

## Old Prussian *kellewefze* ‘Driver of a Cart’<sup>1</sup>

Abstract: 1. An analysis of OPr. *kellewefze*. – 2. OPr. collective formations. – 3. Prussian personal names in *-e*.

In two Old Prussian documents the word for the ‘driver of a cart’, *kellewefze*, is recorded:

1. Hieronymus Meletius’ account *Warhafftige Beschreibung der Sudawen auff Samland / sambt ihren Bock heyligen und Ceremonien* from the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century contains the phrase *kellewefze perioth · der treiber ist kommen* ‘the driver of the cart has come’, repeated several times.

2. The same phrase, although in the present tense, is reputedly found in a chronicle of the Teutonic Order by Count Waldeck: *Kellewezis parioi · der treiber kombt* (cited by Toporov 1980: 310 from Praetorius’ *Deliciae Prussicae*, 1684: 69).

Apart from the etymological dictionaries (Mažiulis 1993: 160; Toporov 1980: 310), this word has been discussed in two articles by Eckert, one a special study of the word (Eckert 1992), the other one his survey article of Old Prussian transport terms (Eckert 1995: 49–59; 1995b: 30–37<sup>2</sup>). In Eckert (1992: 181), he erroneously calls ORuss. *kolovozьcbь* ‘einer, der in Wagen, Gefährten wohnt; Nomade’ “eine genaue Entsprechung” of OPr. *kellewefze*, but this is incorrect on formal grounds: *-vozьcbь* is an agent noun in *\*-iko-*, derived from *\*μoḡ<sup>h</sup>ó-* ‘driver’, which is an agent noun with *o*-grade in the root itself, whereas *-wefze* has *e*-grade in the root; the latter’s stem-class is unclear, but it is certainly no *o*-stem. Although a common denominator for ‘nomad’ and ‘driver of a cart’ could easily be found, the statement that the two words are ‘exact matches’ is rather bold even from a semantic point of view.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is based upon a paper held at the *Colloquium Pruthenicum Tertium*, Sept. 27<sup>th</sup>–29<sup>th</sup> 2001 in Zakopane, Poland. I want to thank Aaron Griffith, Joachim Matzinger, Stefan Schumacher and Karin Stüber for their help and their advice.

<sup>2</sup> Eckert’s list of Old Prussian transport terms, mainly terms for vehicles and various types of horses from the *Elbing Vocabulary*, is not complete. Additional related terms from ploughing, draught technique and horse breeding could be added.

Old Prussian *kelan* ‘wheel,’ \**kelo* ‘cart’

Most scholars agree in interpreting attested *kellewefze* as continuing \**kela-vez*<sup>o</sup> (first Buga III, 133), with assimilation of the expected compositional vowel *a* < \**o* of the first compound member \**kela-* to the surrounding *e*’s. The same explanation has been employed by Mažiulis (1993: 157–158) to account for another compound of *kela-*, namely *keleranco · runge* [E 303] ‘stake to fix the side-boards of a cart’, although in that case there are fewer *e*’s to which the \**a* could assimilate. There are, however, a few other compounds, which exhibit the compositional vowel *e*, but in these the first compound member usually belongs to the *i-* or *ē-*declension (e.g. *nofeproly · nafeloch* [E 86] ‘nostril’ from *nozy · naze* [E 85] ‘nose’, or *pettegiſlo · ruckeoder* [E 108] ‘back vein’ from *pette · schulder* [E 104] ‘shoulder’). These other cases cast some doubt on Buga’s and Mažiulis’ explanations, and a different strategy to account for the *e* may be looked for.

Buga (III, 133) suggested that the first member of the compound does not directly continue the attested OPr. word *kelan* ‘wheel’, but instead presupposes an old plural or collective formation \**kelō* ‘cart < set of wheels’ < \**k<sup>h</sup>élh<sub>1</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>* (in modern notation). This type of word formation, in which a plural or collective noun comes to signify a concrete concept which is made up of a number of the singular component parts, is well attested, both within Old Prussian and in the wider Balto-Slavic area (on the question of collectives in IE in general see Eichner 1985: 139 ff.; and, slightly different in details, Lindeman 1997: 191). Typologically, or even etymologically parallel formations to OPr. \**kelō* ‘cart’ from outside Old Prussian are Slav. neuter sg. *kólo* ‘wheel’ beside neuter plurale tantum *kolá* ‘cart’, and Lith. masculine sg. *rātas* ‘wheel’ < PIE \**rótos* beside plurale tantum *rātai* ‘cart’. The Finnish word *ratas* ‘(steering) wheel’, a loan from East Baltic, adheres to the same principle: pl. *rattaat* means ‘cart, wagon’ (Ritter 1998: 147; for a possible typological parallel in Irish see Hamp 1989; cf. also colloquial English ‘nice wheels’ = ‘cool car’). Because of the loss of the neuter gender in Lithuanian it may be surmised that the masculine plural *rātai* replaced the continuant of a morphologically predictable PIE neuter collective formation \**rotéh<sub>2</sub>* ‘set of wheels’. In Vedic the collective \**rotéh<sub>2</sub>* is believed to underlie the possessive derivative *rātha-* ‘having a set of wheels = chariot’ < \**roth<sub>2</sub>ó-* (EWAIA II, 429).<sup>3</sup> In the case of

<sup>3</sup> This derivative chain is a beautiful construct, but it holds true only if the underlying PIE verbal root was  $\sqrt{\text{ret}}$  ‘to run’, as set up, for example, in LIV 507. It cannot be ruled out, however, that the root was  $\sqrt{\text{reth}_2}$  with a laryngeal. Unfortunately, almost all

Latin *rota*, collective *\*rotéh<sub>2</sub>* was ‘resingularised’ to denote the single ‘wheel’.

languages are inconclusive as to whether the PIE root ended in a plain dental, or in a cluster of dental and second laryngeal. The only form that may help to decide the question is Alb. *rrëth* m. (Tosk. also *rrath*, with the vocalism after the plural), pl. *rrathë* ‘ring, hoop, tire’. It is attractive to connect this form with the IE word for ‘wheel’ reflected, for example, in Lat. *rota*, Germ. *rad*. The Alb. word, however, cannot be derived from *\*rot-*, since PIE *\*t* would not have yielded *th /θ/* in Albanian. Therefore it has been suggested to derive it from *\*roth<sub>2-</sub>* (e.g. Demiraj 1997: 61; Matzinger 2006: 80), under the assumption that a marginal tenuis aspirata *\*t<sup>h</sup>* < *\*th<sub>2</sub>* is reflected as a fricative /θ/ in Albanian. As Matzinger remarks, this could be paralleled by *\*kh<sub>2</sub>* > *\*k<sup>h</sup>* > *\*χ* > *h*, if Alb. *ha* ‘to eat’ is to be connected with OInd. *khad-* ‘to chew’ < *√kh<sub>2</sub>ed*. The rather unspecific explanation from *\*roth<sub>2-</sub>* can be stated in morphologically more precise terms, however. The *umlaut* in the sg. *rrëth*, the synchronically irregular, almost isolated plural formation *rrathë* (cp. also *thes*, pl. *thasë* ‘sack’), and the semantics of the word can be united etymologically under the reconstruction PrAlb. *\*rraθī*, pl. *\*rraθīās*.

This can be analysed as a ‘Zugehörigkeitsbildung’ (‘belonging to X’), containing the appurtenative suffix *\*-ih<sub>2-</sub>*. In Proto-Indo-European terms, a *vrkī-* type of suffix would be expected to be attached to the thematic stem *\*roth<sub>2</sub>ó-*, and this could ultimately lie at the heart of the PrAlb. ending *\*-ī*. An original *devī-* formation is ruled out, as the only certain example of such a formation in Albanian, i.e. *zonjë* ‘lady’ ← *zot* ‘lord’ (Matzinger 2006: 156; Klingenschmitt 1994: 312), shows that the suffix *\*(n)ih<sub>2</sub>* must have become *\*(n)īa* or *\*(n)īā* in Proto-Albanian. But it must not be forgotten that the distinction between the two subtypes of *-ih<sub>2-</sub>* formations is only well preserved in Vedic. The earliest attestations of Albanian, however, are 2,500 years younger than Vedic, and it is not unlikely that the two types had influenced each other or had even merged during that time. This could explain the Alb. plural *rrathë* < *\*rraθīās*, which can only reflect a *devī-* type plural *\*\*roth<sub>2</sub>īeh<sub>2</sub>es* (assuming that whatever *\*th<sub>2</sub>ī* would have become was leavelled to *\*θī* under pressure from the singular stem). Even though a certain amount of morphological adjustment is required for this etymology, it is nevertheless able to account for all the formal problems that beset the Albanian word. The masculine gender of Alb. *rrëth* instead of the expected feminine must remain unexplained for the time being, however. (I want to thank Joachim Matzinger, Stefan Schumacher and Karin Stüber for their highly esteemed counsel, advice and expertise in the foregoing discussion.)

The decisive point is that semantically an appurtenative noun meaning ‘ring, hoop, tire’ requires a derivative base meaning ‘wheel’, not ‘vehicle’. That means that the base, probably *\*roth<sub>2</sub>ó-*, must have been the word for the ‘wheel’. Since *\*roth<sub>2</sub>ó-* ‘wheel’ < *\*runner* cannot be formally distinguished from *\*roth<sub>2</sub>(h<sub>2</sub>)ó-* ‘having a set of wheels’, putatively underlying Ved. *rátha-*, the laws of economy and Occam’s Razor require that the latter form be discarded. Ved. *rátha-* could just as well be the word for ‘wheel’ used metonymically, its accent then being due to secondary, polaric fronting in order to distinguish it from ‘wheel’.

Rasmussen’s objection against a root *√reth<sub>2</sub>* (1989: 154–155), namely that in Old Irish its shape would have yielded a subjunctive stem *\*\*retha-* < Pre-Celtic *\*\*reta<sub>2</sub>se-* instead of the attested OIr. *ress-* < PC *\*rets-*, misses the point. The type of subjunctive stem formation in Irish was determined by the Proto-Celtic shape of the root, not by its Proto-Indo-European shape. In Proto-Celtic terms, the root of *\*reteti* ‘he runs’ was felt to end in a dental obstruent; the laryngeal had of course already been lost in antevocalic position. Therefore, like many other Proto-Celtic roots ending in obstruents, this root was assigned to what can be described as the *s*-subjunctive type in synchronic terms.

An obvious pair of a singular base and its collective *plurale tantum* in Old Prussian is neuter sg. *slayan · sletekuffe* [E 309] 'runners of a sleigh' < PIE \**klójom* 'bent thing' beside plural *slayo · slete* [E 307] 'sleigh', as if < PIE \**klóje<sub>h</sub>2* 'set of bent things'. In a wider context, Ved. masc. sg. *ós̥tha-* 'lip' stands beside OPr. neuter pl. *austo · munt* [E 89] 'mouth', cf. Slav. neuter pl. *usta* 'id.' (a semantic parallel to this is provided by OIr. masculine sg. *bél* 'lip', but pl. *béoil* 'mouth'). An isolated collective neuter plural is attested in *warto · thöre* [E 210] 'door', cf. PrSlav. \**vórta* 'id.' (Ambrazas 1992: 35 ff.; Petit 2000: 30–31).

Since, however, most of the OPr. words under scrutiny here are only known as isolated lexical items devoid of any syntactical context, it is in fact impossible to tell whether they are neuter plurals, as may be assumed in analogy to the Slavic parallels, or if they had been secondarily reinterpreted as feminine singulars like Latin *rota* 'wheel'. Therefore all morphological identifications must necessarily remain interpretations. The question of the synchronic gender and number of the collective formation is of some importance in the case of other Prussian pairs of words. Mathiassen (1998: 98–99) postulated neuter collectives in *-e* for Old Prussian, but did not provide examples. Indeed, there are a few likely candidates. OPr. *slaunis · dy* [E 139] 'thigh' most likely continues directly the PIE *i*-stem \**klóynis* 'thigh, buttock'. The ending *-is* in the *Elbing Vocabulary* is ambiguous and appears in masculine *o-*, *jo-* and *i-* stems. Where no other paradigmatic forms of a word are found in the OPr. corpus, a decision, however arbitrary, about its stem-class can only be made in comparison with etymologically and morphologically related words in Baltic, Slavic or other IE languages. OPr. *slaunis* is a case in question; because of its cognates Ved. *śrōṇi-* and Lat. *clūnis* it is best assumed to have inflected as an *i*-stem in Old Prussian, too.

Beside this word for a body part we find the apparently related term *slaune · arme* [E 300] 'arms = part of the shaft at the front axle to which wheels are attached'. The derivational relationship between *slaunis* and *slaune* could be the same as that between *slayan* and *slayo*. If at some stage the process of forming collectives was felt to consist in adding a long \**ā*, abstracted from thematic formations, to the stem of a word, and if one follows Sommer's (1914) line of thought which holds that Baltic *ē*-stems continue IE *iā*-stems, *slaune* could be explained along the following lines: PIE \**klóynis* → \*\**klóyni-ā* > \*\**klóyniā* > Proto-Baltic \**slauniā* > \**slaunē* > OPr. *slaune* 'set of thighs = *metaph.* structure which connects shaft and wheels'. Originally a neuter plural, this form could have been reinterpreted afterwards as a feminine singular. A small

piece of evidence in favour of the hypothesis that *slaune* historically had been (or even was synchronically?) a neuter plural is furnished by related Lith. pl. *šlaūnys* ‘structure in vehicles on which wheels are suspended’. Here again it may be surmised that this semantically specialised *plurale tantum* of *šlaunis* ‘hip, thigh’ had replaced an older neuter plural after the demise of the neuter gender in Lithuanian.

A similar strategy can be applied to *pette · schulter* [E 104] ‘shoulder’ in relation to *pettis · schuld’blat* [E 106] ‘shoulderblade’, probably a masculine *īo*-stem, judging by Lith. *petỹs* ‘shoulder’ < *\*peth<sub>2</sub>ījo-*. Replacement of the stem-vowel *\*o* by collective *\*ā* would have resulted in *\*peth<sub>2</sub>ījā* > Proto-Baltic *\*petē* ‘set of shoulder blades’.

For semantic reasons I can see no such derivational dependence between singular base and collective *plurale tantum* in the pair *curpis · smedestoc* [E 519] ‘anvil’ and *kurpe · schuch* [E 500] ‘shoe’. The exact relationship between the two words is unclear to me, but it may have something to do with the shoe-like shape of the anvil. The relationship between *warnis · rabe* [E 721] ‘raven’ and *warne · kro* [E 722] ‘crow’, and *gertis · hane* [E 763] ‘cock’ and *gerto · henne* [E 764] ‘hen’ does not belong here either, but is that of masculine base noun and exocentric feminine derivative (‘Motionsfemininum’). Furthermore, the distinction in gender between *warnis* and *warne* is certainly secondary to another morphological process: as Lith. *vařnas* and Russ. *вóрон* < *\*uórnos* ‘raven’ vs. *várna* and *ворóна* < *\*uórneh<sub>2</sub>* ‘crow’ show, the latter is a *vřddhi*-derivative ‘raven-like bird’ from the former (Darms 1978: 344–345).

It was argued above that *\*ā* had become a collective suffix in the prehistory of the Balto-Slavic languages. There is nothing inherently implausible in the hypothesis that in a further step within Baltic or even only within Prussian *\*-ē*, abstracted from cases of *\*ā* added to *i*- or *īo*-stems, acquired the same function and became a collective formant in its own right. With this possibility in mind the pair *grauwus · seyte* [E 120] ‘side (of the body)’ and *grabwe · ribbe* [E 121] ‘rib’ at first sight displays just the reverse relationship to what would be expected. The word for the singular item ‘rib’ has the supposed collective suffix *-e*, whereas the word for ‘side’ appears as a ‘singulative’ *u*-stem. Naturally enough the ‘side of the body’ could be expected to be conceived of as a ‘set of ribs’, not the ‘rib’ to be a semantically derivative ‘set of sides’. This surprising state of affairs can be overcome by taking recourse to the observation that in the transmission of the *Elbing Vocabulary* a number of Prussian lemmas have switched places in the manuscript

because of mistakes of the copyist (see Smoczinsky 2000: 103–106 for previously recognised and new examples). If the pair *grauwus/grabwe* is another such case, we would arrive at a morphologically predictable result.

To return to the point of departure: on a very speculative note it could be argued that the collective noun 'set of wheels = cart' was synchronically formed in Prussian by substituting the *o*-stem suffix *-a-* of *kelan* 'wheel' by *-ē*, thus arriving at a word *\*kelē* 'cart', cp. also, among other formations, dial. Latvian *ducele* 'two-wheeled cart' (Eckert 1995: 50; 1995b: 30). The compositional vowel *-e-* in *kellewefze* and *keleranco* would thus receive a most straightforward explanation.

### Old Prussian *-wefze* 'driver'?

The second element *-wefze* of the OPr. compound *kellewefze* 'driver of a cart' poses morphological problems that have not received a thorough treatment so far. It contains the Baltic verbal root  $\sqrt{vež}$  < PIE  $\sqrt{ueg^h}$  'to transport, to go in a vehicle' (this IE root is treated by Stieglbauer-Schwarz 2001: esp. 23–29). The first *e* of *-wefze* most probably is short, since it is followed by double *s*. In German orthography geminate spelling regularly indicates a preceding short vowel. Therefore an equation of *-wefze* with Lith. *vėžė* 'track of the wheels, rails' < *\*ueg^h* - is excluded. Nor do the semantics match: Prussian *kellewefze* is translated as an agent noun 'der (wagen)treiber' in German, whereas the Lithuanian word refers to an instrument noun.

Buga (III, 133) and Toporov (1980: 310) take the word at face value as an *ē*-stem *\*kelavezē*. The Baltic *ē*-class, however, is practically exclusively feminine, whereas from the context it clearly emerges that *kellewefze* refers to a male person. Neither Buga nor Toporov provide an explanation for this unexpected state of gender affairs. Mažiulis (1993: 160), on the other hand, thinks that *kellewefze* has to be read as a *io*-stem *\*kelavezīs*; Eckert (1995: 51–52; 1995b: 31) follows Mažiulis. On the surface, a *io*-stem *\*kelavezīs* indeed finds support within Prussian in Count Waldeck's variant *kellewezīs* and in the noun *wessis · rytslete* [E 308] 'riding sleigh' (both < *\*ueg^hijōs?*); outside of Prussian the Lith. compound *ratavėžys* 'driver of a cart' < *\*rotoeg^hijōs* can be cited. Yet this approach is not without its drawbacks. The word is repeated several times in Meletius' treatise, always with the ending *-e*, so it cannot be an accidental mis-spelling for a hypothetical *\*kellewefzīs*. With its apparently feminine ending *-e* it is the *lectio difficilior* and must be taken seriously as such.

It could be hypothesised that *kelewefze* is the vocative of a *jo*-stem. No other vocative of this noun class is attested in the Old Prussian corpus, so there is nothing inherently implausible about the assumption that the vocative of *jo*-stems ended in *-e* in Old Prussian. Yet a vocative does not fit syntactically, as *kellewefze* is immediately followed by a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. verbal form.

Mažiulis flatly dismisses the form *kellewefze* by calling it a 'germanisation' of original *\*kelavezīs*. By this he means the process of adding an allegedly German desinence *-e* to Prussian words, in order to make them morphologically acceptable for speakers of German. As another example of this process he cites OPr. *gayde · weiffe* [Gr 13] 'wheat' in Simon Grunau's *Glossary*, against *gaydis · weyfe* [E 259] in the *Elbing Vocabulary*. An examination of Grunau's *Glossary*, however, does not lead to the impression of a widespread process of 'germanisation'. Words ending in *-e* are hardly frequent enough to allow for a regular process of 'germanisation' to be postulated for this text. Divergences between the *Glossary* and the *Elbing Vocabulary* such as *mette · jar* [Gr 57] against *mettan · jor* [E 12] 'year', or *ancte · potter* [Gr 61] against *anctan · puttir* [E 689] 'butter' may be a consequence of the ongoing decline of the neuter gender in the Prussian language, with the transference of former neuters to the feminine gender. As to the difference between *gaydis* and *gayde*, this might as well be due to a real difference in stem formation and meaning, as in the pairs *slaunis* and *slaune* (see above), or *warnis · rabe* [E 721] 'raven' and *warne · kro* [E 722] 'crow', or *gertis · hane* [E 763] 'cock' and *gerto · henne* [E 764] 'hen'.

Mažiulis' strategy to explain away the final *-e* of *kellewefze* as a 'germanism' immediately calls to mind the identical strategy applied to Prussian personal names ending in *-e*. Literally hundreds of those are collected from historical documents in Trautmann's *Altpreußische Personennamen* (1925); Eckert 1998 has recently discussed a few names, too.

#### Excursus: Prussian personal names in *-e*

It seems appropriate at this point to take a closer look at the question of Prussian personal names in *-e*, in order to determine if the rather vague notion of 'germanisation' is the only viable explanation for them. For this purpose I examined the first long text about Prussia, Peter of Dusburg's Latin *Cronica Terre Prussie* (edited in *Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum* I, Leipzig 1861). The collected material can be found in an

appendix to this article. Special attention was given to the way German, Prussian and other Baltic names are rendered in this text. Names of evidently Slavic origin and Latin names of German knights like *Christianus* or *Gregorius* were excluded from the list as irrelevant. The main interest lay in the morphological shape of the names, not in their frequency; therefore it is not indicated in the list how often a particular name is attested. Furthermore, not every single German name has been included, as it soon emerged that none deviated from the general pattern. Both in the case of the German and the Baltic names I distinguished between personal names and 'by-names'. Under 'by-names' I understand all those names which are introduced by Latin *dictus* 'called' or an equivalent formula. In the case of German knights these by-names are clearly early forms of surnames or sometimes nicknames. In the case of the Balts it is difficult to say whether the names in the *dictus*-formulas are in addition to personal names. But as will be seen, at least morphologically there is a clear difference between regular Baltic personal names and by-names.

In the appendix a distinction is made between parts II–III of *Cronica Terre Prussie*, which focus on the war in Prussia, and part IV, which is dedicated to the war in Lithuania. For convenience's sake they will be treated as one here in the analysis. The slight differences in the numerical proportions between parts II–III and part IV may be due to chance and to the small sample. I recorded 27 different latinised German baptismal names, 22 (81%) of which inflect as *o*-stems, 5 (19%) as *n*-stems. There is no German first name ending in *-e*. I collected 31 unlatinised by-names for German knights. Of these 23 (74%) end in a consonant, 8 (26%) end in *-e*. Among the Balts the numbers are: 54 first names, 20 (37%) of which inflect as Latin *o*-stems, 30 (56%) belong to various other Latin stem classes, mainly nasal stems, and four (7%) end in *-e*. The proportions are inversed among Baltic by-names. 29 of these are attested, 13 (45%) belong to various Latin stem classes (mainly *o*- and *n*-stems), 16 (55%) are apparently uninflected and end in *-e*.<sup>4</sup> These numbers lead me to the following observations:

<sup>4</sup> An inspection of the *Cronica Terre Prussie* reveals the need for a revised re-edition of Trautmann's *Altpreußische Personennamen*, in order to make easily accessible all early onomastic material relating to Prussia. For example, the following names, found in the *Cronica*, are not recorded by Trautmann: *Bonse* §190, *Criwe* §5, *Gobotini* §23, *Kudare* §198, *Posdraupotus* §174, *Russigenus* §207, *Scurdo* §219, *Stucze* §138, *Trinota* §159 and *Wadole* §212. In his book, Trautmann cites *Glappe*, the name of a Prussian captain, with final *-e*. This form is nowhere found in the *Cronica*. Instead, once the *o*-stem accusative *Glappum* §89 is attested, beside appearing a number of times inflected as an *n*-stem: *Glappo* §136, *Glapponis* §136, *Glapponi* §130, *Glapponem* §136.



1. Peter of Dusburg had no difficulty in latinising Baltic first names and, even less so, German first names.
2. He did not latinise German by-names and words in the *dictus*-formula (he did not latinise German place names either).
3. Baltic names in *-e* are only prominently represented among by-names.
4. German by-names ending in *-e* are hardly numerous enough to provide a model for the formation of Baltic names of that type, even more so as the language of the studied text is Latin. So German word formation rules wouldn't be expected to apply in the first place.

From the above points I draw the conclusion that Baltic by-names represent the same as German by-names: forms actually used in speech, for morphosyntactic reasons (since they were not inflectable in Latin) introduced by Latin *dictus*.

One possibility to account for genuinely Old Prussian onomastic forms in *-e* is to take the *dictus*-formula literally. This formula tells us how people were called. The act of calling or addressing persons involves the vocative case in Baltic languages. Thus it can be surmised that all or at least a subset of the names ending in *-e* are Prussian vocatives, most probably of the *o*-stem declension. Such an explanation immediately suggests itself, for example, for a name like *Wilke* (Trautmann 1925: 117; not in the *Cronica Terre Prussie*), which looks like the expected Prussian vocative of *o*-stem *wilkis · wulf* [E 657] 'wolf'. Names of this type could either be petrified vocatives, used as nominatives in Prussian itself, or synchronic Prussian vocatives, which were not grammatically understood as such by the Teutonic knights, but were instead mistaken by them for nominatives (or perhaps rather 'Nennformen' in the truest sense of the word).

The reinterpretation of vocatives as nominatives is a widespread and trivial phenomenon, both within languages and in situations of language contact. For example, the Celtiberian name *Likinos* appears in Iberian texts as *likine* [K.28.1] and, with an Iberian ending, as *likinete* [K.5.3] (Wodtko 2000: 223); *Latumaros*, probably a Gaulish name, appears in an Iberian text from Southern France as *latubaře* [B.1.364] (for the replacement of *m* by *b*, which is due to the phonology of Iberian, see Ballester 2001: 290). Both *likine* and *latubaře* have every appearance of regular *o*-stem vocatives in *-e* in their donor languages. The same explanation applies to *Eluveitie* on an Etruscan inscription from Mantua, which in all likelihood is the Celtic ethnonym *\*(h<sup>2</sup>)eluejtijos* (cf. Lat. *Heluetius*) used as a personal name. Italic and Greek names borrowed into Etruscan are treated in a parallel manner: Etr. *Numesie* continues

Latino-Faliscan \**Numesios*, *Spurie Spurius* (Steinbauer 1993: 288), *Tite Titus*, or *Tiϕile* Greek Δίφιλος (Rix 1995: 723). Italic and Greek names of the *o*-declension were thus received in the vocative and incorporated in the pre-existing *e*-declension of Etruscan. The situation in ancient Etruria is especially illuminating, since in Etruscan society Italic (Umbrian) people held an subjugated position, comparable to the one of the Prussians in their own country after the Teutonic conquest.

The reinterpretation of vocatives as nominatives is not restricted to the pre-modern period, cp. the recent case *Hamish*, a name current in modern Scotland, which is the anglicised spelling of the vocative of Scots-Gaelic *Séamus*, nor is it restricted to situations of language contact. I interpret South-Slavic male names in *-o*, like *Ivo*, *Mirko*, *Ranko*, as examples of comparable language-internal developments. Although the *-o* could also be regarded as continuing PIE *\*-os*, it is possible that it was originally the vocative of *ā*-stems that were used hypocoristically for male persons (cp. *Ivo* beside *Ivica*, both from *Ivan*, or *Joško* beside *Joška*, both from *Josip*). Perhaps this is ultimately the origin of Ukrainian surnames in *-nko* also. The unexpected lenition triggered by male personal names on their following attributes in British languages of the type Welsh *Hywel Dda* 'Hywel the Good' (< *da*) or MBret. *Ian Vadezour* 'John the Baptist' (< *badezour*) could also find its explanation in a generalised vocative form, as suggested to me by Anders Jørgensen. Finally, cases of gods' names like *Iuppiter* < *\*d̥i̯eu ph<sub>2</sub>ter*, where the divine epiclesis has come to be used for the nominative, can also be subsumed under the described phenomenon.

Returning to Prussian, alternatively one could toy with the idea that Prussian names in *-e* actually are what they superficially appear to be, that is *ē*-stems. Although in the modern Baltic languages *ē*-stems regularly belong to the feminine gender, there are marginal cases referring to male persons. Senn (1966: 100) mentions Žemaitian names like *Mikė*, *Jūzė*, *Stāsė*, for what would be *Mikas*, *Juōzas*, *Stasys* in the standard language. Standard Lithuanian has words like *dėdė* 'uncle', or nouns of common gender like *lojỹnė* 'someone who prattles on' (Schmalstieg 1998: 155). The extension of the *ē*-declension to male persons could have its reason either in a psychologically motivated appropriateness of feminine stem forms for hypocoristic names (cp. examples in Slavic like *Miša*, *Saša*, *Joška* etc.; the harvest god of the ancient Prussians, *Curche*, *Curcho*, also has a feminine ending), and/or could have had a morphological origin in the identity of *o*- and *ē*-stem vocatives, which could have served as the pivotal point for the intrusion

of the  $\bar{e}$ -inflection into original *o*-stem words. A parallel for the latter scenario can be cited from ancient Boeotia, where names with nominatives in  $-\eta$  and accusatives in  $-\eta\nu$  are found on inscriptions. These names often show gemination of the consonant immediately preceding the final vowel, which is a strong indicator of emotional involvement typical of hypocoristics (Vottero 1985: 407–408), and they have been explained as being based on vocatives.<sup>5</sup>

### Old Prussian *-wefze*

This observation concerning hypocoristics, however, does not provide a good starting point for a solution for *kellewefze*, which from its context does not appear to be a hypocoristic formation, but rather an agent noun. But the discussion of hypocoristics at least shows that  $\bar{e}$ -stems *can* and *could* be used for male persons in Baltic, and indeed under close scrutiny an occasional agentive masculine  $\bar{e}$ -stem does come to light: Latvian allegedly has the noun *pekere* ‘baker’, a loan from German. In Prussian a case could be made for the term for the highest pagan priest, *criwe*, to be an  $\bar{e}$ -stem (see also Buga I, 170 ff.). *Criwe* is attested several times in Peter of Dusburg’s *Cronica Terre Prussie* (III, 5), always in this form, regardless of the syntactic position of the word. Germanisation is assumed for it by Buga (I, 177): “The word *criwe* has been rebuilt from *Criwis* according to the German pattern. We have the ending *-is*, undoubtedly rebuilt into *-e*, in the following Prussian surnames: *Lyc-oyte* (1350, Bartietis), *Warg-oyte* (1360), cp. Pr. *arw-aytis* ‘Füllen, junges Pferd’ [...]” (my translation). The examples adduced by Buga are hardly immediately convincing. Moreover, as I tried to show above, Dusburg had no reason and no real model to ‘germanise’ Prussian names and expressions in his Latin chronicle; quite to the contrary, he had no difficulty in latinising Baltic names, except when they ended in *-e*. In contrast to personal names, it seems less probable in the case of agent nouns that a reinterpretation of vocatives as nominatives took place. Therefore it may be surmised that *criwe* arguably belonged to the  $\bar{e}$ -class. It is perhaps into this morphological class of  $\bar{e}$ -stems for words for professional classes, if indeed it is one, that the name for another type of pre-Christian priest, *waidelotte*, falls. The transmission of this word is especially revealing. It appears in Simon Grunau’s German chronicle of Prussia (1526). Grunau more often than not indeed ‘germanises’ this word, that is, he adapts its ending to German morphology. But this means that he actually drops the

<sup>5</sup> I owe this suggestion to Martin Peters.

ending, which ultimately results in a form *waidlott* (Buga I, 184). Only once does he actually write *waidelotte*. By a related development, he germanises an etymologically connected term as masculine *waidler* and feminine *waidlin* (Buga I, 183 ff.). This conforms well with the two common German agentive suffixes, namely the zero-suffix (e.g. *Wirt-Ø*, *Schmied-Ø*, obsolete *Bäck-Ø*) and the suffix *-er* (e.g. *Bau-er*, *Priest-er*, *Bäck-er*), and this speaks strongly against a hypothetical rule of 'germanisation' by adding an ending *-e*.

All these pieces of evidence taken together do not prove, but at least allow for the possibility that there existed in Old Prussian a group of masculine *ē*-stem nouns for professional classes (and perhaps for personal names), of which *kellewefze* could have been a member. What these are etymologically must remain obscure for the moment: maybe there is a relation to Slavic masculine words in *-ii*, which themselves apparently are connected with the Indic *rathí*-type; or they are concretised abstract nouns in *\*(ij)ā*; or one could think of other IE terms for priests and seers like Latin *uates*, OIr. *fáith*, Av. *kauuایی*-, Lyd. *kaves*, which continue PIE hysterokinetic *i*-stems. But this question goes beyond the scope of the present study.

### Appendix:

#### Personal names in Peter of Dusburg's *Cronica Terre Prussie*

The names are cited in the nom. where it is attested, otherwise the first attested form is given.

#### 1. Prussian War (Parts II and III)

##### 1.1. German first names (19):

*o*-stems (14): *Anselmus*, *Arnoldus*, *Conradus*, *Fridericus*, *Gernuldi*, *Guntheri*, *Hartmannus*, *Henricus*, *Hermannum*, *Hertwigum*, *Marquardi*, *Theodericus*, *Wilhelmi*, *Ulricus*.

*n*-stems (5): *Brunonem*, *Hugonem*, *Miligedo*, *Ottonem*, *Tropo*.

##### 1.2. German by-names (surnames and nicknames) (21):

ending in a consonant (16): Henricum dictum *Botel*, Conradum dictum *Bremer* (v.l. *Brenner*), dicti *Cippel*, Arnoldus *Crop*, dictus *de Glisbergk*, Conradum dictum *Dywel*, dictum *Hirtzhals*, Hermannus dictus *Sarracenus*, Henricus dictus *Stango* (Henrico *Stangone*), dictus *Stenckel*, dictum *Steynow*, dictum *Stovemel*, Henricus *Tupadel*, Henricum *Ulenbusch*, Hartmannus dictus *Watmal*, dictus *Wirtel*.

ending in *-e* (5): *Hermannum dictum Balke* (*Hermannus Balke*), *Fridericus dictus Holle*, *Hugonem dictum Potyre*, *dicti Rawe*, *Theodericus dictus Rode*.

### 1.3. Baltic first names (36):

*o*-stems (14): *Codruno*, *Dywanus*, *Glappum*, *Jedetus* (v.l. *Gedete*, *Jedecus*), *Maudelo*, *Nalubi*, *Pippinus*, *Pobrawo*, *Posdraupoti*, *Samborio*, *Sargini*, *Scumandus*, *Tussini*, *Wissegaudi*.

*n*-stems (10): *Glappo*, *Linko*, *Matto*, *Nalubo*, *Pyopso*, *Sclodo*, *Scumo* (v.l. *Stumo*), *Scurdo*, *Tirsko*, *Wargullo*.

*ā*-stems (6): *Pomanda*, *Sarecka*, *Stinegota* (v.l. *-e*), *Surdeta*, *Swisdeta*, *Trinota*.

ending in *-e* (4): *Auttume* (= *Auctume*?) (*acc.*), *Kudare*, *Samile*, *Stucze*.

others (2): *Nakam* (= *Nakaym*?), *Surbancz*.

### 1.4. Baltic by-names (21):

*o*-stems (3): *dicti Gobotini* (*pl.*), *dictum Ringelum*, *dictus Russigenus*.

*ā*-stem (1): *dictus Powida*.

ending in *-e* (14): *dicto Bonse*, *dicto Cantegerde* (*acc. Cantegerdam*), *Diwanus dictus Clekine*, *dictum Colte*, *dictus Criwe* (*dat. -e*, *acc. -e*), *dictum Dabore*, *dictus Dorge*, *dictum Gedune*, *dictum Glande*, *dictum Goducke*, *dicti Laucstiete*, *Henricum Monte*, *dictum Pobrawe*, *dictum Wadole*.

others (3): *qui dicuntur Candeym*, *dicti Jonis filii*, *dictus Sirenes*.

### Baltic peoples' names (11):

*o*-stems (4): *Barthi*, *Nattangi*, *Pogesani*, *Pomesani*.

*i*-stems (2): *Barthenses*, *Warmienses*.

*ā*-stems (5): *Galindite*, *Nadrowite*, *Sambite*, *Scalowite*, *Sudowite*.

## 2. Lithuanian War (Part IV)

### 2.1. German first names (11):

*o*-stems (11): *Bertoldum*, *Conradus*, *Fridericum*, *Gerardum*, *Godefridus*, *Henemannum*, *Henricum*, *Lodewicum*, *Rudolphum*, *Syfridus*, *Waltherus*.

### 2.2. German by-names (surnames and nicknames) (10):

ending in consonant (7): *Rudolphum dictum Bodemer*, *Waltherus dictus Goldin*, *Godefridus Hoëloch*, *Henemannum dictum Kint*, *dictum List*, *Fridericum dictum Quitz*, *Conradus dictus Tuschevelt*.

ending in *-e* (3): *Bertoldum dictum Bruhave*, *Lodewicum dictum Osse*, *Gerardum dictum Rude*.

## 2.3. Baltic first names (18):

*o*-stems (6): *Gedemini, Masini, Pucuwerus* (v.l. *Lutuwerus*), *Sudargus, Surminus, Vithenus*.

*n*-stems (8): *Dersko, Jesbuto* (v.l. *Jeisbute, Sesbuto*), *Mansto, Missino, Numo, Pinnonem, Scoldone, Stanto*.

*ā*-stems (3): *Gauwina, Jodute* (? , gen.), *Trinta*.

other (1): *Nodam* (nom.).

## 2.4. Baltic by-names (8):

*o*-stem (1): dicti *Surmini*.

*n*-stems (4): dictus *Drayko*, dictus *Girdilo*, dictus *Mucko*, dictus *Spudo*.

*ā*-stem (1): dictum *Naudiotam*.

ending in *-e* (2): dictus *Peluse*, dictum *Sabine*.

## References

- Ambrazas, Saulius (1992): 'On the development of *nomina collectiva* in the Baltic languages,' *Linguistica Baltica* 1, 35–48.
- Ballester, Xaverio (2001): 'Fono(tipo)logía de las (con)sonantes (celt)ibéricas', in: *Religión, lengua y culturas prerromanas de Hispania. Actas del VIII Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la Península Ibérica* (Salamanca, 11–14 de mayo de 1999), ed. por F. Villar y M<sup>a</sup> Pilar Fernández Álvarez [= Acta Salmanticensia. Estudios filológicos 283], Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 287–303.
- Buga, Kazimieras (1958–1962): *Rinktiniai Raštai*, 4 voll., Vilnius.
- Darms, George (1978): *Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn. Die Vřddhi-Ableitung im Germanischen* [= MSS Beiheft 9, N.F.], München: Kitzinger
- Demiraj, Bardhyl (1997): *Albanische Etymologien. Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortschatz* [= Leiden Studies in Indo-European 7], Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Eckert, Rainer (1992): 'Eine genaue Entsprechung zu apr. *kellewesze* im Russisch-Kirchenslawischen,' *Linguistica Baltica* 1, 179–182.
- (1995): 'Wagen und Pferd in Sprache und Kultur der alten Preussen,' *Baltistica* 30/1, 49–59.
- (1995b): 'Zur altpreußischen Sprache,' in: *Tumult. Schriften zur Verkehrswissenschaft. Band 21. Preußisch*. Herausgegeben von Franz Böckelmann, Dietmar Kamper und Walter Seitter, Bodenheim: Syndikat Buchgesellschaft, 18–37.
- (1998): 'Zur Deutung einiger altpreußischer Personennamen aus dem Insterburger 'Schadenbuch' Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts,' in: *Colloquium Pruthenicum secundum*, ed. Wojciech Smoczyński, Kraków: Universitas, 61–68.
- Eichner, Heiner (1985): 'Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus "Kollektiv" ("Komprehensiv"),' in: *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*. Hrsg. von Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 134–169.
- EWAIA = Mayrhofer, Manfred (1996): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. II. Band, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hamp, Eric (1989): 'Varia. XXXVII. OIr. *fén, fēnae*,' *ÉC* 26, 62.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert (1994): 'Das Tocharische in indogermanistischer Sicht', in: *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Berlin,*

- September 1990*. Herausgegeben von Bernfried Schlerath [= Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Suppl. Ser. 4], Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, 310–411.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto (1997): 'Indo-European and Proto-Anatolian Vowels. A Phonologic Remark,' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricarum* 50, 185–193.
- LIV 2001 = *LIV. Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Mathiassen, Terje (1998): 'Zur Verbreitung der pluralia tantum im Altpreussischen,' in: *Colloquium Pruthenicum secundum*. Ed. Wojciech Smoczyński, Kraków: Universitas, 97–102.
- Matzinger, Joachim (2006): *Der Altalbanische Text [E]Mbsuame e Krështerë (Dottrina Cristiana) des Lekë Matrënga von 1592. Eine Einführung in die albanische Sprachwissenschaft* [= Jenaer Indogermanistische Textbearbeitung 3], Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas (1993): *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. 2 I-K*, Vilnius.
- Petit, Daniel (2000): 'Quelques observations sur les substantifs de genre neutre en vieux prussien,' *Baltistica* 35/1, 29–44.
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård (1989): 'Die Tenuis Aspiratae: Dreiteilung oder Vierteilung des indogermanischen Plosivsystems und die Konsequenzen dieser Frage für die Chronologie einer Glottalreihe', in: *The New Sound of Indo-European. Essays in Phonological Reconstruction*. Edited by Theo Vennemann [= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 41], Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 153–176.
- Ritter, Ralf-Peter (1998): 'Die Rolle des Altpreußischen bei der Frage der baltischen Lehnwörter des Ostseefinnischen,' in: *Colloquium Pruthenicum secundum*. Ed. Wojciech Smoczyński, Kraków: Universitas, 147–151.
- Rix, Helmut (1995): '105. Etruskische Personennamen', in: *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*. Herausgegeben von Ernst Eichler, Herold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, Ladislav Zgusta. 1. Teilband, [= Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 11.1], Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 719–724.
- Schmalstieg, William (1998): 'Old Prussian *giwei* and Baltic \*-ē stem nouns,' in: *Colloquium Pruthenicum secundum*. Ed. Wojciech Smoczyński, Kraków: Universitas, 153–157.
- Senn, Alfred (1966): *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*. 1. Band: *Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech (2000): *Untersuchungen zum deutschen Lehnwort im Altpreussischen*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Sommer, Ferdinand (1914): *Die indogermanischen iā- und io-Stämme im Baltischen*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Steinbauer, Dieter (1993): 'Etruskisch-ostitalische Lehnbeziehungen,' in: *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25. bis 28. September 1991 in Freiburg*. Herausgegeben von Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 287–306.
- Stieglbauer-Schwarz, Judith (2001): *Wiegen, wägen und bewegen. Etymologie und Wortgeschichte* [= Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 1, Deutsche Sprache und Literatur, Bd. 1787], Frankfurt/Main.
- Топоров, Владимир Николаевич (1980): *Прусский язык. Словарь I-K*, Москва.
- Trautmann, Reinhold (1909): *Die altpreußischen Sprachdenkmäler. Einleitung, Texte, Grammatik, Wörterbuch*, Göttingen.

- (1925): *Die altpreußischen Personennamen. Ein Beitrag zur baltischen Philologie* [= KZ Erg. Heft 3], Göttingen.
- Vottero, Guy (1985): 'Procédés d'expressivité dans l'onomastique personnelle de Béotie,' in: *La Béotie antique. Actes du colloque international. Lyon – Saint Étienne. 16-20 mai 1983*. Ed. Gilbert Argoud, Paul Roesch, Paris, 403–417.
- Wodtko, Dagmar (2000): *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*. Herausgegeben von Jürgen Untermann. *Band V.1. Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft  
der Universität Wien  
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1  
A-1010 Wien  
*e-mail: david.stifter@univie.ac.at*

David Stifter