FOUR OLD PRUSSIAN ETYMOLOGIES

1. In the Elbing Vocabulary the word for ‘Knecht’ (no. 191) is usually transcribed as gewineis and is thought to stand for gewinėjas or gewinėjis¹. It is usually stated that the word is derived from the verb attested in the Enchiridion as gewinna ‘works’. This latter verb is variously derived from German gewinnen ‘to gain, to earn’ or as a causative *gavint derived from a root similar to that found in Lithuanian gauti ‘to get’². Another possibility is that gewinna is derived from *gelwina and is to be connected with Latvian dziēvāt ‘to live; to work’³. Any one of these etymologies seems to me to be plausible, but I should like to suggest even another possibility for the Old Prussian counterpart of ‘Knecht’. In the facsimile edition of the Elbing Vocabulary prepared by V. Mažiulis one may note that the single letter w as it is found, for example, in the word Towis ‘father’ (no. 169) or Jucwrowe ‘maid’ (no. 193) is scarcely distinguishable from the sequence lb as found in Elboge ‘elbow’ (no. 110)⁴. Could Holczwesscher have made a mistake in transcription? According to Mažiulis, Holczwesscher apparently did not understand Old Prussian⁵. Thus the word should perhaps be transcribed gelbineis which might have been phonemicized as (gelbinėjas) or (gelbinėjis). The word would then mean ‘helper’ and would be related to Lithuanian gelbinėti ‘to help’⁶.

¹ A. Bezzenberger, Review of Erich Berneker’s, – Die preußische Sprach e, BB XXIII (1897), 299.
² E. Berneker, Die preußische Sprache, Straßburg, 1896, 135.
³ J. Endzelins, Senprūšu valoda, Rīgā, 1943, 177.
⁴ Prūsų kalbos paminklai, Vilnius, 1966, 63, 61; G. H. F. Nesselmann, Thesaurus linguæ prussicæ, Berlin, 1873, 46 suggests a similar conclusion, but says that since the root with orthographic e is not elsewhere attested in Old Prussian which has galbton ‘to help’, etc. the word is to be read gewineis. I would argue that given the frequent vacillation between orthographic e and a, the word galbton may be read (gelbtun) or conversely even gelbineis could be read (galbinē[j]as).
⁵ Ibid., 27.
⁶ See Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, III, Vilnius, 1956, 213.
2. Most authorities seem to agree that the OP word written as mulgeno\(^7\) is Endzelins says: „Atgâdina skr. majan-, av. mazga-, sensl. możdan\(\)-\(\) tp., možg\(\) ‘smadzenes’ u. c. Valdes Vrgl Wrtb II 369, bet kâ skaidrojams -\(u\)-? Ar po. mózg ‘smadzenes’ ietekmi? Piedēkļa ziņa sal. strigeno\(^8\). As I have pointed out elsewhere, orthographic \(u\) in Old Prussian frequently merely denotes a phonemic \(a\) after a labialized consonant\(^9\). One can assume that Old Prussian consonants followed by non-front vowels were slightly labialized, particularly labial and velar consonants. Thus there is no problem to the orthographic -\(u\). The word should be phonemicized as (mazgenā). (It seems most likely that orthographic o stands for the phonemes \(ā\) as Michael Burwell and James Marchand pointed out at the Pennsylvania State University Conference on Baltic Linguistics (papers to be published by the Pennsylvania State University Press].) With the proposed phonemicization Endzelins’ query as to how to explain the -\(u\) is solved.

3. In the catechisms we find the word quaits ‘will’ (quaïts III), the accusative case of which is either quáitan or quáittin. The same root is represented in the particle qui which translates German will. It is also found in the following verbal forms: (3 person indicative) quoitā, quoitē ‘wants’, (1 plural indicative) quoi-tmaï, (2 plural indicative) quoi-tēiti, (2 singular optative) quoi-tilaisit, (3 optative) quoi-tilai, quoi-tilai, quoi-tiïlaij, (2 plural optative) quoi-tilaiti, quoi-tiïlaiti. With the prefix po- (= /pa-) we encounter the forms poquoi-tēïets, poquoi-tïton and poquoi-tïuns. The words labbaiquoi-tïtsnan (acc.) ‘Wollust’ and niquáïtings ‘unwillig’ and poquoi-tïsna (final -\(u\) to be corrected to -\(n\)) are also cognate. This word is usually derived from an Indo-European root which is also found in Skt. kēta-h ‘will, desire’, Latin invitō ‘I invite’, Lithuanian kvïësti ‘to invite’\(^10\).

It seems to me that there is good reason to interpret the first three letters qua-, quā-, quo- as representing phonemic (ka-). The reason for the orthographic -\(u\) and -\(o\) in these various words may well be the incorrect interpretation of labialization on the part of the German scribes. A similar misinterpretation is


found in the relative pronouns *quai and *quoi, forms which Trautmann considers to be the nominative plural masculine of *kas. The exact interpretation of the relatives *quai and *quoi remains in doubt, but it would certainly seem odd to find a relative pronoun with initial *kv- or *kw- in a satom language. The first two phonemes of this word are (ka-).

Thus the word poquoitēts is probably a nominative singular masculine of a present passive participle and is to be phonemicized (pakaitēts[a]s). If one establishes an infinitive *(kaitē) for the verb in question it can then be related to Lithuanian kaitēti in the meaning ‘to lack, to be wanting; to worry’. The semantic development from ‘to lack’ to ‘to wish’ can be seen in the several meanings of the English word want. The root is also attested in Latvian kaitēt ‘to be harmful’, cf. the idiomatic expressions quoted in the Latviešu-krievu vārdnīca, Rīga, 1953, 254: „kas tev kaiš (kait)? ‘čto s toboj’; kas tam nekaiš (nekait) ‘emu жаловаться не приходится; чего ему нехватает?’

The usual interpretation of the macron is that it denotes a long vowel. I suggest that for Abel Will this may have denoted what he heard as a long vowel, but that indeed in Old Prussian it may have been merely a stressed vowel. Thus the third person indicative form quoitā should probably be phonemicized (kaitā) which would correspond exactly to Latvian kait and perhaps the third person form quoitē should be phonemicized as either (kaitā) or (kaitē) which would correspond exactly to Latvian kaiš. In other words the present stem may have been either an *e/o-stem or *je/o-stem in Latvian and Old Prussian. Likewise the 1st plural indicative quoitāmai could quite possibly have been phonemicized (kaitāme) and the 2nd plural indicative quoitēti could well have been phonemicized either (kaitāte) or (kaitēte).

The further development of this root into a modal particle *quoi = (kai) is paralleled by the development of Slavic xotēti, xotēti ‘to wish’ into modern Bulgarian šte, or Greek thēlō+ná ‘I wish that’ into contemporary Greek thá. One might also note that in the Göttingen manuscript of Simon Grunau’s Vocabulary we find the cognate kayat thu glossed as 'Wo wiltu hin'.

It is then clearly plausible to suggest that the Old Prussian past passive participle, masculine plural nominative ankaitītai, enkaitītai ‘tempted’ is also cognate and probably to be phonemicized (enkaitētai). In this regard one should also note that etymological (ē) is frequently rendered by orthographic ī, īj. This could be explained as representing an innovating phonemic system as I have done.

---

12 Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, V, Vilnius, 1959, 78.
13 D. C. Swanson, Vocabulary of Modern Spoken Greek, Athens, 1957, 47.
14 See V. Mažuliš, op. cit., 251.
elsewhere\textsuperscript{15}. Another possibility, however, is that it is a simple scribal error resulting from the incorrect interpretation of the tenseness of the long (e).

4. Word no. 214 in the Elbing Vocabulary is *accodis which is glossed as 'roch-loch' and explained as 'a hole in the wall for the elimination of smoke'. Endzelins reconstructs the word as *atkōdis and calls attention to the fact that t could have been assimilated to the following k as in Latvian dialects and to the fact that in the Elbing Vocabulary t and c are not infrequently confused\textsuperscript{18}. The prefix is then *at- and the root *kōd-; this latter is connected with Old Church Slavic ka-
diti 'to burn incense', Czech čad 'smoke', Slovenian čađ 'smoke, soot', Greek kodomeūó 'I roast barley'\textsuperscript{17}. Still another possibility is to consider the word a borrowing from Polish with the element kod from Polish chod\textsuperscript{18}.

I suggest that *accodis is to be phonemicized (akutis). Evidence for the rendering of phonemic (u) by orthographic o is found, e. g. in prostnà 'snout'. The confusion of voiced and unvoiced consonants seems rare, but this is also attested in the word agins 'eyes' where the voiced consonant is written mistakenly for the unvoiced (k). The word *accodis (akutis) is then a diminutive of the word *ackis (akis) 'eye' and is to be interpreted as denoting 'small eye, eyelet'. The derivation can be compared to that of Slavic okəno 'win-
dow' or to that of English window < Old Norse vindauga < vindr 'wind' plus auga 'eye'\textsuperscript{19}.
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\textsuperscript{15} The Phonemes of the Old Prussian Enchiridion, Word, XX (1964), 211−221.

\textsuperscript{16} Op. cit., 140.

\textsuperscript{17} R. Trautmann, op. cit., 298.

\textsuperscript{18} W. Pierson, Nachtrag zu den 'litauischen Aequivalenten', Altpreußische Monatsschrift, VIII (1871), 362.