₈), probably a recent creation due to the influence of other cases (for ex. acc. deiwan) by suppressing the inherited alternation of the thematic vowel *e (voc.) ∼ *o (elsewhere)₁¹. We find a similar variation in the vocative tawe (III 81₈, 85₁₀, 12₁₂₂) or tawa (III 47₁, 47₆, 49₁₂, 65₁₉, 7₉₈, 8₃₁₂) of the noun tāws “father”; both forms tawe and tawa are in particular attested in the first line of the Lord’s Prayer (e.g. Tawa noūson / Vater unser). But, apart from these isolated forms, which may have been preserved by their formulaic character in religious speech, the vocative is always identical with the nominative, e.g. mes dinkaumai tebbe Rikijs Deiws Taws / wir danken Dir Herr Gott Vater “we thank Thee, Lord God Father” (III 8₅₁₂).

An instrumental case has been postulated on the grounds of the pronominal form sen māim / mit mir “with me” (III 7₉₁₉, cf. sen maim / mit mir III 8₁₁₉). The traditional account for this form is that it should be read *manim (with <ā> = /an/) and compared to Lithuanian manimì (instr. sg. of àš “I”)₁². The problem is that the preposition sen “with” regularly governs the dative (e.g. sen stawīdsmu / damit “with that” III 4₇₈), the accusative (e.g. sen senditans rānkans / mit gefalten henden “with folded hands” III 8₃₁₉–₂₀) or sometimes both cases together (e.g. sen swaiāsmu Swinton tēmpran krawian / mit seinem heyligen theuren blut “with his dear holy blood” III 4₃₁₇), but never the instrumental, which does not exist as an independent case in Old Prussian. Another problem is that the same form is attested once in a context which clearly requires a dative (III 1₀₇₁₅):

As N. imma tin N. māim prei ainan Salūbin / Ich N. neme dich N. mir zu einem Ehelichen “I N. take you N. for myself as a wife.”

---

₁¹ For Schmalstieg (1976, 149), the vocative ending -a is “merely a scribal error”.
₁² Thus e.g. Rosinas (1995, 3₅f. with literature).
This problem has been resolved in different ways in the scholarly literature. It seems, however, that the reconstruction of an instrumental case in Old Prussian is rather dubious.

Finally, a locative case has been also reconstructed, in particular on the basis of a masculine o-stem form *wirdai (from *wirds “word”) in the phrase *en stesmu *wirdai / *in dem wort “in the word” (III 97, 16−17). The ending -ai of *wirdai (instead of an expected accusative *wirdan or dative *wirdu) could reflect an old locative *-ai (< PIE *-oij, cf. Gr. οἶκοι “at home”) that would find a perfect match in the Lithuanian adverb namiė “at home” (< ie < *-ai < *-oij). But other explanations are possible. The form *wirdai could be merely a scribal error for *wirdan, taking into account the more frequent phrase *en stesmu *wirdan. Or, alternatively, one might suppose that the ending -ai comes from the feminine ā-stem nouns, where a dative -ai is expected (and actually attested in the First and Second Catechisms: preitickray Deiuas I 92, preytickaray deywás II 92 / zur rechten Gottes “to the right of God”, with *tickrai, dative of *tickra “the right [hand]”). Confusions between masculine and feminine nouns in Old Prussian are quite frequent and have probably been caused by the fact that, in the German linguistic system, which constitutes the background on which all the Old Prussian forms are based, gender distinctions were rather evanescent in nouns. An opposite case could be the feminine ē-stem noun *piřē “community” (cf. acc. sg. pijrin / Gemeine III 103ii) which appears once in the dative with the masculine ending -u: *steismu Piru / der Gemeine (III 97, 15). In this particular case, a contamination with the preceding article (steismu) may also have played a role.

It is no real surprise that the Old Prussian case system with four basic cases (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative) corresponds exactly to the

---


14 It is also possible that *stu (in *stu ilgimi / biß “so far, until” III 105, 13) and *ste (in *ste mijšis / deste lieber “all the dearer” III 89, 8) reflect old instrumental forms (respectively *stō and *stē) of the definite article, but from a synchronic point of view they are adverbs, not case forms. Compare also sēnu / *damit “so that” (< “with what”, III 113, 125)? For a discussion see e.g. Stang (1966, 177ff.), Mažiulis (1970, 163); cf. also van Wijk (1918, 81−86).

15 Thus e.g. Mažiulis (1970, 224, note 1). Differently, Smoczyński (1992, 52; 2005, 361, note 837) assumes that *wirdai goes back to *wirdan with denasalisation. Benveniste (1934−1935, 73) considers *wirdai to be a scribal error for *wirdan. For further discussion on alleged “locative” forms in Old Prussian, see e.g. Stang (1966, 176ff.).
original case system of the German language; the influence of German on Old Prussian is obvious. It seems to me, however, that this influence has not yet rightly received the attention it deserves and has sometimes even been misunderstood. I think it can involve three different levels, which may perhaps play a crucial role, but must be dealt with differently:

(1) influence through borrowing: the linguistic material itself is modified through direct borrowing of German endings into Old Prussian;

(2) influence on the use of case forms: due to German influence the use of the linguistic material is modified;

(3) influence on agreement properties: agreement rules in Old Prussian are modified due to imitation of structural features proper to German.

In the following lines I shall try to examine these three levels of German influence and to determine criteria that could help decide whether they affect Old Prussian as a whole or only the particular context of the *Enchiridion*.

### III. Borrowing of case endings in Old Prussian?

Borrowing of case endings is not a trivial issue; it presupposes a situation of deep interlinguistic contamination. For Old Prussian it has been assumed by Wojciech Smoćzyński (1992, 63; 1998, 105), who for example tries to derive the Old Prussian genitive ending *-as* from the corresponding German genitive ending *-es*. There are to be sure many contexts in the *Enchiridion* in which we can observe an equation of the type Old Prussian *-as* = German *-(e)s*, as in *Deiw-as / Gott-es* “of God” (e.g. III 2713-14), *mens-as / Fleisch-es* “of the meat” (III 45) or *Pjckul-as / Teuffel-s* “of the devil” (e.g. III 4316), *Tāw-as / Vatter-s* “of the father” (III 5916), *Saūn-as / Son-s* “of the son” (e.g. III 5916), *geijw-as / leben-s* “of life” (III 631), *dīl-as / werck-s* “of work” (III 89), etc. Similarly, Smoczyński assumes that the Prussian ending *-n* which sometimes appears in genitive forms has been influenced by the genitive *-n* of the German weak declension (e.g. des *Herr-en*), e.g. *stēisei prābutsk-an giжw-an / des ewigen Lebens* “of eternal life” (III 63)16.

---

16 A similar contamination (Prussian *-n* influenced by German *-n*) might also explain certain discrepancies in number observed elsewhere in the *Enchiridion* between German and Old Prussian, such as *wird-an* “word” [acc. sg.] / *Worten* [dat. pl.] (III 77), *kaul-an* "bone“ [acc. sg.] / *Beinen* [dat. pl.] (III 85), *rānkān* “hand“ [acc. sg.] / *hend-en* [dat. pl.] (III 83), *Höfftmman-in* “captain” [acc. sg.] / *Heubtleuten* [dat. pl.] (III 91), *vrais-in* “parent” [acc. sg.] / *Elter-n* [dat. pl.] (III 93), *Wēis-in* [acc. sg.] “fruit“ / *Frucht-en* [dat. pl.]
The problem with this account is twofold. First of all, we have to exclude a large number of counterexamples, for which the postulated equations (German -s, -n → Prussian -s, -n) simply do not work. Prussian genitives in -as often correspond to German forms that present either a different case-marker or are unmarked, e.g. *twaisei Tawisch-as* / *deines Nechst-en* “of your fellow man” (e.g. III 356–7) or *stesei swīt-as* / *der welt* “of the world” (III 51). Or conversely a German genitive in -(e)s can correspond to a Prussian form with a different ending or no ending at all, e.g. *deines Angesicht-s* / *twaise prosn-an* “of your face” (III 105), *deines Weibs* / *twaiasei genn-an* “of your wife” (III 105–6), *des Keyser-s* / *staise Keiser-in* “of Caesar” (III 91). Significant enough, the genitive of the German definite article *des* corresponds to an Old Prussian form which regularly presents an asigmatic ending, cf. *stise / des* (e.g. III 43, etc.), *stēisei / des* (e.g. III 35, etc.), etc. Similar problems arise when one considers the equation postulated between the Old Prussian (genitive) ending -n and the German weak declension -n. In many cases, the Prussian ending -n corresponds to German forms that show a different ending (or no ending at all) and are by no means limited to the weak declension. Particularly illustrative is the phrase *Noūs-on Rikij-as* / *vnser-s Herr-n* “of our Lord” (III 73), in which endings (-n + -s / -s + -n) are apparently reversed. Such

17 In the latter case, however, the “genitive” Keiserin could merely be a scribal error, assuming a reiteration of the preceding (unspecified) accusative Keiserin (cf. dāiti stesmu **Keiserin** ka staise Keiserin ast = *gebet dem Keyser was des Keysers ist* “give Caesar what belongs to Caesar” III 91).

18 Note, however, the allomorph *stises* (e.g. III 63) or *stesses* (e.g. III 111) with a sigmatic ending that could be due to the influence of the corresponding German *des*. But, even if one accepts this idea, the question is whether this influence took place in Old Prussian itself or only in the Enchiridion. It should be noted that this sigmatic form does not necessarily correspond to German *des* in the Enchiridion (see for ex. *stesses Crixtinsas / der Tauff III 111*).
discrepancies between case endings of both languages are quite numerous, so that one cannot simply transpose the German case system into the Old Prussian of the Enchiridion.

The second problem with Smoczyński’s account is that it is not clear in his view whether one is dealing here with real linguistic contamination or with textual interference. As far as I can see, Smoczyński claims borrowing of case endings to be a linguistic phenomenon, characteristic of Old Prussian as a recessive language, and indeed he must do so, if he wants to establish that the Prussian genitive ending -as was borrowed from German, because this ending is not limited to the Old Prussian Catechisms: it occurs in the Elbing Vocabulary (e.g. EV 484: *silkasdrûb’ / sydenslewir “silk veil”, with a gen. *silkas) and in various toponyms (e.g. Wilkaskaymen “Kreis Pr. Eylau” < “wolf’s village”, with a gen. *wilkas) as well. By this account Smoczyński can apparently rule out all discrepancies observed in the Enchiridion by assuming that, once the new ending has been introduced into the Prussian linguistic system, it does not need to correspond to a precise German counterpart in the particular translation context of the Enchiridion.

Borrowing of case endings seems to me as a rule quite unlikely, unless there is no other way to explain case forms – either through direct inheritance or by secondary morphological processes. Now it is by no means impossible to derive the genitive endings of Old Prussian from PIE or Baltic prototypes. An ending -n is exactly what one expects for the accusative from PIE *-m. It corresponds quite well to the Lithuanian accusative singular ending -q (< *-an, *-aŋ), -e (< *-ēn), etc. Its use in genitive function must be connected with the well-known phenomenon of “mixed constructions” in Old Prussian, which I will discuss at length later in this paper. The feminine genitive -as (e.g. gennas “of the woman” III 87.2, 103.2) probably reflects *-ās like Lithuanian -os (e.g. raŋkos “of the hand”) and may be traced back to PIE *-ās (< *-eh2es, cf. Greek ἡμέρας “of God” III 43.5, etc.) appears to be problematic. The traditional account is that it comes from PIE *-o-so like Greek -ou (< *-o-so) beside *-e-so (in Goth. dagis), but this implies assuming a curious difference with East Baltic

19 See e.g. Mažiulis (2004, 38).
20 For a discussion see e.g. van Wijk (1918, 77), Kazlauskas (1968, 173), Mažiulis (1970, 88–106), Schmalstieg (1976, 144ff.).
and Slavic, which for this case have an ending *-ā, probably of ablative origin (Lith. diëvo, Latv. dieva, OChSl. boga “of God”). This is perhaps the reason why Smoczyński looked for a German origin, thus eliminating this West Baltic peculiarity. Now one must recognize that other explanations are conceivable. My own view on this matter is that the Old Prussian genitive ending -as is analogical to feminine ā-stems; in the latter the relationship between an accusative -ān and a genitive -ās may have provided a model for the spread of a new ending -as in the genitive of thematic stems (acc. -ān : gen. -ās, hence acc. -an : x = gen. -as). In any case, it is obvious that a configuration acc. -an, gen. *-ā in thematic stems (corresponding to Lith. acc. -q, gen. -o) was anomalous: the thematic genitive ending was the only asigmatic genitive ending. Taking this into account, one does not need to explain the ending -as by assuming a foreign origin.

In addition, Smoczyński’s account does not explain why the genitive singular alone would have been borrowed from German, whereas for the other endings Old Prussian preserved – more or less directly – PIE prototypes; the motivation for such an unusual process is clearly lacking. I thus consider that borrowing of case endings in Old Prussian is unlikely. This does not mean that no textual interference occurred in the Enchiridion between similarly sounding endings of both languages, but this is a different matter I will endeavour to deal with later.

There is, in my opinion, only one context in which case endings seem to have been directly borrowed from the German original text into the Old Prussian Enchiridion. According to a tradition widespread at that time, Latin words preserved in German their Latin endings; this use has been consequently imitated in Old Prussian, e.g. nom. sg. Jesus Christus (III 4310, cf. III 619, 652, 751, 1037, 10322, 11311, 12115–16, cf. Jesus III 1131), Marcus (III 7322), acc. sg. Jesum Christum (III 4510, cf. III 4121, 637, 7912, 8112, 8317, 8513, 10917, 11326, 1195–6, 12113, 1277, 1339, cf. Jesum III 11121), gen.sg. Jesu Christi (III 7118, cf. III 7316, 9513, 10910, 11110, 11528, 11717, 12311, 12915, 1313), Marci (III 619), dat. sg. Christo (III 6324, 9510), abl. sg. sen Christō (III 6324), esse Christo (III 7318), en Christo (III 1238, 1316), po Pontio Pilato (III 431, cf. III 12711). Adaptation of Latin words to the Old Prussian case system is relatively rare, though one may encounter a few examples such as nom. sg. Christis (III 5912), Marx (III 11119), Adams (III 6314), acc. sg. Christie (III 4517, cf. III 1157, 11923, 12918), Marcon (III 5913), acc. sg. masc.−
nt. Evangelion (III 8720, 11118), acc. sg. fem. Arcan (III 1216). Sometimes foreign words are left without any case ending, especially those of Hebrew origin, e.g. Adam (III 11320, 1213), Sara, Abraham (III 9313), Moises (III 1017), Noe (III 11913), Pharao (III 11915), Israel (III 11917), Salomon (III 1073).

And, finally, there are occasionally mistakes in the transposition of Latin words: for instance, in III 63 and 03, the nominative Sanct Paulus is mistranslated as a phrase with a Prussian nominative and a Latin genitive Swints Pauli. This is perhaps due to a contamination with the well known title Sancti Pauli Epistulae “Epistles of Saint Paul”, where the proper name stood in the genitive.

Apart from this particular context we have no clear instance of direct borrowing of case endings in the Old Prussian Enchiridion.

**IV. Uses of case forms in Old Prussian**

Another level of German influence on Old Prussian affects the uses of case forms. It was already noted that the number of cases is the same in German and in Old Prussian (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative), leaving aside a few relics of vocative forms in the frozen religious phraseology of Old Prussian. In other words, case syncretism in Old Prussian was largely conditioned under the pressure of the German case system. The question is whether this syncretism is proper to the Old Prussian language itself or limited to the particular context of the Enchiridion.

The evidence of the first two Catechisms remains here inconclusive, since they are similarly based on a German original and may have been influenced by German in the same way as the Enchiridion. And indeed we find in both texts exactly the same case system with four basic cases (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative), as in the Enchiridion. Apart from the Catechisms we have very few fragments that could shed some light on the Old Prussian case system. From Elbing and Simon Grunau’s Vocabularies the existence of an independent genitive case can be reconstructed, as already pointed out, e.g. silkasdrûb’ / sydenslewir “silk veil” (EV 484, gen. silkas) or Mangos Sones / ein huren kind t “son of a whore” (GrG 98, gen. mangos). A vocative case can be recognized in various fragments recorded by Hieronymus Maletius in his book Warhafftige Beschreibung der Sudawen auff Samland (middle of the 16th century), e.g. ocho moy myle schwante panicke / o mein liebes heiliges
fewerlein! “o my dear holy little fire!”\(^{21}\). Finally, a postpositive locative (or inessive) has been postulated for Old Prussian on the grounds of a fragment of the Lord’s Prayer dating from the beginning of the 15th century: *Towe Nuśze kāb esse andangonsiência* “Our Father, who art in heaven”\(^{22}\). A precise analysis of this form, however, is rather problematic and there is no basis for the claim that the Old Prussian language of the 16th century preserved postpositive locatives.

We must thus limit ourselves to the Enchiridion. In this respect, a few methodological remarks are to be made. First, if we try to distinguish linguistic reality from textual contamination, we have to look for every kind of discrepancy between the German and the Old Prussian texts in the hope that it may reveal peculiarities of the Old Prussian language\(^{23}\). For instance, it is clear that the construction of the preposition *pagār* with the accusative in the meaning “next to, beside” must be genuine in Old Prussian, because no German influence could have taken place (German has here *neben* + dat.): compare *pagār mien* / *neben mir* “beside me” (III 27\(_{6−7}\)). The same kind of discrepancy is to be found between Prussian *no* (+ acc.) and German *nach* (+ dat.) in the meaning “according to”, e.g. *no twaian debijkan engraudīsnan* / *nach deiner grossen Barmhertzigkeit* “according to your great mercy” (III 119\(_{14}\)). Similarly, in the First and Second Catechisms, the Prussian preposition *po* (or *pho*) “after” stands with the accusative, whereas German has *nach* with the dative, e.g. *pho stan betten eden* / *nach dem Abendmal* (I 13\(_{13}\)), *postan bitans ydi* / *nach dem Abendmal* (II 13\(_{13}\)) “after the evening meal”\(^{24}\). See also Prussian *prei* (+ acc.) corresponding to German *zu* (+ dat.), e.g. *preistan Rīkijan* / *zu dem HERRN* “to the Lord” (III 93\(_{20}\), cf. also 107\(_{13}\)), or Prussian *no* (+ acc.) corresponding to German *auf* (+ dat.), e.g. *nostan laukan* / *auf dem Felde* “in the field” (III 105\(_{13}\)). Since no German influence can be postulated, one must assume that these constructions reflect an authentic use in Old Prussian.

This procedure however is limited, because it does not enable us to observe rightly features of Old Prussian that are by chance (or by common

\(^{21}\) For further relics of vocative forms see Mažiulis (PKP 2 63f.).


\(^{23}\) For this methodological principle see e.g. Ambrazas (2006, 15).

\(^{24}\) Compare also *pōmien* “after me” (III 107\(_{14}\), 131\(_{13}\)).
inheritance) identical to German features. For example, using such a method, we could hardly say anything positive about the uses of the nominative in Old Prussian, because it regularly concords with the German nominative: it expresses the subject (as in stas Swints Nosēilis / der Heylige Geyst “the Holy Spirit” III 45\textsubscript{12}) or its predicates (as in tāns ast nouson tickars Tawas / er sey vnser rechter Vatter “he is our true Father” III 47\textsubscript{9–10}). Similarly, it is no surprise that we find in Old Prussian accusative forms in the function of direct object (e.g. twaian Tāwan bhe Mūtien smūnint / dein Vater und dein Mutter ehren “to honor your father and your mother” III 29\textsubscript{17}), genitive forms for the possessor (e.g. Deiwas wirdan / Gottes Wort “the word of God” III 113\textsubscript{18}) or dative forms for the beneficiary (e.g. dai swaimans maldaisimans / gabs seinen jūngern “he gave it to his disciples” III 75\textsubscript{3–4}). In all this, we have only a clear testimony that Old Prussian was an Indo-European language, like German.

The same holds true for the use of cases with prepositions. It is possible that the construction of the Prussian preposition pra “through” with the accusative (e.g. pra swaian etnīstin / durch seine gnade “through his mercy” III 51\textsubscript{1}) is authentic, although it corresponds to German durch (+ acc.), because we have the same construction in Lithuanian (e.g. prõ vartūs “through the gate”). There is no reason to ascribe the construction of Prussian no “on, towards” with the accusative (e.g. no dins / auff sie “towards them” III 113\textsubscript{7}) specifically to a German influence (auf + acc.), because it could well be inherited: compare Old Church Slavic на горѧ na gorϙ “towards the mountain” (Mt 4, 8 Zogr.). In such cases, inheritance and secondary contamination with German cannot be distinguished.

One must also take into account the fact that we are dealing with a closed corpus of texts: it is often difficult to affirm beyond any doubt that a given feature did not exist in Old Prussian. This does not mean, however, that no conclusion can be drawn from the available data. If we try to answer the question whether Old Prussian preserved a given case, we must not only investigate whether forms of this case are actually attested in the Enchiridion, but also look at all the contexts where for historical reasons this case is expected. If it appears to have been regularly displaced by the same case in all these contexts, we may safely conclude that the case has disappeared through a syncretic process; the regularity of its displacement testifies that syncretism took place.
This method, however, is not always reliable. Let us examine some examples. The Old Prussian preposition *sen* “with”\(^{25}\), which seems at first glance predisposed to govern the instrumental, as does its Lithuanian counterpart *sù* “with”, governs in Old Prussian the dative (sometimes, the accusative or both cases together), but no form that could be identified as an instrumental (even the problematic *māim*). Similarly, it is noteworthy that we do not find any instance of predicative instrumental in the Enchiridion: we always have a nominative, e.g. *tāns turei twais rikijs bout / er soll dein Herr sein* “he must be your Lord” (III 105\(_s\)), or a prepositive construction imitated from German, e.g. *prei semmien postātwei / zur Erde werden* “to become earth” (III 105\(_{17}\))\(^{26}\). Based on these facts, one could conclude that there was no longer an instrumental case in Old Prussian. Similarly, where a locative is expected (in the inessive function), Old Prussian quite regularly presents a dative, with the preposition *en* “in”, as in *en wissai nautei / in allen nóthen “in all the misery” (III 29\(_s\)) or *en wirdemmans / inn worten “in words” (III 33\(_s\)). Here again, we can assume that there was no longer a locative in Old Prussian. But, in both cases, the difficulty is that an influence of German, either linguistic or textual, can always be assumed, considering that Old Prussian *sen* (+ dat.) corresponds to German *mit* (+ dat.) and Old Prussian *en* (+ dat.) to German *in* (+ dat.). We can hardly decide whether these syntactic uses are genuine or due to interference with German.

Let us consider another instance. Given the fact that the Lithuanian preposition *iš* “from” governs the genitive (probably syncretic for an inherited ablative), one may wonder why its Old Prussian counterpart *is* regularly governs the dative, e.g. *isstesmu / daraus “from it” (III 75\(_s\)). Is this use authentic? Or, in other words, does this mean that the genitive has been displaced by the dative? Certainly not, because in other contexts the genitive is widely attested (for example as the case of the possessor). The construction *is* (+ dat.) can therefore hardly be the result of a syncretic pattern; it must have another source, probably based on a foreign model, and indeed the influence of the German preposition *von* (+ dat.) is obvious. Similarly, it is striking that the Prussian preposition *bhe* “without” governs the accusative (e.g. *bhe noūson madlan / on vnser Gebet “without our prayer” III 49\(_{17}\)), whereas its East

\(^{25}\) Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 125 [1943]).

\(^{26}\) See Endzelīns (DI 4(2), 72 [1943]).
Baltic counterpart governs the genitive (Lithuanian bè, Latvian bez, dial. be “without” + gen.); this may be in Old Prussian the result of a contamination with German ohne (+ acc.).

The result of these considerations may be, I think, of some relevance from a methodological point of view. The distribution of a given case in the Enchiridion must be considered as significant for the reconstruction of Old Prussian only if it fulfils at least one of the following two requirements: (1) it occurs where it is expected from a historical point of view or (2) it may be shown to have displaced the expected case according to a normal evolution (either due to syncretic pattern, syntactic process or foreign influence). Based on these principles, one may suppose, for instance, that the use of the accusative for the direct object was a linguistic reality in Old Prussian, because it corresponds to a widespread use in other Indo-European languages (in particular in East Baltic): thus, it fulfils the first requirement formulated above and there is no reason to deny its existence nor to suppose in this case a German influence. Conversely, we may suppose that the construction of is (+ dat.) is not authentic in Old Prussian, because it fulfils neither requirement: it is historically unexpected and can hardly be due to a usual form of syncretism or to normal evolution.

To be sure, the data sometimes remain inconclusive. I do not see how one could decide whether the constructions of sen (+ dat.) “with” or en (+ dat.) “in” are authentic in Old Prussian or due to contamination with German. In both cases, syncretism may have taken place, but the possibility of a German influence cannot be so easily ruled out. At least, one can note that a syncretic pattern [instrumental > dative] (in sen “with”) or [locative > dative] (in en + dative) is not typologically unparalleled (cf. Greek), whereas a syncretism [genitive > dative] (in is “from”) is by nature highly suspect, not to mention the fact that it does not explain why the genitive would have remained unchanged in its other uses.

Based on these considerations, one can in most cases distinguish what is genuine in Old Prussian from what is due to German influence. But, if a German influence is assumed, the question remains whether we should ascribe it to Old Prussian as a whole or to the particular context of the Enchiridion? There is no indisputable answer to this question, but some general principles may be drawn: this will be the issue of the following section.
V. Agreement properties

1. Case disagreement in the Enchiridion

To begin with, let us examine why connected forms sometimes stand in different cases in the Old Prussian Enchiridion, as in *sen stesmu wirdan* “with the word” III 61\textsubscript{21}, 87\textsubscript{22} (dat. + acc.). Such mixed constructions are widely attested; they have hitherto been considered merely translation mistakes, but it can be shown that their distribution is not as capricious as it appears at first glance. In what follows I will give a large, although certainly incomplete, set of examples to illustrate disturbed case agreement in the Enchiridion. The following basic patterns are attested (I shall concentrate first on sequences of nouns with determinants):\(^{27}\)

With a determinant in the accusative:

(1) [Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *stan emnan* / *den Namen* (III 27\textsubscript{13}), *ēn stan gallan* / *in den Todt* (III 65\textsubscript{i}), *nostan wirdan* / *ob dem wort* (III 87\textsubscript{5}), *stan smunent* / *den Menschen* (III 105\textsubscript{22}), *twaian Tāwan* / *dein Vater* (III 29\textsubscript{17}), *prijki twaians tawischan* / *wider deinen Nechsten* (III 33\textsubscript{16}), *en twaians rānanks* / *inn deine Hende* (III 79\textsubscript{19}, 81\textsubscript{18}), *kittans Deiwans* / *andere Götter* (III 27\textsubscript{6}), *prijki wissan wargan* / *für allem Vbel* (III 41\textsubscript{11});

(2) [Det. Acc.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:

e.g. *schlāit wissan maian perschlūsisnan* / *ohn all mein Verdienst* (III 41\textsubscript{14}).

With a determinant in the dative:

(3) [Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Dat.]:

e.g. *stesmu waldniku* / *dem König* (III 91\textsubscript{25}), *enstesmu wirdai* / *jn dem wort* (III 97\textsubscript{17}), *steismu Pīru* / *der Gemeine* (III 97\textsubscript{15}), *steimans Sallūbi gennāmans* / *Den Ehefrawen* (III 93\textsubscript{11}), *steimans Waikammans Mergūmans Deināalgenikamans* / *Den Knechten Megden Taglōner* (III 95\textsubscript{5−6}), *steimans widdewūmans* / *den Widwen* (III 97\textsubscript{9}), *steimans malnijkikamans* / *den Kindlein* (III 115\textsubscript{8}), *schismu Malniki* / *diesem Kind* (III 131\textsubscript{17}), *en swaiai pērgimie* / *in seiner Natur* (III 115\textsubscript{2}), *swaimans maldaisimans* / *seinen Jōngern* (III 75\textsubscript{3−4}), *swaimans wijrimans* / *jren Mennern* (III 103\textsubscript{26}), *en wissai nautei* / *inn allen no̱then* (III 29\textsubscript{3}), *sen wissamans Druwīngimans* / *mit allen Glaubigen* (III 121\textsubscript{10});

\(^{27}\) For further examples see Euler (1985, 171f.).
(4) [Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Acc.]:
e.g. sen stesmu wirdan / mit dem wort (III 61, 21, 87, 22), en stesmu kükis
teiküsбан / in der Kirchenordnung (III 17, 20), stesmu vndan / dem Wasser
(III 61, 7), postesmu nadruwisban / nach der Hoffnung (III 63, 10), esse stesmu
klausüwingin vom Beichtiger (III 65, 10, cf. 65, 20), priki stesmu Klausüweniki
gegen / dem Beichtiger (III 71), po stesmu geitin bhe wjnan / unter dem Brodt
vndn Wein (III 73, 16), stesmu Rikijan / dem Herrn (III 85, 1, cf. 89, 7, 93, 13, 95, 15,
103, 21, 117, 2−3, 117, 4), stesmu Pecku / dem Vihe (III 85), stesmu kuruwan / dem
Ochsen (III 89), stesmu Keiserin / dem Keyser (III 91), stesmu Mistran / dem
Fürsten (III 91, 20), stesmu tärin / der Stimme (III 105), esse stesmu garrin / von
dem Baum (III 105), stesmu madlin / dem Gebet (III 111), stesmu preisiki /
dem Feinde (III 117, 1), stesmu giรบin / der Zal (III 121), stesmu Tāwān / dem
Vatter (III 57), esse stesmu smunentin / von dem Menschen (III 101), stesmu
genneniskan / dem weibischen (III 93), stēismu Pikullan / dem Teuffel (III
125, 10), ensteǐmans malnijkan / an den Kindern (III 37, 15), stesmu wirdans /
diesen Wortten (III 77), stesmu Bīskopins, Pappans bhe Preddikerins / den
Bischoffen, Pfarherrn vnn Predigern (III 85), esse stesmu Poklusmingins /
von den Unterthanen (III 91, 1), stesmans labbans / den fromen (III 93), stesmans
Sallūbaiwīrins / den Ehemennern (III 93), steǐmans Vraisins / Den Eltern (III
93, 17, cf. 97), esse steǐmans Malneijkans / von den Kindern (III 93, 21), stesmans
smunentins / den Menschen (III 95, 15, cf. 95, 11−12), steǐmans Butta Rikians /
Den Haußherrn (III 95), steǐmans labbatīngins / den hoffertigen (III 97),
steǐmans Lāustingins / den demütigen (III 97, 2), stawidsmu wirdan / solchem
wort (III 61), is schismu Eɔanlioni / auß diesem Eɔanlioni (III 113),
entennēismu rīkin / in seinem Reych (III 43, 20), en kawīdsmu Christiānisken /
jn welcher Christenheyt (III 45), sen ainesmu swāigstan / mit Schein (III 35, 13),
en antersmu sklaitinsnan / am andern Capitel (III 101, 8), maiāsmu Rikijan /
meinem Herrn (III 67, 22), maiāsmu kaiminān / meinem Nachbar (III 69, 14−15),
is twāāsmu Lastin / auß dem Bette (III 79), twāāsmu wijran / deinem
Manne (III 105), twaismu emmen / deinem Namen (III 121), swāāsmu
seimīnan / seinem gesinde (III 27−4), en swāāsmu kermīnan / an seinem
Leib (III 31), en swāāsmu gennan / an seinem Weib (III 101, 23), swāāms
Mukīnnewigins / jren Lērern (III 87, 14), noūśesmu Tawisken / unsem
Nechsten (III 31, 35, 11, 37), nousesmu pogālbenikan / unserm Heylandt (III
91, 19), wismu mensen / allem Fleisch (III 85), wissamans drūwigins / allen
Glaubigen (III 45, 19), sen wissamans griķans / mit allen Sünden (III 63, 16);
(5) [Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:
e.g. *sen stesma Swintan Scrisin / mit dem Heiligen Creutz (III 79₃), stesmu vcka kuslaisin dijalapagaptin / dem schwechesten werckzeug (III 93₇), *sen stesmu wargan noseilien / mit dem bösen Geist (III 123₁₉), steismo Perönin Maldünin / Der gemeinen Jugent (III 97₁), steísma gântsan swîtan / der gantzen Welt (III 11₅₇), steímans maldans Warnins / den jungen Raben (III 8₅₄), en schisman ackewijstin Krixtiāniskan astin / in dieser öffentlichen Christlichen Handlung (III 12₅₄-₅₅), kawīdsu [sic] debijkan powargsennien bhe nautien / was grossem Jammer vnnd Noth (III 2₀₉),

(6) [Det. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.]:
e.g. *stessei swītas / der Welt (III 5₁₇), stesse kermenes / des Leibes (III 1₀₉₈), stesses Crixitisnas / der Tauff (III 1₁₁₁₆), steisei Gennas / des Weibs (III 1₀₄₂₂), steise Pjckulas / des Teuffels (III 4₃₁₆, etc.), steise Tāwas / des Vatters (III ₅₉₁₅, cf. ₆₅₃, ₇₁₁₉, ₁₀₉₁, ₁₂₉₁₁), steise Saūnas / des Sons (III ₅₉₁₅, cf. ₇₁₂₀, ₁₀₉₁, ₁₂₉₁₁), steises geijwas / des Lebens (III ₆₃₁, cf. ₉₃₈), steises nierties / des Zorns (III 1₁₅₂₃), steiseisei [sic] russas / des Rosses (III ₈₅₆), steisan pikullis / des Teufels (III ₁₁₇₈), steíson malnijkas / des Kindes (III ₁₂₁₈), schiēise kermenes bhe gīwas / diß Leibes vnnd Lebens (III ₄₁₉),

(7) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.]:
e.g. *stesse gântsas swītas / der gantzen Welt (III 1₁₅₁₀), twaise mijlas Soūnas / deines lieben Sons (III ₁₀₉₉), twaisei Dengniskas spagtas / deines himlischen Bades (III ₁₁₉₃), twaisas mijlas malnikas / deines lieben Kindes (III ₁₁₉₂₂);

(8) [Det. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.]:
e.g. *steisei tickrōmiskan / des Rechtens (III ₃₅₁₃), steisei Aucktimmiskan / der Obrigkeit (III ₈₉₁₇, cf. ₉₁₂₀), steisei Keiserin / des Keysers (III ₉₁₁₂), stəīse
etnīstin / der Gnade (III 93_8), steise kīrki / der Kirchen (III 109_10), steise powaisemnen / des Gewissens (III 73_2), steise Salauīban / der Ehe (III 99_6), stēise deichtan / seiner stat (III 125_6), steison smūni / der Person (III 95_24), steison wīrdan / des Worts (III 100_3), steison perōniskan / der Gemeine (III 103_23), steīson Crixtiāniskun / der Christenheit (III 121_6), twaisei Gennan / deines Weibs (III 105_7), twaise prosnan / deines Angesichts (III 105_14), twaisai Crixtisnan / deiner Tauff (III 117_20);

(9) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.]:
e.g. steise wīssemuśingīn Tāwās / des Allmechtigen Vaters (III 43_5, cf. 127_14), steise Swintan Noseīlis / des Heyligen Geists (III 59_16, 109_1, 129_11-12);

(10) [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.]:
e.g. stesai swintan crixtisnan / der heyligen Tauffe (III 59_2), steise nаnangimsenin / der neuen geburt (III 63_2), stēise Swintan Noseīlie / des heyligen Geists (III 63_5, cf. 71_20), stēisei prābutskan gījwan / des ewigen Lebens (III 63_9), prei stēisei pogauton labbanseggīsnan / bey der empfangenen wolthat (III 133_3), stēison prābutskan gallan / des Ewigen Todes (III 115_4), twaisei Swintan Crixtisnan / deiner Heiligen Tauff (III 119_19), twaisei Dengenninikans labbans / deiner himlischen Güter (III 131_21-22), twais Swintan Emnen / deines heiligen Namens (III 133_5).

Based on the collected data the following remarks can be made. First of all, it should be noted that the only cases the use of which is sometimes subject to disagreement are the dative and the genitive, displaced by the accusative, e.g. sen stesmu wīrdan / mit dem wort III 61_21 (type 4) or stēisei Aucktimmiskan / der Obrigkeit III 89_17 (type 8). The opposite situation – that is, a dative or a genitive instead of an accusative – is, so far as I can see, never attested in the Enchiridion. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that case disagreement is not documented in contexts with nominative forms: they are always used consistently, e.g. as stas Rikijs twaïs Deiws asmāu ains Stūrintickrōms Deiws / Ich der HERR dein Gott bin ein eiueringer Gott “I, the Lord, your God, am a severe God” (III 37_12-13), stas swintn Nosēilis / der Heylige Geist “the Holy Spirit” (III 45_12), ains nauns smūnets / ein newer Mensch “a new man” (III 63_19), twaias swintn Engels / Dein heyliger Engel “your Holy Angel” (III 79_19, 81_10), see also III 63_3, 73_15, 85_1, 87_1, 95_17-18, and so on. The same holds true for the accusative, which is used consistently in all contexts that obviously require an accusative, see e.g. Deiws teikū stan smunentin / Gott Schuff den
Menschen “God created man” III 105 (type 1). Nominative and accusative are always well distinguished in the Old Prussian Enchiridion. It should be noted that this applies also to the only word class that did not originally distinguish nominative and accusative, that is the neuter class. Neuter forms are apparently well preserved in the Elbing Vocabulary, but in the Enchiridion they tend to become masculine; this evolution is partly based on the necessity of distinguishing nominative and accusative. As I tried to show elsewhere (Petit 2001), this distinction was so strong that it was introduced by Abel Will even in neuter pronoun forms, where a nominative and an accusative were secondarily opposed (nom. sta / acc. stan “this”).

All this means that case disagreement is not entirely arbitrary in the Enchiridion, but follows some kind of directionality. This could be interpreted in two ways, either as a linguistic or as a textual matter. If we consider the extension of the accusative at the expense of the dative and the genitive to be a linguistic process, we may assume that Old Prussian was on the way toward a radical simplification of its case system and becoming a two-case system, opposing a direct and an oblique case, as did for example Old French (cas sujet / cas régime). This opinion has been apparently upheld by some scholars who see the accusative in Old Prussian as a “casus generalis”. But this account can hardly explain why dative and genitive forms are nevertheless attested in the Enchiridion, in substantive forms as well, e.g. stesmu waldniku / dem Könige III 91 (type 3) or stessei swītas / der Welt III 51 (type 6). This cannot reflect different chronological layers in the language of the Enchiridion, the composition of which must be viewed as strictly synchronic. We thus need to look for another explanation.

Interestingly, contrary to the Lithuanian use, we have in Old Prussian the accusative, not the genitive, as direct object after negative verb, e.g. Tou niturri kittans Deiwans pagār mien turritwei / du sollt nicht andere Götter neben mir haben (III 27–27). Compare the same sentence in Old Lithuanian ne turek kitu Diewu prieg manes VE 116, neturek Diewu kitu poakim mano PK 46 (with the genitive kitu Diewu or Diewu kitu “other Gods”). This may be due in Old Prussian to a German influence (either a linguistic or a textual one) or this may reflect a trivial evolution (generalisation of the object accusative). Latvian presents here both possibilities, e.g. with the genitive es neredzu nevienu cilvēka or with the accusative es neredzu nevienu cilvēku “I don’t see anybody”.

Thus e.g. Trautmann (1910, 207) or more recently Toporov (2006, 67).
It is striking that the different word classes are differently affected by case disagreement. Thus, determinants are more consistently used in the dative and genitive than substantives. We have a very large number of instances of the type [Det. Dat./Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.], such as sen stesmu wîrdan (type 4) or steisei Auctimmisskan (type 8). To be sure, there are also a large number of contexts where all forms display case disagreement, including determinants. Frequently, we have an entire sequence of accusatives instead datives (e.g. sen wissans përgimmans / sampt allen Creatures “with all creatures” III 413 in comparison with sen + dat. e.g. in sen wissamans Druwîngimans / mit allen Glaubigen “with all believers” III 12110 or, more rarely, instead genitives (I have found only one instance: wissans grikans skellants / aller Šûnden schuldig “guilty of all sins” III 6719). Significantly enough, the opposite situation to types 4 and 8 – that is a determinant in the accusative with a substantive in the dative or genitive – is almost never attested. I have found only one example (III 5321), which, however, might receive a straightforward explanation31:

Bhe etwerpeis noûmas nousons auschautins kai mes etwèrpimai noûsons auschautenîkamans / Vnnd verlasse ons vnser schulde als wir verlassen vnsern Schuldigern “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors!”

We have here in noûsons auschautenîkamans “our debtors” a mixed construction [Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.] in a clearly dative function. The crucial point here is, I think, the nature of the possessive noûsons “our” in Old Prussian. In the German text we have a possessive adjective vnsern (dative

30 Other examples with prepositions regularly governing the dative: 1. en “in” (e.g. ēnstan nakktien / inn der Nacht III 751, enstan kîrdan / zu der zeit III 11120, ēnstan Swîntan Arcan / inn der heiligen Archa III 1216, ēnstan Emnan / in dem Namen III 12310, 12910, ēnsschien madlin / inn diesem Gebet III 492, etc., en maian krawian / inn meinem Blut III 7510–11, en wissans kerneniskans nautins / in allen leibs nôthen III 3113); 2. esse “from” (e.g. essestän Teikûsnâ / von der Schöpfung III 3917, esse stans Gallans / von den Todten III 652, esse stans malnijkikans / von den Kindlein III 11118, esse maian mensan / von meinem fleisch III 10119, esse wissans grikans / von allen Šûnden III 4315, esse wissans schins Pallaipsans / von diesen Gebotten III 378, en wissans poweistins / in allen dingen III 10326); 3. is “from” (e.g. is kalsiwingiskan Tawiskan Deiwûtiskan labbiskan / aus lauter Vatterlicher Götlicher Güte III 4112), 4. sen “with” (e.g. sen wissan preweringiskan bhe maitâsnan / mit aller Notturfft und Narung III 418, sen wissan auschaudîsnan / mit aller zuuersicht III 4711, sen swaians Dûans / mit seinen Gaben III 4513).

plural). I assume that Old Prussian used, like Lithuanian, in plural forms of personal pronouns a pronominal genitive “of us”, which was something like *
ūsōn* (cf. Lith. mūšų “our” with m- from mēs “we”). In the Enchiridion there is some evidence that such a form actually did exist, especially when it clearly disagrees with the head noun in case marking, as in tāns ast nouson tickars Tawas / er sey vnser rechter Vatter “he is our true Father” III 479–10 (*nūsōn + nom. sg.), or in number-marking, as in noūsan Rikijas / vnser Herrn “of our Lord” III 129,14 (*nūsōn + gen. sg.). But, perhaps because of a contamination with German, Old Prussian also developed possessive adjectives of the type *
ūsas* “our”, agreeing in case, number and gender with the head noun, e.g. nousā mensai / unser Fleisch “our flesh” III 5519 (nom. fem. sg. nousā + head noun mensai)32. The problem with the genitive plural form *
ūsōn > noūson*, noūsan is that it sounded much like an accusative singular (with a similar ending -an, -on). And, indeed, when we find for example nouson Rikijan / vnsern Herrn “our Lord” (III 109,17–18, 119, 121, 127, cf. also III 113), we can hardly decide whether nouson is a pronominal genitive (*nūsōn “of us”) or a possessive adjective in the accusative singular (*nūsan “our”). The translator may have been confused in much the same way by such a form, especially when the head noun was a plural form: the connection with a possessive form that looked like an accusative singular was then inconceivable. Taking this difficulty into account, one might suppose that in noūsons äuschautenikamans “our debtors” (III 53,21) we have the genitive plural *
ūsōn*, misunderstood as a possessive adjective because of the German model and then pluralized by the addition of -s (*nūsōn → *nūsōn-s*) in order to regularize its occurring with a plural head noun; the influence of preceding nousons might also have played a role.

Apart from this unique context, there is thus no evidence of case disagreement affecting a determinant and leaving its head noun unaffected: we find sometimes [Det. Dat./Gen. + Subst. Dat./Gen.] (types 3 and 6), sometimes [Det. Dat./Gen. + Subst. Acc.] (types 4 and 8), but never *[Det. Acc. + Subst. Dat./Gen.]. This fact has, to my knowledge, so far not received the attention it deserves and yet it needs some explanation.

---

32 Sometimes, we find secondary case disagreement, as in noūsesmu Tawischen / unserm Nechsten “to our fellow man” III 31,12, 35,11, 37, etc. (dative noūsesmu + accusative Tawischen).
Concerning adjective forms, we obtain the following picture. I shall first concentrate on contexts of the type [Det. + Adj. + Subst.]. Complete case agreement is regular in the accusative (type 2: e.g. schlāit wissan maian perschlūisnan / ohn all mein Verdienst III 41\textsuperscript{14})\textsuperscript{33}, sporadically found in the genitive (type 7: e.g. stesse gāntsas swītas / der gantzen Welt III 115\textsuperscript{10})\textsuperscript{34}, but, so far as I can see, never attested in the dative. Here again, this absence must receive an explanation. Several subtypes of case disagreement are attested. In the dative we find quite frequently a type [Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.] (type 5: e.g. stēismu gāntsan swītan / der gantzen Welt III 115\textsuperscript{7}), and similarly in the genitive we have [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Acc.] (type 10: e.g. stessei swintan crixtisnan / der heyligen Tauffe III 59\textsuperscript{2}). But, in the genitive, an intermediary subtype [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] is also found, although very sporadically (type 9: e.g. steise wissemusīngin Tawas / des Allmechtigen Vaters III 43\textsuperscript{5}); there is no such example in the dative. This difference between genitive and dative is curious. Structures like [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 7) or [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 9) are found in the Enchiridion, whereas we have no trace of *[Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Dat.] + [Subst. Dat.] or even *[Det. Dat.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.]. From this we may conclude that genitive forms are used more consistently than dative forms; this once again requires an explanation. Furthermore, it should be noted that adjective forms are more affected by case disagreement not only than pronominal forms, but also than substantives as well (cf. for example type 9). It is significant that a subtype [Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Acc.] + [Subst. Gen.] (type 9) is attested in the Enchiridion, but, as far as I can see, not a single instance of a subtype *[Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.] is to be found\textsuperscript{35}. Obviously, we are dealing here with a hierarchical case-marking system where determinants

\textsuperscript{33} I have quoted just one example, but this is very frequent.

\textsuperscript{34} Other examples: twaise mijlas Soūnas / deines lieben Sons (III 109\textsubscript{9}), twaias Dengniskas spagtas / deines himlischen Bades (III 119\textsubscript{3}), twaias mijlas malnikas / deines lieben Kindes (III 119\textsubscript{22}).

\textsuperscript{35} In III 63\textsubscript{8} prei stessei supsas etnīstin / durch desselbigen gnade, the structure is not *[Det. Gen.] + [Adj. Gen.] + [Subst. Acc.], as mistakenly assumed by Zigmantavičiūtė and Zigmantavičiūtė (2000, 36), but prei... etnīstin “through the favour” (prei + acc.), modified by the genitive stessei supsas / desselbigen “of the same (person)”. The phrase stessei supsas is an instance of my subtype 6.
are ranked over substantives and substantives over adjectives. Whether this reflects the Old Prussian linguistic system or interference from German, remains for the time being still doubtful.

We will now examine contexts where no determinants are used. In such contexts we find a large number of instances of substantive forms consistently marked in the accusative (e.g. *prei Pickullien* / *zur Hellen* “to Hell” III 432), in the dative (e.g. *en wirdemmans* / *in worten* “in words” III 332) or in the genitive (e.g. *Deiwas* / *Gottes* “of God” III 497, etc.); occasionally they occur with an adjective form (even in the dative: *sen reddisku perdāsai* / *mit falscher wahr* “with a false truth” III 3310). Case disagreement is however found there as well. The following subtypes may be distinguished:

(11) [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:

(12) [Adj. Dat. for Dat.] + [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:
e.g. *en prabuskai tickrōmiskan* / *in ewiger Gerechtigkeit* (III 4321–22), *is supsai ispresnā* / *aus eigener Vernunft* (II 4923), *sen... wargasmu kāupiskan* / *mit... bösem handel* (II 3311);

(13) [Adj. Acc. for Dat.] + [Subst. Acc. for Dat.]:
e.g. *en Prūsiskan tautan* / *in Land zu Preussen* (III 1721); *esse Swintan Noseilien* / *vom Heyligen Geist* (III 4123, cf. III 632); *en tīrtan deinan* / *am dritten Tage* (III 433); *en maldaisin deinan* / *am Jüngsten tage* (III 4521); *sen niteiswīngins wīrdans bhe seggīnsans* / *mit unzūchtigen wortten und wercken* (III 6913); *sen labban quāitin* / *mit gutem willen* (III 9514); *en vorminan iūrin* / *im Roten Meer* (III 11916); *sen senditans rānkans* / *mit gefalten henden* (III 8319); *en tīrtan deinan* / *am dritten Tage* (III 12712).

Once again, case disagreement is attested mostly in dative functions, where we find accusative forms instead of datives; I did not find any instance
in genitive function. An important difference, however, may be seen between definite and indefinite structures. In the former, adjectives are clearly more affected by case disagreement than substantives, as shown by type 9 in the genitive (e.g. steise wissemusingin Tawas III 433), whereas in the latter this is the opposite, as shown by type 12 in the dative (e.g. en prabuskai tickrōmiskan III 4321–22). This difference is not to be explained, I think, mainly by the case (dative in type 12, vs. genitive in type 9), but probably by the presence, vs. absence of a determinant. Whether we consider this to be a structural feature of Old Prussian or due to the influence of German, we must find an explanation for this curious discrepancy.

Be that as it may, it is clear that case disagreement should not be seen merely as a translation mistake. On the contrary, it follows certain rules, the motivation of which, to be sure, remains for the time being largely obscure. Let us now present a brief summary of these rules:

Rule 1. Case disagreement occurs only in one direction: [Gen.] or [Dat.] → [Acc.].

Rule 2. The dative is more affected by case disagreement than the genitive, while the nominative and the accusative are always used consistently.

Rule 3. Among all word classes, determinants are the most resistant to case disagreement.

Rule 4. In the genitive, substantives are more resistant to case disagreement than adjectives.

Rule 5. Without determinants, adjectives are more resistant to case disagreement than substantives.

It should be said that these “rules” are by no means absolute; variations are quite frequent, even in identical contexts. To give just one example, the same formula “of the Holy Spirit” occurs sometimes as steise Swintan Noseilīs [Det. Gen. + Adj. Acc. + Subst. Gen.]36, sometimes as steise Swintan Noseilin [Det. Gen. + Adj. Acc. + Subst. Acc.]37. It is also significant that we occasionally find different cases in coordinate structures where we would expect case forms to be consistently marked. The model is then always [Dat.] or [Gen.] first, followed by [Acc.], as in e.g. sen wırdemmans adder dılins /

---

36 In III 5936–17 (cf. also III 1092, 12911).
37 In III 7120 (the form Noseilie in III 636 is ambiguous, because it could be */-ien/, see S m o c z y ń s k i 1992, 54). This does not mean, however, that Old Prussian possessed a genitive ending –n (pace S m o c z y ń s k i 1992, 63).
It is clear that the considerations presented above should be seen only as an attempt to classify case disagreement in the Old Prussian Enchiridion. They do not pretend to solve every difficulty. Admittedly, there are some cases I am unable to explain and which do not follow the rules I tried to establish. However, it should not be controversial that the facts observed so far are not entirely arbitrary. The question remains how one could explain them in a satisfactory way.

2. Underspecification and case disagreement

From a theoretical point of view, case syncretism may have two main sources. It may be based on formal confusion, when two case forms resembling each other merge into a single form. For example, in Latvian, the merging of the instrumental with the accusative in the singular is probably due to the similarity of both forms at least in some paradigms (e.g. in thematic stems: instr. sg. *-u, vs. acc. sg. *-an > *-u). Syncretism may be also based on a semantic confusion, when two cases present close semantic values. For example, the merging of the genitive and the ablative in Balto-Slavic may be due to the fact that there was originally only a slight difference between the values of both cases. Taking this into account, one could suppose that Old Prussian was progressively developing a “casus (obliquus) generalis” on the basis of the accusative as a result of the merging of the accusative, genitive and dative. This account seems to me unlikely. First of all, there was no formal motivation for such a merger, because in most paradigms each form was expected to remain clearly marked; a “casus generalis” usually

38 Such cases are, for instance, sen senditmai rānkān / mit gefalten henden “with folded hands” (III 83;), swaiāsmu supsei buttan / seinem eigen Hause “to his own house” (III 87;), schieison malnijkikai / des Kindleins “of the little child” (III 111;), stesses prabuskas Deng-niskans labans / der ewigen Himlischen Güter “of the eternal heavenly goods” (III 117;).
results from a drastic phonetic reduction of final syllables (as in Old French). Secondly, there could not be any semantic confusion, because in a large number of contexts we still find a correct use of correctly marked accusative, genitive and dative forms. As I have often pointed out, case disagreement in the Enchiridion is frequent, but not absolute. It thus follows that the concept of syncretism as a linguistic process can hardly be useful to explain the position of oblique cases in the Old Prussian case system.

Let us now examine if this rather awkward configuration of Old Prussian can be due to German influence. As is well known, German is characterized by a four-case system, but case-marking is rather deficient in a large number of word classes. For example, in phrases like *dem guten Mann* (dat. sg.), vs. *den guten Mann* (acc. sg.), the distinction of dative and accusative is provided only by the definite article (*dem*, vs. *den*); the adjective and the substantive are ambiguous. In the scholarly literature, this phenomenon is sometimes called “underspecification”\(^\text{39}\): in the German phrase, the definite article is case-specified, whereas the substantive *Mann* and the adjective *gute*n are underspecified. The extent of underspecification in German is complex, because it depends not only on word classes, but also on number, gender and finally on the case forms themselves. For example, the definite article is normally specified in the masculine singular (nom. *der*, vs. dat. *dem*, vs. gen. *des*, vs. acc. *den*), but remains underspecified in some plural forms (nom.-acc. *die*, vs. gen. *der*, dat. *den*) and in the feminine singular (nom.-acc. *die*, vs. gen.-dat. *der* each respectively underspecified). Masculine substantives are underspecified in the entire singular paradigm except for the genitive (nom.-acc.-dat. *Mann*, vs. gen. *Mannes*), in the entire plural except for the dative (nom.-acc.-gen. *Männer*, vs. dat. *Männern*). I think this general feature of the German case system played a crucial role in the question of case-marking and case disagreement in Old Prussian. More precisely, I assume that the five rules I have established above directly reflect the influence of German underspecification on the Old Prussian language.

To begin with, one may argue that the second rule, according to which the dative is more affected by case disagreement than the genitive, is due to the fact that, in German masculine substantives, the genitive singular is better

\(^{39}\) On underspecification in German see e.g. Bayer (2001, 465–514) and Lühr (2004, 129–147).
marked than the dative singular (Mann-es, vs. Mann). This may explain why
dative singular forms of substantives are so rare in Old Prussian (type 3, e.g.
stesmu walndiku III 91_{25}) and so often replaced by the accusative (type 4, e.g.
*sen stesmu wirdan III 61_{21}), whereas we find more genitive singular forms of
substantives (type 6, e.g. stessei swītas III 51_{17}). This of course is not true in
German feminine stems, where the substantive is not inflected in the entire
singular paradigm (Frau), nor in plural stems, where, on the contrary, dative
forms are better marked in masculine stems than genitive forms (Männer, vs.
Männer-n). Significantly enough, in Old Prussian, dative forms of substantives
are somewhat more frequent in the plural (e.g. swaimans wijrimans III 103_{26})
than in the singular.

The third rule, according to which, among all word classes, determinants
are the most resistant to case disagreement, is closely linked with the fact
that, in German, determinants – and especially definite articles – are better
case-marked than substantives and adjectives. This explains the hierarchical
system we have found in Old Prussian, where, for example, structures like
[Det. Dat.] + [Subst. Acc.] are attested (type 4, e.g. *sen stesmu wirdan III
61_{21} corresponding to German mit dem Wort), but not structures like *
[Det. Acc.] + [Subst. Dat.].

The fourth rule, according to which, in the genitive, substantives are more
resistant to case disagreement than adjectives, is due to the fact that, in
German masculine stems, the genitive is marked in substantives, whereas
adjectives are underspecified. This explains why the German structure des
Allmechtigen Vaters “of the Almighty Father” is translated in III 43_{5} as steise
wissemusīngin Tawas (gen. + acc. + gen.). Specified genitives of the German
text (des, Vaters) are rendered in Old Prussian by genitive forms (steise, Tawas),
whereas the ambiguous genitive Allmechtigen is rendered by an accusative
form wissemusīngin, that functions here as a default form.

The fifth rule, according to which, without determinants, adjectives are
more resistant to case disagreement than substantives, is based on German
structures where no determinant is used and therefore case-marking is
shifted onto the adjective form, e.g. in ewiger Gerechtigkeit III 43_{21–22}, aus
eigener Vernunft II 45_{9}, mit...bösem handel III 33_{11}, etc. (dat. + acc.). It is not
surprising that this feature has been imitated in the Old Prussian translation:
en prabuskai tickrōmiskan III 43_{21–22}, is supsai ispresnā II 45_{9}, sen... wargasmu
kāupiskan III 33_{11} (dat. + acc.).
The most interesting rule is certainly the first one, according to which case disagreement takes place only in one direction: [Gen.] or [Dat.] → [Acc.]. In underspecified contexts – that is when a given form was ambiguous and could be interpreted in different ways –, the default reading was always the accusative, not the dative, or the genitive. Thus, having to render German datives like *der gantzen Welt* “to the whole world” (III 1157) or genitives like *der heyligen Tauffe* “of [the] Holy baptism” (III 592), the translator might have hesitated as to whether the adjectives *gantzen*, *heyligen* and the substantives *Welt*, *Tauffe* were accusatives, datives or genitives; in all instances, he chose to interpret them as accusatives. In other words, the accusative case appeared to him as representative for the entire set of oblique cases.

Now we may finally answer the question of whether case disagreement resulting from German influence is proper to Old Prussian or only to the translation of the Enchiridion. Both approaches have been upheld in the scholarly literature: the extension of the accusative in Old Prussian is seen by Trautmann (1910, 207) and Mažiulis (1968, 24) to be a feature of Old Prussian; but, according to Beineker (1896, 92), it is merely translation error.

At first glance, one might be inclined to think that Old Prussian imitated the most salient structural property of the German case system, i.e. underspecification. But, if it appears that some of the observed features are typologically inconceivable, they will be ascribed to translation strategies proper to the Enchiridion. Obviously, the final word here belongs to diachronic typology: a typologically implausible evolution is hardly to be supposed for Old Prussian as for any other language and must therefore be suspected as resulting from textual interference, which sometimes does not follow the rules of ordinary typology.

Based on this methodological principle, one can formulate two remarks. First of all, we must remember that case disagreement in the Enchiridion is not absolute. One may compare for example type 7 (e.g. *stesse gäntsas switas* / *der gantzen Welt* III 11510) and type 10 (e.g. *stessei swintan crixtisnan* / *der heyligen Tauffe* III 592). In the former, Old Prussian obviously behaves like every inflected language (e.g. like Lithuanian), where each form is case-marked (here in the genitive). In the latter, it behaves like German, with a kind of Gruppenflexion: one form is marked (in the genitive), the rest remaining underspecified (in the accusative). Considering that the translation
of the Enchiridion is strictly synchronic, such doublets are incompatible with the reconstruction of a real language. One is forced to admit that one of these constructions is not genuine; since it cannot be the former (type 7), because one does not see how it would have been produced, it must be the latter (type 10). There is thus some evidence that Old Prussian, like Lithuanian, regularly inflected each member of a sequence [Det. + Adj. + Subst.] in the same case; case disagreement cannot be ascribed to Old Prussian, but only to the erroneous translation of the Enchiridion.

However, it is noteworthy that case disagreement is not always directly caused by imitation of a particular passage of the German text. For example, a German genitive can occasionally be translated by a Prussian accusative, even if it was not underspecified in the German text (compare e. g. des Gewissen-s / steise powaisemen III 73, cf. also deines Weib-s / twaise Gennan III 1057, deines Angesicht-s / twaise prosnan III 10514, etc.). This means that, even if case disagreement is due to textual interference, as I assume, it does not necessarily follow the principle of a word-for-word translation. My view on this matter is based on the idea that the translator tried not only to render the German text unit by unit, but also to identify some general rules that could help him record Prussian case forms in other contexts as well. It is possible that Paul Megott’s pronunciation of Prussian did not allow for a clear recognition of final syllables (this in turn being perhaps a feature of 16th century Old Prussian) and that Abel Will had to establish rules – rather artificially in some cases – in order to write them in a satisfactory way. As I already tried to show elsewhere (Pe t it 2001), Abel Will’s work was sometimes creative.

VI. Conclusion

The facts described in this paper allow for a few useful generalizations. It is obvious that the Old Prussian translation of the Enchiridion was deeply influenced by German. On this matter, there is a broad consensus. Any attempt at reconstructing the Old Prussian case system must therefore keep in mind that we are dealing here with distorted linguistic evidence. The problem is whether this distortion is a feature of Old Prussian as a whole or is due in more limited fashion to translation pressure in the Enchiridion. In this paper, I have tried to classify different levels of German influence on the
Old Prussian case system (direct borrowing, modifications of the use of case forms, influence on agreement properties) and to show to what extent they played a role in Old Prussian. Whereas there is no basis whatsoever for the claim that Old Prussian directly borrowed German case endings, the German model may nevertheless have played a crucial role in renewing syntactic uses and/or in limiting agreement properties. I assume that, in some cases, German influence on Old Prussian syntactic uses may reflect the authentic evolution of Prussian as a dying West Baltic language; for example, case syncretism should probably be seen as a linguistic reality in Old Prussian. On the other hand, some uses seem rather aberrant from a typological point of view and may be considered to be due merely to textual interference. The crucial point therefore is that linguistic typology may provide a suitable criterion for determining whether a given feature is authentic in Old Prussian or limited to the Enchiridion. I am aware, of course, that this account might sound desperately programmatic; the evidence often remains ambiguous. Finally, I assume that case disagreement, particularly well documented through the so-called “mixed constructions” of Old Prussian, does not reflect any kind of linguistic reality, but was caused by direct imitation of the German agreement properties. In this respect, German underspecification might have constituted the basis for this curious development. In any case, the Old Prussian Enchiridion is a fascinating document: it provides interesting clues on the question how the case system of a dying language can be recorded through the filter of a deeply different linguistic system.

PRŪSU ENCHIRIDIONO LINKSNIAVIMO SISTEMA IR VERTIMO STRATEGIJA

Santrauka

Prūsų kalbos paminkluose, ypač Enchiridione (1561), linksnių formos dėl vokiečių kalbos įtakos yra labai dažnai painiojamos, todėl linksniavimo sistemą rekonstruoti sunku. Šio straipsnio tikslas – aptarti įvairiopų vokiečių kalbos įtaką prūsų kalbos linksnių formoms ir aprašyti vadinamąsias „mišriąias konstrukcijas“ (pvz., sen stesmu [D] wirdan [A] „su žodžiu“).
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