MAŽVYDAS CATECHISM 31.22–23

The text has: Prisch Dewa ij stai-tima stawij. Gordon B. Ford’s edition (Assen 1971) emends to read ijstatima\(^1\). Clearly this rests internally on the related form ijngi statitas in the preceding line, as well as externally on the noun ordinationi of Willich.

We may wonder, however, what prompted the error of introducing ai. I submit that, given the similarity in the old typeface of t and k, the spelling was attracted by the suggestive similarity (even in semantics as well) of iskaitymas.

Now this in turn suggests an error not on the part of Mažvydas in the act of writing, but of a printer or typesetter, who is looking at the type faces and not keeping in mind the whole of the text. At the same time it is the kind of error that only a native speaker could make\(^2\).

Here we have internal evidence that the printer of the Catechism spoke Lithuanian.

---

\(^1\) Stang writes thus (Die Sprache des lit. Kat. von M., 21) without mentioning the reading.

\(^2\) There does not seem to be strong enough motivation in the surrounding taip and betaigį to oook for contamination from these.