“KORTLANDT’S HYPOTHESIS” AND OLD PRUSSIAN STRESS*

Hitherto, our sole direct source of information on the placement of stress in Old Prussian has been the third and last of the Catechism texts, Abel Will’s 1561 translation of Luther’s Enchiridion. Here, it is generally agreed that word stress is indicated by the marking of length on a stressed syllable with a macron-like device: wîrans ‘man, acc. pl.’: Lith. vîrus (with -ij- as an allograph of -î-) ¹. In diphthongs, as Fortunatov (1880, 153 ff.) has shown, the marking of (secondary) moric length indicates not only word stress, but also syllable tone: rânkan ‘hand, acc. sg.’ (Lith. raîkâ, with Baltic circumflex): kaîlins ‘bone, acc. pl.’ (Lith. kaûlus, i.e., Baltic acute). In the Enchiridion, then, the representation of stress and vowel/mora length is graphically merged, and word stress is directly attested only for long vowels.

There is no communis opinio regarding the indication of stress on short vowels. On the one hand, Trautmann (1910, 196), Van Wijk (1918, 101), and Rysiewicz (1938–40, 101–2) find that short accented vowels are indeed represented graphically, by a doubling of a following (intervocalic) consonant: buttan [‘butan] : Lith. bûtas, gallan [‘galan] : Lith. gâla, enmigguns [en’ migguns] : Lith. imigês. Smoczyński 1990 extends this interpretation to other environments. On the other hand, Berneker (1896, 102), Endzelin (1944, 23–24, 27), and Schmalstieg (1974, 25) argue that Will’s doubling of a consonant is simply a device to mark the shortness of a preceding vowel, “nach dem Vorbild der deutschen Orthographie”, according to Endzelin (1944, 23). In this case, a geminate consonant (-j- and -w- are never doubled) could be found after either a stressed or

---

* The preparation of this paper was facilitated by F. Kortlandt’s posting of the three Old Prussian catechisms on his web page: <http://www.let.rug.nl/~schaeken/kortlandt.html> and has benefited greatly from discussions with Rick Derksen (Leiden). Needless to say, any shortcomings are my own.

¹ Abel Will says as much in the foreword to the Catechism (cited according to Mažiulis 1981, 105): “Damit aber der lefer folche iضرب nach jrer Natürlichen art verfendlîg lêfen könne; vnd es die zuhörrer auch verstehen / ift dieses fleißig zu mergen / das die Fünff Vocaless gemeinlich durch eine lange Pronunciation aussgesprochen werden / Derwegen folche buchstaben jhre fondere zeychen haben müssen / Wo nun diese nachfolgende verzeychnus an einem folchen buchstaben im wort erfunden, muss derfelbige mit feinem gewohnlichen accent Pronuncijrt werden. ā, ē, ī, ō, ū, ĩ”.
unstressed vowel, and, conversely, the single writing of a consonant indicates the length of a preceding vowel (regardless of stress).  

While these two approaches agree in regarding Will’s use of single and geminated consonants as essentially reflecting contemporary German orthographic practice, a fundamentally different interpretation of the doubling of consonants in the Enchiridon has been put forward by Kortlandt (1974), who, starting from numerous writings of the type semmē, desmīngts, ettrāī, with a macron on the vowel following a geminated consonant, proposes that such a notation indicates the stress of a following, rather than preceding vowel (or simple brevity). As Kortlandt explains (loc. cit., 300), “Considering that it is a priori more probable that double consonants occur under the same conditions in word forms without a macron as they do in word forms where we can derive the place of the stress from the macron, we can formulate the following HYPOTHESIS: a double consonant indicates that the next vowel was stressed” (original emphasis). The above buttan (Lith. butās), gallan (Lith. gālā), enmigguns (Lith. imigēs) would thus represent “bu’tan”, “ga’lan”, “enmi’guns”, all with final stress.

Together with this hypothesis, Kortlandt (loc. cit., 302) proposes a progressive stress shift for Old Prussian analogous to Dybo’s law for Slavic (advancement of stress from a non-acute syllable to the next syllable, irrespective of its prosodic composition), except that in Old Prussian the conditions for stress displacement are more restricted: here stress advances only from a short syllable; circumflex syllables are unaffected: “a stressed short vowel lost the iictus to the following syllable”. This would account for such comparisons as OPr. nom. sg. semmē ‘earth’: Lith. žemē, OPr. 3 sg. pret. wedē(din) ‘lead’: Lith. vēdē, OPr. fem. sg. twaiā ‘your’.

---

2 As Endzelin (1944, 23–24) points out, the marking of a short vowel through the gemination of a following C is not absolutely consistent in these texts; for example, it is rare before another C (siggna = signā). It is, however, typically found before a resonant: madila, tickra.) As Endzelin further notes, consonant gemination is less common in suffixes than in roots (spartina, spartinno), is almost completely lacking across a prefix-root boundary (pallap- is the only example), and is never found in word-final position (kas).

3 I count 193 examples (including hyphenated words) of this sort in the Enchiridon, including forms with the structure -VCCj- (Dellijks), -VCCrV- (tickromai), and stressed diphthong after the geminated consonant (sallaubiskan). The only examples here of a geminated consonant following a stressed syllable (vowel or diphthong) are poliźki 27, drūktai 66 12, billit 79, dīnka 79 11, lassīnmuns 104 29, drūktawingiskan 119 11, dinckun 132 15.

4 Dybo 1982, 247, note 25, refers to “Закон Кортландта” and says that he himself had proposed something similar at a conference on Nostratic in 1973. Commenting on Kortlandt’s Hypothesis, he notes that it “eliminates the ‘mystical nature’ (мистический характер) of the connection between iictus and double consonants”. He is apparently referring to the view put forth in the works of Trautmann (1910, 196), Van Wijk (1918, 101), and Rysiewicz (1938–40, 101–2), that the doubling of a consonant in the various Old Prussian texts is an attempt at representing the stress of a previous short vowel.
Russ. тво́й, твоё (original barytone), OPr. dat. pl. gennámons ‘woman’ : Russ. женá, женý (original barytone). Circumflex bases retain their original stress: OPr. acc. pl. ránkans ‘hand’ : Lith. rankás (circumflex base with Saussure’s law), OPr. acc. pl. aúsin ‘ear’ : Lith. aúsis (circumflex base with Saussure’s law).

As supporting evidence for such a stress advancement in Old Prussian, Kortlandt (loc. cit., 300) cites the “remarkable alternation between e and a before a double consonant in wirdemmans, waikammons and giwemmai, giwammai. The vacillation is more easily explained as the result of a pretonic neutralization than as an unmotivated alternation in the stressed syllable. ... (p. 302:) Here again the final stress in the Old Prussian forms is supported by the variants gannan, gannai, gannans, which point to a weak pretonic vowel”. But as Parenti 1998, 136 has indicated, this “remarkable alternation” is found equally well in syllables which according to Kortlandt’s hypothesis would be stressed, and the alternation would therefore be unmotivated: ucke- (1x) of vckcelángewin-giskai 594/5 : ucka- (5x; vckaläng_wingiskai 3913/14, etc.); 8122 wesselingi 8122 : Wessals 1218 (Parenti loc. cit. cites other examples). The alternation is also found in kittewídei 498 and kittewidiskai 12915 : kittawidin 11525; pogattewinlai 10310/11 : pogattawint 7711, which according to Kortlandt (p. 303) are not actually exceptions to his hypothesis, but represent stress on the syllables -wid- and -win-, the -w- having exerted a certain reducing effect on the preceding vowel; a stop preceding this vowel is written doubly.

On the other hand, there are words of relatively high frequency throughout the Enchiridion, like tebbei (11x; hyphenated forms are included for all counts), mennei (9x), adder (72x), paggan (26x), pallaips (25x), labban (25x), segge/seggè (12x), gemmons (6x), which never show an alternation e ~ a in actual or purported pretonic position; etymological a and e are kept distinct here (cf. also Levin 1982, 206–209).5

The graphic alternation of e ~ a in the Old Prussian texts is a complex issue which almost certainly has several motivating factors. For cases like giwemmai, wirdemmans, gennan, Stang 1966, 27 sees the fronting of a stressed a before a nasal. Other instances, such as Sacramentan ~ Sacramenten reflect, according to Stang, a reduced pronunciation of the vowel in unstressed position. Still other instances in the Enchiridion of graphic e ~ a contain an etymological e, and may reflect the open pronunciation of this vowel (as is the case in the Elbing Vocabu-

---

5 Since etymological e is rendered consistently in high-frequency examples such as tebbei, mennei, seggè, gemmons, I have reservations concerning Parenti’s (1998, 138–139) reiteration of Schmalstiege 1959: “in Old Prussian, as in modern Lithuanian, there was no opposition between /a/ and /e/ in the position after a consonant”.
lary: Levin 1971, 12, 17), which is apparently marked in Catechism II by the graph æ: IIæst (est): III ast, IIæse ‘from’: III esse/asse, IIæse ‘be, 2 sg. pres.’: III essei/assai/assei.

In fact, there are several other compelling reasons, both linguistic and cultural, for preferring the traditional interpretation of consonant gemination (in Endzelin’s formulation) to Kortlandt’s hypothesis. To begin with, the Enchiridion text itself provides a number of graphic counterexamples to Kortlandt’s hypothesis. These include:

a) Multiple writings of double C: Omitting compounds (like stessepaggan) on the grounds that they may have more than one stress, we have tickinnimai 35², saddinna 97₁¹, isspressennen 67₁¹ (3 sets!), perweckammai 31₄, pickullas 51₁⁶, preistattinnimai 111₁⁵, kackinnais 117²⁷, Critixissenien 131₁₈, and others.

b) Expected double consonants lacking: ismigé 101₁³, budē 89₁¹, Supūni 67₄, 69₈, pagår 27⁶, perōni 103²⁴;

c) Forms in which double consonants are not immediately pretonic (again, excluding compounds like ackewijstin 12₅⁵) Pallaiptswei 35⁶, përgimmans 41³, këmpinna 51₁⁴, poliycki 57₁⁰, Jssprettingi 75₁₈, aï-pallai 79₂⁰₂¹, widdewū 97₁⁰ Widdewūmans 9₇, boüseennien, 103², skijstinnons 103⁹, and others. Note also giwass (2x) alongside the spelling giwasi (1x). On the basis of such forms, Endzelins (1943, 19; 1944, 27) raised doubts concerning Trautmann’s formulation.

d) Instances of vowel reduction after a doubled consonant (suggesting an un-stressed syllable): tickars 47⁹, 61²⁰, 77₁³ (indicating reduced final: *'tikrs), tickran; tāns 37₁¹ (repeatedly) < *'tanas, although Kortlandt argues that tennā/tannā is by progressive stress shift; Trinta_winni 89₂⁶ (-i < unstressed -ē, if this is not in fact an -ī ~ -ā stem, on which cf. Levin 1971, 82 ff.).

e) Forms such as semmé 105₁⁷ ‘earth’: Lith. žėmė, OPr. 3 sg. pret. weddé(din) 101₁⁷ ‘lead’: Lith. vėdė, which serve in part to motivate Kortlandt’s hypothesis, are somewhat suspect in view of the fact that etymological long -ē- in the Enchiridion is otherwise routinely represented as -ē- (Stang 1966, 46)⁷.

Kortlandt’s hypothesis is also less compelling when the cultural context underlying the appearance of the catechisms is brought to bear on the question of Old

---

⁶Note also Derksen 1996, 366: “Words of the type widdewū constitute an exception to the general rule that a double consonant indicates that the next vowel was stressed”. As in the examples kittewidei, pogattewini, Kortlandt (loc. cit., 303) sees in widdewū the “reducing effect of the w on the preceding pretonic vowel”.

⁷Smoczyński 1990, 192, note 12, views the macron of ē as an abbreviatory device for a diphthong ei.
Prussian orthographic practice. The three catechism editions were translated into Old Prussian in order to assist German speaking clergymen in educating a generation of native speakers of Old Prussian in the Christian doctrine. This aim is stated quite clearly in Hartknoch’s 1684 *Alt- und Neues Preussen*, and it would be useful to quote the relevant passage in full (p. 89, column 2; original emphasis in bold used as a quotation):


The question remains: Why would books intended for use by 16th-century German-speaking clergy (rather than for 20th-century linguists) adopt an orthographic convention presumably unfamiliar to the speakers? Nor is there any evidence (e.g., in Hartknoch 1684) of a German-derived Old Prussian writing tradition which over time may have evolved into the system envisioned by Kortlandt, and upon which Abel Will might have drawn; and no such system is found among those languages in the Baltic region which were subject to German cultural influence. For Latvian, which distinguishes vowel length, earlier orthographic practice shows a doubling of consonants after short vowels: Older Latvian *zītas* (citas), *taggad* (tagad), *ažis* (acis), *labbi* (labi), *tu eʃi* (esi), *turram* (turam), *Semme* (zeme). The same practice of doubling consonants to denote the shortness of preceding vowels prevailed in Estonian up until Ahren’s spelling reforms of the mid-19th century,
when the German-style orthography was replaced by one modelled on Finnish: older *tulkene* > *tulukene* ‘little fire’, while *tuled* > *tuuled* ‘winds’ (Raun, Saareste 1965, 72).

Of course, both Latvian and Estonian, like German, are languages with initial stress; the question of the representation of word-internal accent does not arise. The question is germane, however, in the case of the East Prussian publications in Lithuanian (a point recently made by Parenti 1998, 137 ff.), which, like Old Prussian, is a language with free stress. Regarding such texts, Derksen 1996, 16–17 (citing Illich-Svitych 1979, 17–18, 152) notes that “in certain Lithuanian editions that appeared in Königsberg a double consonant indicates that a preceding *e* or *a* is short and therefore usually unstressed, e.g. Asg. *rāsą* (= *rāsą*), Gsg. *rassos* (= *rasos*) in the Prayer Book of 1705, or Gpl. *pādū* (= *pādū*), *naggū* (= *nagū*) ... This orthographic convention was first pointed out by A. Baranowskij with respect to Haack’s vocabulary (1730), where we find *sukkū*, *lippū* ... Though in these cases the function of the double consonant as a marker of the place of stress seems to be secondary, I think that it supports Kortlandt’s hypothesis”.

Derksen properly notes here that the function of the double consonant in these Lithuanian texts is secondary, as it surely is in the relevant examples for Old Prussian: the correlation of geminate consonant and following stress is merely a consequence of the general convention for short vowels. But it does not follow that this notation supports Kortlandt’s hypothesis: for disyllabic Lithuanian words with a root in *e*, *a*, like *rasā*, a geminated consonant will necessarily indicate stress on the following syllable, since root-stressed forms will have secondary lengthening of the *e*, *a* (which has not been proposed for Old Prussian!) and concomitant single-writing of the consonant in question: acc. sg. *rāsą*, as opposed to *rassos*, with original short *a* and double consonant. In syllables with short *i*, *u* (and non-lengthened *e*, *a*), consonant gemination will appear irrespective of stress, because there is no inherent connection with stress. A perusal of Daniel Kleins’ Grammar and Compendium (1653, 1654), which serve as a model for later Prussian-Lithuanian orthographic practice, shows consonant doubling here (although with no great consistency) without reference to stress: *žinnau* (*žinaū*), *žinnai* (*žinaī*), *žinno* (*žino*); *vadinnu* (*vadinū*), *vadinni* (*vadini*), *vadinna* (*vadīna*); *wiffas* (nom. sg. masc.: *visas*), *wiffas* (acc. pl. fem.: *visas*), *wiffa* (ntr. sg.: *visa*); *uppe* (*upē*); *suprattiu* (1 sg. fut.) (*suprāsiu*, short *a!*), *supratattau* (*supratāu*)

---

8 The same point is made with illustrations from Lysius’ 1719 Catechism by Dini 1990, 76, and Parenti 1998, 135–6. Palionis 1995, 31, sums up the relevant orthographic principles underlying the Lithuanian texts of East Prussia as follows: “Anuometinei priebalsių rašbais būdingas dar ir priebalsių rašmenų dvejinimas
Although the various arguments adduced above against Kortlandt’s hypothesis are, I believe, compelling in themselves, the most decisive proof would be a single clear case of a stressed short vowel in the language. I believe such direct evidence exists.

In his intriguing 1991 article “Die Altpreußischen Wörter in einem Gedicht von Friedrich Zamelius (1590–1647)”, Josh Schaecken indicates several Old Prussian words and phrases which embellish an early 17th-century poem, “De Galindis ac Sudinis, Carmen, In quo multa de Veteri Lingua Prussica occurrunt”, composed in Latin by a certain Friedrich Zamelius (Zamel, Zamehl). Citing J. H. Zedler’s Universal-Lexicon of 1749, Schaecken informs us that Zamelius, about whom little is otherwise known, was “ein Preusse, Kayserl. gecrönter Poet und Bürgermeister zu Elbingen”.

As Schaecken reports, the poem appears in two nearly identical versions. Version A (in Schaecken’s usage) concludes (pp. 104–108) the section “De Lingua Veterum Prussorum”, one of the “Selectae dissertationes historiae de variis rebus prussicis”, a supplement to historian Christoph Hartknoch’s 1679 publication of Peter von Düsburg’s Chronicon Prussiae. Version B is found in Hartknoch’s 1684 Alt- und Neues Preussen (pp. 112–114), at the end of the chapter “Von der vorjährigen Preussischen Sprache”.

Certain of the Old Prussian forms in this poem appear in Greek letters with attendant diaeretics (since it is customary to write Greek words with accents); these appear again in Latin transcription, this time without diaeretics, in Hartknoch’s discussion of whether Old Prussian might be related to Greek (p. 92 of Hartknoch 1679; p. 97, column 2, of Hartknoch 1684). I reproduce the Greek-letter forms with diaeretics here from my own readings of both versions; page and line numbers refer to Version B. Unless otherwise noted, the forms in versions A and B are identical.

γάννας (γάννας peperereγυναίκες is the full phrase in the poem), p. 113, line 23 from bottom.

Μαλνῦκαν (Μαλνῦκαν Sobolem, Pumilum propè Sarmata vertat), p. 113, line 20 from bottom.

πετον (πετον potare ab origine Graeca), p. 113, line 10 from bottom. Schaecken represents the root vowel as two graphs: ποτον; the original actually has the single ligature ς in both versions.

(geminacja). Jis ypač buvo išplėtės R[ynu] P[rūsijoje], kur stipriaus veikė vokiečių rašybos įtaka. Čia iš pradžios dažniau buvo dvejimama tik s [...], o vėliau ir l, m, n, r, b, d, g, p, t [...]. Šitoki dvejinimu, panašiai kaip ir vokiečių rašyboje, norėta pažymėti prieš dvejinamų priešais balso trumpumą".
ἀυξλιτζζ (ἀυξλιτζζ adopertum à voce καλύπτω), p. 113, line 10 from bottom. The expected τ (for ζ) appears in Version A. Some of the Greek τ’s in the original text are quite similar to ζ; it is easy to see how the misprint might have occurred. The Latin transcription in Version B also shows “t” (p. 97). Version A differs in placing over the initial α- a grave accent somewhat higher and to the right of the smooth breathing.

Μῆς ῥίκυαί ἄσμεν (Μῆς ῥίκυαί ἄσμεν ἱονατ ἧμεῖς κύριοι ἐσμέν), line 113, line 3 from bottom. Version A lacks the rough breathing over initial r.

Schaeken concludes from the Old Prussian material of the poem that Zamelius’ main source for these words was the Enchiridion, and that we cannot assume that he was a fluent speaker of Old Prussian (p. 285). He also finds (p. 288, note 15) that “Den Akzentzeichen über den griechischen Wörtern muß offensichtlich keine Bedeutung beigemessen werden”: although the circumflex as macron in Μαλνοκαν and ποῦτον agrees with the orthographic -ij- (= i) and ū in the Enchiridion, we would not expect the acute as a mark of stress in ῥίκυαί and γάνναν, the latter apparently because of Kortlandt’s Hypothesis: “vgl. Kortlandt 1974”.

But Schaeken’s conclusions are surely more pessimistic than the data warrant. Schaeken himself (p. 285) gives evidence for Zamelius as a seemingly original source of Old Prussian: Zamelius corrects the misprint boklussmans in the Enchiridion to Poclusmans (note that an accusative singular poklusman does occur in the Enchiridion); chooses the correct of two forms (waikui, waikai) attested as nominative/vocative plural in this text; produces an original Old Prussian sentence; adduces three new Old Prussian forms: nom. pl. Kurpis, nom. pl. ῥίκυαί and nom. pl. rankas; and gives two hitherto-unknown place names. I might add that Zamelius includes the indication of stress in the form ἀυξλιτζζζζ (ἀυξλιτζζτζζ), which it lacks in the Enchiridion (auklipsis 774); in Μῆς he provides a long-vowel form of “we” unknown elsewhere in the Old Prussian corpus, though it is standard in Latvian and dialectal in Lithuanian (S t a n g 1966, 254); and, lastly, he provides stress marks for ῥίκυαί and γάνναν, which remain to be discussed.

As mentioned above, Schaeken dismisses the significance of the diacritics in the Greek transcription of Zamelius’ Old Prussian words. But if certain of these, such as Μαλνοκαν and ποῦτον, are taken at face value, why not all? Indeed, the diacritics of Μαλνοκαν and ποῦτον have stress correspondences in the Enchiridion: dat. sg. malniki 131 17 and the many instances of the stem malniķ-; pūton 41 6, poūton 75 24, 77 1, 77 5. The circumflex in the Greek forms is technically not a replacement for a macron (and clearly has no connection with Old Prussian tone), but simply the accentual diacritic required by Greek orthographic practice when marking a long
stressed penult, given a short-vowel ultima. The form ἀυκλίπττζ (➔ ἀυκλιπττζ), while it apparently violates the rules of Greek diacritics (but, then again, the final consonant cluster is not found in Greek), can be seen as uncontroversially reflecting the initial stress seen in the Enchiridion in other instances of the au- prefix; compare Enchiridion äuschautins 53^20/21 and aūpallai 79^20/21. Like Schaeken, I have no explanation for ἀσμεν in place of the Enchiridion’s asmai; as he suggests, it may simply be in imitation of the Greek form.

Needing special comment is βλεπεί (corresponding segmentally to the Enchiridion nom./voc. pl. Rikijai 95^21), which shows the proper acute diacritic for antepenultimate stress, but unexpected stress on the initial syllable. The following forms of this frequent word are known from the Enchiridion, where the spelling is quite consistent: nom./voc. sg. Rikij (23x), Rickijes (1x), Rikeis (1x); gen. sg. Rikijas (6x), Rikijes (2x); acc. sg. Rikijan (32x); nom. pl. Rikijai (1x); acc. pl. Rikijans (2x), Rikian (1x); adv. Rikijiskai (“herrlich”) (1x). Since the sequence -ij- functions as -i-, the spelling Rikij suggests stress on the second syllable. But in this particular stem, the graphic sequence -ij- may function in a unique way: before a vowel (Rikijan, Rikijas, Rikijiskai, etc.) it is ambiguous — it may indicate a long or short i+j+vowel. If a short -i- is present, then the nom. sg. Rikijes has secondary length formed by the closing of a syllable ending in a resonant, a process well-known in Lithuanian and seen elsewhere in the Enchiridion in examples such as pickullis 117^8, Pickullan 125^10, but Pickūls 55^19; tannans 111^22, but tāns (frequent throughout). In this case, the -ij- may not necessarily refer to stress. Even assuming that it does (Sta n g 1966, 192 views rikij as an -iūo- stem), the possibility remains of a stress alternation *rikijas (> rīkās) – rikijai, i.e., certain case forms with stress on the initial syllable (which must be interpreted as long due to the nearly consistent writing of a following single consonant, and the word’s origin^9). Maziulis 1981, although working within a different orthographic interpretation, sees barytonic stress in this word in the accusative and (apparently) other oblique forms (p. 325, note 274).

Finally, in γανανα, the diacritic is appropriate in terms of Greek orthographic practice (acute on a short stressed vowel). Taking the form at face value, which I believe is sanctioned by the above considerations, we have the sole direct example

---

9 According to Büga II 85, the Enchiridion’s rikij represents rīkās, a borrowing from Gothic *reikeis ‘Herrschere, Herr’ (cf. B a m n n e s b e r g e r 1990, 199: *rik- > Gothic reiks ‘Herrschere’). Büga’s rejection of a connection between OPr. rikjis and Lith. rykātu, Latv. rikuoties (tes) ‘anordnen, schalten und warten’ (Dankantas’ rykys ‘valdovas, karalius’ is an innovation) seems artificial. Concerning the reflection of length on unstressed (as well as stressed) syllables through the single-writing of a following consonant, see Tr a u t m a n n 1910, 198.
of a stressed short vowel in Old Prussian. The stress is on the root (it shows the same place of stress as acc. sg. rānkan, but is at odds with the stress of dat. pl. gennāmans 93\textsuperscript{11}), and Kortlandt’s Hypothesis for Old Prussian, already suspect on the basis of the Enchiridion’s cultural context and the graphic counterexamples adduced above, is vitiated. Consequently, a claim for a progressive stress shift in Old Prussian cannot be demonstrated. The handful of cases which seem to indicate a progressive shift of ictus with respect to Lithuanian (OPr. nom. sg. semmē `earth’ : Lith. žemė; OPr. 3 sg. pret. weddē\textsuperscript{(din)} `lead’ : Lith. vėdė) or parallel Dybo’s Law in Slavic (OPr. fem. sg. twaiā ‘your’ : Russ. твои, твоё; OPr. dat. pl. gennāmans ‘woman’ : Russ. женя, жень; OPr. nom. sg. widdewī ‘widow’ : Russ. вдова, вдовь) await another explanation\textsuperscript{10}.
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