Old Prussian *kellewesle* ‘Driver of a Cart’


In two Old Prussian documents the word for the ‘driver of a cart’, *kellewesle*, is recorded:
1. Hieronymus Meletius’ account *Warhaftige Beschreibung der Sudauen auff Samland / samt ihren Bock heyligen und Ceremonien* from the middle of the 16th century contains the phrase *kellewesle 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). In Eckert (1992: 181), he erroneously calls ORuss. *kolovozьь* ‘einer, der in Wagen, Gefährten wohnt; Nomade’ “eine genaue Entsprechung” of OPr. *kellewesle*, but this is incorrect on formal grounds: -ьь is an agent noun in *-isko-*, derived from *yögьö-‘driver’, which is an agent noun with o-grade in the root itself, whereas -esle 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.

---

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

2 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.
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Old Prussian kellewefze ‘Driver of a Cart’

281

Old Prussian kelan ‘wheel,* kelo ‘cart’

Most scholars agree in interpreting attested kellewefze as continuing *kela-vez⁵ (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 e-declension (e.g. nofeproly · nafeloch [E 86] ‘nostril’ from nozy · naze [E 85] ‘nose’, or pettegiło · 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 ‘set of wheels’ < *kℓéh₁e₂ (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 pluralis tantum kolá ‘cart’, and Lith. masculine sg. rātas ‘wheel’ < PIE *rōtos beside pluralis tantum rūtai ‘cart’. The Finnish word raitas ‘(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 rūtai replaced the continuant of a morphologically predictable PIE neuter collective formation *roīh₂ ‘set of wheels’. In Vedic the collective *roṭēh₂ is believed to underlie the possessive derivative rātha- ‘having a set of wheels = chariot’ < *roṭh₂- (EWAIA II, 429).3
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---

3 This derivative chain is a beautiful construct, but it holds true only if the underlying PIE verbal root was *vreb ‘to run’, as set up, for example, in LIV 507. It cannot be ruled out, however, that the root was *vrebhi, with a laryngeal. Unfortunately, almost all...
Latin *rota*, collective *rotēh₂* 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. *reth₄m* (Tosk. also *rath*, with the vocalism after the plural), pl. *rahē* ‘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 *ro-*, since PIE *tʰ* would not have yielded *tʰ/h/ in Albanian. Therefore it has been suggested to derive it from *roth₃*- (e.g. Demiraj 1997: 61; Matzinger 2006: 80), under the assumption that a marginal tenuis aspirata *h* < *th₂* is reflected as a fricative *h/ in Albanian. As Matzinger remarks, this could be paralleled by *kʰ₃* > *kʰ* > *χ* > *h₃* if Alb. *ha ‘to eat*’ is to be connected with OInd. *kha- ‘to chew*’ < *kih₂-ya*. The rather unspecified explanation from *roth₃*- can be stated in morphologically more precise terms, however. The *umlaut* in the sg. *reth*, the synchronically irregular, almost isolated plural formation *ra Khánh* (cp. also *thē*, pl. *thēs* ‘sack’), and the semantics of the word can be united etymologically under the reconstruction Proto-Albanian *rath₁* × *rath₂*, pl. *rath₁₂*.

This can be analysed as a ‘Zugehörigkeitsbildung’ (‘belonging to X’), containing the appurtenative suffix *-ih₂*- in Proto-Indo-European terms, a *všt*-type of suffix would be expected to be attached to the thematic stem *roth₃-*, and this could ultimately lie at the heart of the PrAlb. ending *-i*. An original *dev*-formation is ruled out, as the only certain example of such a formation in Albanian, i.e. *sonjë ‘lady’ — zot ‘lord*’ (Matzinger 2006: 156; Kliangenschmitt 1994: 312), shows that the suffix *-ih₂* must have become *-(n)ha* or *-(n)jë* in Proto-Albanian. But it must not be forgotten that the distinction between the two subtypes of *-ih₂*-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 *ra Khánh* × *rath₁₂*, which can only reflect a *dev*-type plural *roth₃-je₁₂-es* (assuming that whatever *th₂j* would have become was levelling to *j* 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. *reth* 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 *roth₃-*, must have been the word for the ‘wheel’. Since *roth₃- ‘wheel’ < *runner cannot be formally distinguished from *roth₂/hjó- ‘having a set of wheels’, putatively underlying Ved. *ratha*, the laws of economy and Occam’s Razor require that the latter form be discarded. Ved. *rathā- 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 *weth₃* (1989: 154–155), namely that in Old Irish its shape would have yielded a subjunctive stem *raeth₁₃* × Proto-Celtic *re₂₃*- instead of the attested Olr. *ress₃*- < PC *rest₁₃*-, 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 *re₂₃*- ‘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.
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Since, however, most of the OPPr. 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. Matthiessen (1998: 98–99) postulated neuter collectives in -e for Old Prussian, but did not provide examples. Indeed, there are a few likely candidates. OPPr. * slaunis* · *dy* [E 139] ‘thigh’ most likely continues directly the PIE i-stem *klōynis* ‘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 OPPr. 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. OPPr. *slaunis* is a case in question; because of its cognates Ved. *šrōni-* and Lat. *clānis* 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* · *arne* [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 ō-stems continue IE ū-stems, *slaune* could be explained along the following lines: PIE *klōynis* → **klōyi-ā > **klōyniā > Proto-Baltic *slauniā > *slaunē > OPPr. *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. slaunys ‘structure in vehicles on which wheels are suspended’. Here again it may be surmised that this semantically specialised plural tantum of slaunis ‘hip, thigh’ had replaced an older neuter plural after the demise of the neuter gender in Lithuanian.

A similar strategy can be applied to petite · schulter [E 104] ‘shoulder’ in relation to pettis · schuldblat [E 106] ‘shoulderblade’, probably a masculine io-stem, judging by Lith. petys ‘shoulder’ < *pethis-o-. Replacement of the stem-vowel o by collective *a would have resulted in *pethis-a > Proto-Baltic *pete ‘set of shoulder blades’.

For semantic reasons I can see no such derivational dependence between singular base and collective plural tantum in the pair curpis · smedefioc [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 · hemme [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. vaþnas and Russ. ворон < *yörnos ‘raven’ vs. ворона and воронh < *yörneh ‘crow’ show, the latter is a vypdhi-derivative ‘raven-like bird’ from the former (Darms 1978: 344–345).

It was argued above that *a 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 *-e, abstracted from cases of *a added to i- or io-stems, acquired the same function and became a collective formant in its own right. With this possibility in mind the pair grauvus · seyte [E 120] ‘side (of the body)’ and græbwe · 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.
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because of mistakes of the copyist (see Smoczinsky 2000: 103–106 for previously recognised and new examples). If the pair *grouvus*/grobwe 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 -ë, thus arriving at a word *kelë ‘cart’, cp. also, among other formations, dial. Latvian ducele ‘two-wheeled cart’ (Eckert 1995: 50; 1995b: 30). The compositional vowel -e- in kelleweffe and keleranco would thus receive a most straightforward explanation.

Old Prussian -weffe ‘driver’?

The second element -weffe of the OPr. compound kelleweffe ‘driver of a cart’ poses morphological problems that have not received a thorough treatment so far. It contains the Baltic verbal root *vež < PIE *wwegh ‘to transport, to go in a vehicle’ (this IE root is treated by Stieglbauer-Schwarz 2001: esp. 23–29). The first e of -weffe 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 -weffe with Lith. vežė ‘track of the wheels, rails’ < *wegh is excluded. Nor do the semantics match: Prussian kelleweffe 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 e-stem *kelažė. The Baltic e-class, however, is practically exclusively feminine, whereas from the context it clearly emerges that kelleweffe 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 kelleweffe has to be read as a jo-stem *kelažė; Eckert (1995: 51–52; 1995b: 31) follows Mažiulis. On the surface, a jo-stem *kelažės indeed finds support within Prussian in Count Waldeck’s variant kellewežis and in the noun wessis · rytsite [E 308] ‘riding sleigh’ (both < *weghijos?); outside of Prussian the Lith. compound ratavežis ‘driver of a cart’ < *rotoveghijos 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 *kellewefis. With its apparently feminine ending -e it is the lectio difficilior and must be taken seriously as such.
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It could be hypothesised that *keliewezē 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 *keliewezē is immediately followed by a 3rd sg. verbal form.

Maziulis flatly dismisses the form *keliewezē by calling it a ‘germanisation’ of original *kelavezēs. 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 · weife [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 · poter [Gr 61] against anctan · putir [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 slauinis 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’.

Maziulis’ strategy to explain away the final -e of *keliewezē 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 Terrae Prussiae (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 dicitus ‘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 inverted 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.4 These numbers lead me to the following observations:

4 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, Crieve §5, Gobotini §23, Kudare §198, Posdrauopolus §174, Russignon §207, Scardu §219, Stucec §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: Glappe §136, Glapponis §136, Glapponi §130, Glappone §136.
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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 wilks · 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 latubahre [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 latubahre have every appearance of regular o-stem vocatives in -e in their donor languages. The same explanation applies to Eluveite on an Etruscan inscription from Mantua, which in all likelihood is the Celtic ethnonym *(h)elweitis (cf. Lat. Helvetius) used as a personal name. Italic and Greek names borrowed into Etruscan are treated in a parallel manner: Etr. Namesie continues
Latino-Faliscan *Numesios, Spurie Spurius (Steinbauer 1993: 288), Tite Titus, or Tipile Greek Δίφυς (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 subjugged 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 á-stems that were used hypocoristically for male persons (cp. Ivo beside Ivica, both from Ivan, or Joštko beside Joška, both from Josip). Perhaps this is ultimately the origin of Ukrainian surnames in -enko 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 Jupiter < *djeu phṣ-tar, 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 ź-stems. Although in the modern Baltic languages ź-stems regularly belong to the feminine gender, there are marginal cases referring to male persons. Senn (1966: 100) mentions Žemaitian names like Mikė, Jūzė, Stūsė, for what would be Mikas, Juozas, Stasys in the standard language. Standard Lithuanian has words like dėdė ‘uncle’, or nouns of common gender like lojynė ‘someone who prattles on’ (Schmalstieg 1998: 155). The extension of the ź-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 ź-stem vocatives, which could have served as the pivotal point for the intrusion.
of the ĕ-inflection into original o-stem words. A parallel for the latter scenario can be cited from ancient Boeotia, where names with nominatives in -ŋ and accusatives in -ŋv 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.\(^5\)

**Old Prussian -wefäe**

This observation concerning hypocoristics, however, does not provide a good starting point for a solution for *kellwefäe*, 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 ĕ-stems *can* and *could* be used for male persons in Baltic, and indeed under close scrutiny an occasional agentive masculine ĕ-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 ĕ-stem (see also Buga 1, 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 (1, 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. *arwyatis* ‘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 ĕ-class. It is perhaps into this morphological class of ĕ-stems for words for professional classes, if indeed it is one, that the name for another type of pre-Christian priest, *waideleotte*, 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

---

5 I owe this suggestion to Martin Peters.
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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 agitative suffixes, namely the zero-suffix (e.g. Wirr-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 ‘ger-
 manisation’ 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 -i, which themselves
 apparently are connected with the Indic rathi-type; or they are
 concretised abstract nouns in *(i)iā; or one could think of other IE
 terms for priests and seers like Latin uates, Ofr. fāth, Av. kauwāi-, 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 nominative 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, Germuldi,
 Guntheri, Hartmannus, Henricus, Hermannum, Hertwigum, Marquardi,
 Theodericus, Wilhelmi, Ulricus.

 n-stems (5): Brunonem, Hugonem, Miligedum, Ottonem, Troppo.

 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
 Uelenbusch, Hartmannus dictus Watmal, dictus Wirtel.
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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):
   a-stems (6): Pomanda, Sarecka, Stinegota (v.l. -e), Surdeta, Swisdeta, Trinota.
   ending in -e (4): Aultume (= 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.
   a-stem (1): dictus Powida.
   others (3): qui dicuntur Candeym, dicti Jonis filii, dictus Sirenes.

Baltic peoples’ names (11):
   i-stems (2): Barthenses, Warmienses.
   a-stems (5): Galindite, Nadrowite, Sambite, Scalowite, Sudowite.

2. Lithuanian War (Part IV)

2.1. German first names (11):

2.2. German by-names (surnames and nicknames) (10):
   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.
   ä-stems (3): Gauwina, Jodute (?, gen.), Trinta.
   other (1): Nodam (nom.).
2.4. Baltic by-names (8):
   o-stem (1): dictus Surmini.
   n-stems (4): dictus Drayko, dictus Girdilo, dictus Mucko, dictus Spudo.
   ä-stem (1): dictum Naudiotam.
   ending in -e (2): dictus Peluse, dictum Sabine.
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Old Prussian kellewezze ‘Driver of a Cart’
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