

the logic of presentation of the material. Numerous cross-references can be found (sometimes, however, not indicating the exact page). Not all but many grammatical terms appearing for the first time are translated into Lithuanian (in such cases, together with marked accent one would like to have the accent class also given). The principle to accentuate single Lithuanian words declared on p. 17 (not sentences and word groups) is not always consistently followed and some single words lack the accent mark. In fact, it would be useful to mark accent in all Lithuanian words and phrases in the book; that would be a big advantage especially for students.

In the Introduction, the author modestly expresses his hope that there is «a considerable need for a grammar of Lithuanian of this size in English» (p. 17). It must be stressed, however, that the book is necessary and useful not because of the fact that it is written in English. It is an original study of the modern Lithuanian language interesting and valuable in itself. It could be doubted, however, that the object of description can be strictly considered as Contemporary Standard Lithuanian (p. 17). The recommendations of the author do not always correspond with those of normativists of Lithuanian. Sometimes colloquial expressions are introduced and some obsolete or dialectal words or forms can be found. Unfortunately, the book contains many minor errors and misprints, so one should wait for the revised edition where they will be corrected.

Terje Mathiassens A short Grammar of Lithuanian
Aleksiej Andronov (Sankt-Peterburg)

Anmelderen kommenterer flere deler av T. Mathiassens nylig utgitte litauiske grammatik på engelsk. I anmeldelsen blir det analysert i detalj og diskutert enkelte punkter som kunne være annerledes enn slik de er presentert i grammatikken. Bokens vellykkethet og viktighet blir understreket.

NOTES ON THE LATVIAN DEBITIVE

AXEL HOLVOET
Warszawa

1. Debitive and mood.

In Latvian grammar, the debitive is traditionally described as a mood, but the correctness of this treatment has rightly been disputed¹. Though the function of the debitive is connected with modality, it cannot be classified as a mood on a level with the indicative, conditional, imperative etc., because mood is a category defining mutually exclusive classes of forms. A verb form cannot at the same time be marked for the indicative and the imperative, the indicative and the conditional etc. The Latvian debitive, however, may be additionally marked for several moods: apart from the indicative (*ir jāstrādā*) there is also the conditional (*būtu jāstrādā*) and the relative mood (*esot jāstrādā*). It is true that the status of the relative mood is itself at issue, but, apart from the 'relative debitive' just mentioned, the relative mood is now exclusive of other kinds of modal marking². It is thus the status of the debitive rather than that of the relative mood that is problematic.

The function of the debitive is, of course, associated with modality, though not with sentence modality. The meaning of necessity characteristic of the debitive (the types of 'necessity' which may be involved will be discussed below), represents a higher modal predicate with one propositional argument, sc. the predication expressed by the verb occurring in the debitive form. The debitive can thus be adequately compared to the incorporation of modal auxiliaries, a phenomenon characteristic of agglutinating languages. As far as

¹ Cf. Marvan J., *Par verbu izteiksmes kategoriju mūsdienu latviešu valodā*, in: *Latviešu valodas apcerējumi* (LVU Zinātniskie raksti 60), Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1967, 127-133, and, more recently, Mathiassen T., *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian* (Universitet i Oslo, Slavisk-baltisk avdeling, Meddelelser, 75), 1996, 29.

² In the dialects, relative forms of the conditional, such as *būtot*, are attested, cf. Endzelīns J., *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība, 1951, 981-982.

modal predicates are concerned, Hungarian with its productive potential suffix *-hat-/-het-* 'to be able' is an example. The status of these forms is apparently not clear in Hungarian grammar – at least as far as can be judged from the account given by Majtinskaja³. On the one hand, they can be marked for the imperative and conditional moods in addition to their potential marking, and therefore they are usually described as having derivational rather than inflectional status. On the other hand, they do not have a full paradigm, as infinite forms are lacking. This, in turn, would be an argument in favour of classifying these forms with the category of verbal mood, though this approach has a drawback as well: every combination of the potential suffix *-hat-/-het-* with another modal marker would have to be treated as a separate mood, e.g., the potential-conditional (*jár-hat-nék* 'I would be able to walk') and the potential-subjunctive, provided with the marker also used for the imperative (*hogy jár-hassak* 'in order that I should be able to walk'). In a similar way, treating the debitive as a mood would actually amount to introducing two further moods: the debitive-conditional *man būtu jāstaigā* 'I would have to walk' and the debitive-relative *man esot jāstaigā* 'It is reported that I have to walk'⁴. Obviously this is not an elegant solution.

A more distant parallel to the debitive as a verbal form incorporating a higher predicate is provided by the causative formations occurring in many languages. Causative formations may apparently often be derived in quite a regular and productive way (cf. Hungarian, Turkish etc.), so that one would be inclined to include them into the inflectional paradigm of the verb rather than in the system of word formation. However, there is no place for forms of this type in the traditional model of the verbal paradigm. Just as causative formations belong to the domain of diathesis, but not of voice *stricto sensu*, so formations with incorporated modal predicates belong to the domain of modality, but not of mood proper. Causative formations are usually not described as belonging to the

³ Majtinskaja K.E., *Istoriko-sopostavitel'naja morfologija finno-ugorskich jazykov*, Moskva: Nauka, 1979, 28-29.

⁴ In the Academy Grammar these forms are described as 'ramifications' of the debitive, cf. Bergmane A. et al. (eds.), *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika I. Fonētika un morfologija*, Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas izdevniecība, 1959, 617.

domain of voice because they involve the addition of an argument rather than the reconfiguration of arguments characteristic of the active-passive opposition. For the sake of consistency, instances of argument reduction such as decausative (middle voice) constructions like Russian *дверь открывается* 'the door opens' should be kept apart from voice as well, as stressed by Mel'čuk⁵. It is interesting to note in this connection that Mel'čuk considers the reflexive (as distinct from pseudoreflexives expressing the middle voice) a genuine instance of a 'grammeme of voice'⁶. With regard to the Baltic languages this causes some difficulties, as Mel'čuk himself concedes, since Lithuanian occasionally combines reflexive and passive morphemes, as in *Onos apsirengta ir išėita* (the passive form of *Ona apsirengė ir išėjo*)⁷. If one insists on classifying both categories as 'grammemes of voice', then one has to operate with voice oppositions at more than one level, say, VOICE₁ and VOICE₂. The same holds true for the debitive. If we want to consider it a mood, then we have to distinguish MOOD₁ and MOOD₂.

Typologically, the debitive is specific in that, in its basic, non-epistemic uses, it presents us with an instance of grammaticalisation of 'root modality', i.e. a kind of modality which is dissociated from the speaker's attitudes⁸. This kind of modality, in contradistinction to deontic modality, is normally expressed by modal verbs only (though the possibility exists of these modal verbs being incorporated, as the example of Hungarian *-hat-/-het-* shows). Grammaticalisation of deontic necessity, i.e. the expression of obligations laid by the speaker or by the community whose norms of behaviour the speaker formulates, is apparently not uncommon. Deontic necessity may be expressed by verbal mood, e.g. by the

⁵ Cf. Mel'čuk I., *Voice: Toward a rigorous definition*, in Comrie, B. & Polinsky, M. (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993, 11.

⁶ Mel'čuk, *op. cit.*, 13.

⁷ Mel'čuk, *op. cit.*, 25.

⁸ Rather than using the term 'root modality' in a wider sense, to refer to all kinds of non-epistemic modality, I follow Palmer in restricting its use to the 'subject-oriented modality' expressed by modals like 'can', 'have to', which do not involve any opinion or attitude of the speaker, cf. Palmer F.R., *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge: University Press, 1986, 103.

subjunctive in Latin⁹. With reference to the past, such forms tend to be counterfactive¹⁰, as a rule of conduct with reference to a situation in the past is usually stated when it is at variance with the actual state of affairs. The Latvian debitive may have deontic meaning as well, and then it is more or less synonymous with the modal verb *vajadzēt*. This often seems to be the case in the present tense, where it is not rigidly opposed to the deontic *vajadzēt*. Basically, however, the debitive has the value of a root modal expressing a line of conduct resulting from external coercion or objective necessity. In the past tense, the debitive is always factive: *Tam bija jānotiek* can mean only 'this had to happen', and not 'this should have happened'. In counterfactive meaning the preterite of *vajadzēt* is used. Compare (1) and (2):

(1) Kad tu rakstīji, ka [...] nespēsi izrauties atbraukt to mazo gabiņu uz Rīgu, bija vien man pašai jāmēģina tevi sameklēt (A. Eglītis)

'When you wrote [...] you wouldn't manage to free yourself and make this short trip to Riga, I had to try and look you up myself.'

(2) Jau sen mums vajadzēja citādi rīkoties, tad nebūtu drīkstējis tā okšķerēt. (P. Rozītis)

'We should have acted differently a long time ago, then he wouldn't have dared to spy on us.'

A comparison between English *We should have acted differently* and *We had to act differently* reveals an interesting difference between root modals and deontic (as well as epistemic) modals as far as the interplay of tense forms is concerned. In the case of the deontic *We should have acted differently* the modal verb displays no tense oppositions, and reference to a situation in the past is conveyed by the use of the compound infinitive expressing anteriority. This seems to indicate that sentences containing constructions of this type describe an ideal world conceived of as existing simultaneously

⁹ Cf. *Sed maneor etiam, opinor* (Plautus) 'But I should still remain, I think' (Palmer, *op. cit.*, 106).

¹⁰ Cf. *At tu dictis, Albane, maneres* (Virgil, Aeneid 8.643) 'But thou, Alban, shouldst have kept thy word' (Palmer, *ibid.*).

with the actual one and differing from it only by the fact of the subject having performed the action which was expected from him in the light of the speaker's standards of behaviour. The same pattern can be observed with epistemic modals: in constructions like *He must have left yesterday* the modal verb is always in the present, and reference to the past is conveyed by the compound infinitive. In such cases the speaker asserts the necessary truth of a judgement concerning the subject's having performed a certain action at an earlier moment. Root modals behave differently: in *He had to leave yesterday* the modal verb is in the past tense because the sentence describes a situation in the past, and as the action conditioned by this situation is necessarily posterior to it, the infinitive is in its basic rather than in its compound form.

It is interesting to note that the Latvian debitive displays a similar variation in the distribution of tense markers as we have observed in English constructions with modal verbs. In the more common variety of the debitive, the basic component, consisting of the prefix *jā-* and the third person singular of the verb (with the exception of *būt*, whose debitive is derived from the infinitive), remains unchanged in all tense forms. Tense is conveyed by the auxiliary *būt*: *man ir jāstaigā, man bija jāstaigā, man būs jāstaigā, man ir bijis jāstaigā, man bija bijis jāstaigā, man būs bijis jāstaigā* etc. But there is also a second variety, directly derived from the compound stem of the verb, which consists of the auxiliary *būt* and the past active participle. In this variety, the auxiliary of the compound tenses, *būt*, is debitiveised. This yields constructions like (3):

(3) Nav jābūt lasījušam likumu grāmatas [...], lai pamanītu, ka pilsonības ieīstīnāšana Latvijas Republikā ir bezprecedenta situācija. (*Literatūra un māksla*, 11.10.1991)

'One doesn't need to have studied the codes of law [...] to become aware that the introduction of the institution of citizenship in the Latvian Republic is a situation without precedent.'

I would call this sentence an instance of alethic modality¹¹, as it belongs to the type of statements concerning the necessary or contingent truth of propositions in our actual world. What is predicated in (3) is that it is not the case that the statement of a person's not having studied the codes of law at some previous moment and that of this person's understanding the intricate problem of Latvian citizenship cannot be simultaneously true. Alethic modal predicates are inherently tenseless, but their propositional arguments, i.e. the propositions whose truth conditions are being assessed, may, of course, refer to the past. In constructions with modal verbs this is reflected in the use of the present tense of the modal verb and the compound form of the infinitive (if available in the given language). The structure of the debitive construction illustrated in (3) also reflects this: the present tense form of the auxiliary of the debitive (*būt*) is combined with the past active participle.

For equally obvious reasons, the same type of debitive forms will be used in epistemic meaning:

(4) *Kaut kam jābūt notikušam.*

'Something must have happened.'

Debitive forms of this type are rare, but they cannot be regarded as an anomaly. We have no alternative but to treat them as regular forms of the debitive paradigm, otherwise the status of the participle would be inexplicable. If we regard the participle in *es esmu lasījis* as part of a compound tense form rather than as a participle in predicative use, then the same explanation should hold for the participle in *man jābūt lasījušam*. An equally strong case could be made for *jābūt lasījušam* as for *bija jālasa* as the past tense form of (*ir*) *jālasa*. In the epistemic sense illustrated by (4), the present debitive based on the compound stem is the only possible form referring to the past. Moreover, the compound stem can be combined with different tense forms of the auxiliary if the debitive is used in the meaning of a root modal, though such uses are extremely rare. It is possible to derive forms like *bija jābūt (iz)lasījušam* 'one was obliged to have read', *būs jābūt (iz)lasījušam*

¹¹ Cf. Lyons J., *Semantics II*, Cambridge: University Press, 1977, 791 ff.

'one will be obliged to have read' etc. We thus have two more or less complete debitive paradigms rather than one.

As we can see, both components of the debitive can be conjugated more or less independently, even though the conjugation of the 'lexical' component is restricted to the alternative use of an unmarked stem or a compound stem marking anteriority. This pattern is typical of combinations of modal verbs with lexical verbs. The most adequate way of describing the debitive would therefore be to call it an agglutinative form incorporating a modal verb, even though the segmentation of this form has become so difficult that in Latvian grammars, for practical reasons, the debitive forms have to be included in the inflectional paradigm of the verb.

2. Debitive and voice.

Apart from its relation to mood, the debitive also presents another interesting problem: that of its relation to voice. Just like the passive, the debitive construction involves a reassignment of (surface) grammatical relations: the original object becomes a subject in terms of case marking, though not with regard to other subject properties¹². There is thus at least a superficial similarity between the debitive and the passive, though their functional dissimilarity is obvious as well. The passive (at least in its most prototypical variety, represented by the Latvian agentless passive) has been described as an 'agent-backgrounding device'¹³; in all its varieties (including the agented passive) it reflects a pattern of thematic-rhematic structure different from that of the active, with the patient (the original object) in thematic position (topicalised). The syntactic properties of the debitive construction, on the other hand, have no independent functional motivation of their own. The function of the debitive belongs to the domain of modality, and its

¹² For a discussion of subject properties in the debitive construction cf. Fennell T. G., *The subject of Latvian verbs in the debitive mood*, in Ziedonis A. et al. (eds.), *Baltic Literature and Linguistics*, Columbus, Ohio: Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies, 1973, 213-221.

¹³ Cf. Keenan E., *Passive in the World's Languages*, in Shopen T. (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description Vol. 1. Clause Structure*, Cambridge: University Press, 1985, 243-281.

syntactic properties, which reflect the origin of the debitive construction¹⁴, are now nothing but an anomaly from the functional point of view.

The superficial similarity between the debitive construction and the passive has been noticed a long time ago. As is known, Bielenstein regarded the debitive as a kind of passive¹⁵. Bielenstein's view of the debitive as the Latvian passive was cited, and dismissed as 'ganz unpassend', by Endzelin¹⁶, who did not, however, motivate his criticism. He obviously regarded Bielenstein's view as too conspicuously inadequate to be elaborately refuted.

Bielenstein's treatment of the debitive as the only genuine passive Latvian can boast was motivated, no doubt, by his morphological view of the passive, which was rooted, in turn, in the tradition of comparative Indo-European grammar. The analytical passive, though mentioned by Bielenstein¹⁷, could not aspire to the status of basic passive form in his view. Whatever may have induced Bielenstein to treat the debitive as a kind of passive, the reason was not that he was loath to treat it as a mood. In fact, he states explicitly that these passive forms 'heutzutage nirgend einfache Passivbedeutung haben, sondern überall mit der Passivbedeutung den Begriff einer objectiven Nothwendigkeit verbinden', so that they may occur only 'in den modis debitivis'¹⁸. What seems to be meant by this statement is that the debitive was originally a kind of passive, which secondarily acquired modal functions. A parallel for such a development would, of course, be provided by the present passive participle, for which Bielenstein also notes that it has acquired 'debitive' meaning¹⁹, and it was probably the parallel use of the debitive and the construction with the passive participle (e.g. *es zinu,*

¹⁴ The debitive developed from a possessive construction, cf. Endzelins J., *Zur Entstehung des lettischen Debitivs*, in Endzelins J., *Darbu izlase I*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1971, 288-9 (originally: Bezenbergers Beiträge 29, 320-1).

¹⁵ Bielenstein A., *Die lettische Sprache nach ihren Lauten und Formen erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt*, Bd. II, Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1864, 211.

¹⁶ Endzelins J., *Ursprung und Gebrauch des lettischen Debitivs*, in Id., *Darbu izlase I*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1971 (originally: Bezenbergers Beiträge 26, 1901), 143.

¹⁷ Bielenstein, *op. cit.*, 214ff.

¹⁸ Bielenstein, *op. cit.*, 211.

¹⁹ Bielenstein, *op. cit.*, 217.

kur man ejams / kur man jāiet 'I know where I have to go') that suggested a passive origin of the debitive to Bielenstein.

It is a well-known fact that the use of the debitive involves a reassignment of case forms. Does this also mean that there is a reassignment of grammatical relations, i.e. a promotion of the original object to the status of subject, as in the passive construction?

No clear answer to our question can be found in the Academy Grammar²⁰, where it is stated that sometimes it is the dative NP, and sometimes the nominative NP that behaves like a subject. According to another view, stated by Valdmanis in the 1989 syntax²¹, only the dative NP can be ascribed subject status because of its paradigmatic relation to the nominative subject of the non-debitive forms. Though the statement in the Academy Grammar probably results from the lack of a clear criterion for establishing what is the subject, the intuition behind it seems to be sound. In school grammar, the subject is usually defined in semantic terms as the NP denoting the thing about which something is stated in the sentence, though it is also tacitly assumed that this NP coincides with the NP in the nominative, so that, in practice, a formal rather than a syntactic criterion is used. The semantic feature used in defining the subject actually defines, in a more accurate way, what would now usually be called the theme or topic. Both will often coincide, as the subject basically reflects the unmarked topic. The unmarked pattern of topicalisation in a sentence will normally be the one with the grammatical subject as the topic, deviant patterns being reflected in a change in word order (but not in grammatical relations, as for each predicate only one pattern of thematic-rhematic structure can be grammaticalised). Every language probably has at least a few clause types where there is a discrepancy between the pattern of grammatical relations (and, in particular, the selection of the subject) and the unmarked pattern of thematic-rhematic structure. As an example we may cite possessive constructions of the *mihi est* type (illustrated by Latvian and Russian, with some differences of detail), where the typically animate possessor NP is not in subject

²⁰ Bergmane A. et al. (eds.), *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika II. Sintakse*, Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas izdevniecība, 1962, 233.

²¹ Ceplītis L., Rozenbergs J., Valdmanis J., *Latviešu valodas sintakse*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1989, 82.

position, although it is usually more topicworthy than the possessee NP. The debitive construction, which is derived from the possessive one, shows the same discrepancy, which accounts for subject properties being shifted to the dative NP.

However, the pattern of thematic-rhematic structure is not fixed to the same degree in debitive constructions as in the possessive construction. In the latter, the dative (possessor) NP is probably nearly always topicalised. The situation of the debitive construction is different. Though the dative NP tends to rank higher in topicality than the nominative NP when present, it may also be lacking, and we then have an 'agentless' debitive construction which, apart from its modal marking, is very close to a passive, as can be seen in the type *Kartāga ir jāsagrauj* 'Carthago delenda est'. When no agent NP is present, the nominative NP (the original object) inherits the status of main theme (topic), which is also characteristic of (both agented and agentless) passives. We are reminded here of Bielenstein's description of the debitive as a kind of passive.

To a certain extent, the opposition of active and passive is functionally neutralised in the debitive construction. The debitive equivalent of an active construction is the full debitive construction with a dative NP, whereas the equivalent of both the passive construction and of the active construction with an indefinite zero subject (of the type *tevi meklē* 'they are looking for you, you are being looked for') is the agentless debitive construction. Debitive forms based on the passive, i.e. constructions of the type NP_{dat} + *jātieks* (*jātop*) + PART. PASS_{dat} are rare, probably because there is no functional motivation for their existence. They can occasionally be found in archaising language, probably under the influence of German, where passive infinitives frequently occur in combination with the modal verb *müssen*. In a literal translation, attempts are made to render both features by means of independent devices – passivisation and the use of the debitive. In older writers, this results in constructions like the following:

(5) Jo varai jātieks citu apbrīnotai un apskaustai, tikai tad viņa ir salda. (P: Rozītis)

'For power must be admired and envied by others, only then is it sweet.'

The influence of German manifests itself in two ways here: first, the debitive is needlessly passivised; and, secondly, this device renders impossible the use of the dative, the usual case form of the agent in the debitive construction, so that the author must have recourse to the agentive genitive, which is not normally combined with the actional passive containing the auxiliary *tikt*.

The only type of passive whose occurrence in the debitive form is functionally motivated is the stative (resultative) passive with the auxiliary *būt*, for even if the agentless debitive with preposed nominative NP is, apart from its modal marking, a functional equivalent of the passive, it cannot convey the specific effect of the stative passive, i.e. a state resulting from a preceding action.

(6) Bet – pēc likuma – spiestuves adresei bija jābūt apzīmētai.
(K. Lesiņš)

'But, according to law, the printer's address had to be indicated'

Otherwise there is no need to use passive morphology in the debitive construction, and 'The address has to be indicated', interpreted as an actional passive, will simply be translated *Adrese ir jāapzīmē*. Of course, there is always the possibility of deriving a debitive form from a passive construction, so that there is no formal neutralisation of the voice opposition in the debitive. There is, however, a functional neutralisation, as in the debitive construction the dative NP, expressing the agent, is an optional constituent which, unlike the nominative NP in the basic non-debitive construction, is freely deletable, and the different patterns of thematic-rhematic structure, normally reflected in the voice opposition, are conveyed by word order. In terms of marked vs. unmarked word order, there is no difference whatsoever between *Adrese jāapzīmē* and *Jāapzīmē adrese*. Only the full debitive construction, with an agent NP in the dative, has a preferential unmarked pattern of word order, which is exactly the same as that of the basic non-debitive construction.

Notes on the Latvian debitive

Axel Holvoet (Warszawa)

The article deals with two questions. (1) The relation of the debitive to mood. The traditional view of the debitive as a mood has been disputed more than once. The debitive has partly retained the character of an agglutinative form, comparable to a combination of modal verb and lexical verb. Both components, the auxiliary and the stem, can to a certain extent be conjugated independently, as the stem displays an alternation of simple and compound stems (*jālasa : jābūt lasījušam*). Although the forms derived from the compound stem are not frequent, they can be said to define a second conjugational paradigm alongside that described in the grammars. The debitive is a rare instance of grammaticalisation of root modality. (2) The relation of the debitive to voice. The debitive construction involves a reassignment of grammatical relations with regard to the basic non-debitive construction, which explains why Bielenstein regarded it as a kind of passive. Though the debitive can be derived from both active and passive forms, the functional opposition of active and passive is partly neutralised in the debitive (at least in its agentless variety), which accounts for the rarity of the passive debitive.

DIE RELIGIONSREFORM DES BRUTENIS

GINTARAS BERESNEVIČIUS

Kaunas

Im ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus erwähnt Tacitus im 45. Kapitel der *Germania*, daß die am östlichen Ufer der Ostsee lebenden Aisten (*Aestii*) eine Muttergottheit verehrt hätten (*Matrem Deum venerantur*). Archäologische Daten bestätigen, daß die vom ersten bis vierten Jahrhundert hier lebenden, Ackerbau treibenden Stämme einen "agrарischen Kult ausübten", in dem weibliche Gottheiten eine wichtige Rolle spielten. Besonders deutlich erkennbar ist die Verehrung der Sonne¹. Nach den Angaben von Simon Grunau lebten in der ersten Hälfte des ersten Jahrtausends nach Christus hier die Ulmiganen (*Ulmigani*), die «weder den einen Gott noch mehrere Götter kannten, sondern die Sonne verehrten»². Wir sehen hier ziemlich deutliche Züge einer Religion der Muttergöttin, die sich durch das Erstarken des Ackerbaues noch weiter konsolidierte. Wenn man gerade zu dieser Zeit in Preußen und Litauen die alte indoeuropäische Sitte der Leichenverbrennung zugunsten der Erdbestattung aufgab, läßt sich dies vielleicht auch mit dem für agrarische Kulte charakteristischen Glauben an die Regenerationskraft der Muttergöttin in Verbindung bringen. Demgegenüber bieten die Quellen des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts, die über die prussische und litauische Religion berichten, das recht eindeutige Bild einer patrizientrischen Religion. Das Pantheon setzt sich zusammen aus kraftvollen männlichen Gottheiten, unter denen der Donnergott *Perkuno* am stärksten hervortritt (die Entsprechung zum skandinavischen Thor). Es kommt zum Wiederaufleben der Leichenverbrennung, und es scheint kaum noch Göttinnen zu geben. In einer Quelle des 16. Jahrhunderts sind die zehn genannten prussischen Götter allesamt männlichen Geschlechts³.

1 W. Safran̄ski, *Pradzieje religii w Polsce*, Warszawa 1979, 285-289.

2 W. Mannhardt, *Letto-preussische Götterlehre*, Riga 1936, 196.

3 *Ibidem*, 233-235.