

**INTERPRETATIONS OF MATTHAEUS PRAETORIUS  
MYTHICAL MATERIAL ON *PERDOYTUS*, *WEJOPATTIS*,  
*GARDOUTEN*, *BANGPJTJS*, *LUOBGELDA* IN THE WORKS  
OF LITHUANIAN AND PRUSSIAN MYTHOLOGY  
RESEARCHERS OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup>–21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURIES**

**Summary**

The present article provides an overview and evaluation of interpretations of Lithuanian and Prussian mythology researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries on the following deities, attributable to the Baltic pantheon and associated with the water sphere: *Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis*, *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda* (partly *Bardoayts*) that were described in Matthaeus Praetorius' (*Matthäus Prätorius*) work "Deliciae Prussicae or Prussian Theater" ("Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne") (the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century). The said interpretations, depending on the evaluation of reliability of the mythical material recorded by M. Praetorius, are divided into three groups: a) Praetorius' mythical data is considered to be the original data; b) it is noted and discussed that the present manuscript, in certain cases, is not the primary source; c) all chronicles of the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries, including the one by Praetorius, are considered to be authentic and equivalent.

The object of the research is mythical material by Matthaeus Praetorius on *Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis*, *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda* and its interpretations in the works of Lithuanian and Prussian mythology researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

The purpose is to evaluate the interpretations of mythical material by Matthaeus Praetorius on *Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis*, *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda* in the works of Lithuanian and Prussian mythology researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

Tasks: 1) to select Lithuanian mythology researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries who in their works purposely used Praetorius' mythical material on *Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis*, *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda*; 2) to distinguish by which researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries Matthaeus Praetorius' mythological material on *Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis*, *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda*: a) was treated as the primary source; b) was noticed and estimated that the information is not primary; c) and which researchers considered Matthaeus Praetorius' material and all other sources of the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries to be authentic-equivalent.

Methods: analytical, structured content analysis, hermeneutic interpretive description, comparative.

**Keywords:** Matthaeus Praetorius, Baltic religion and mythology, history of science.

One of the richest written sources providing information about the pagan Baltic religion is a multivolume manuscript "Deliciae Prussicae or Prussian Theater" (*Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne*) developed by Matthaeus Praetorius (*Matthäus Prätorius*) (~ 1635–1704, 1707 (?)) in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Mythological data recorded by Praetorius, repeatedly used by the authors of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries who

had studied Baltic culture and religion, is used now and will probably be used in the future. To prepare this article only those works of distinguished Lithuanian and Prussian mythology researchers, that belong to the defined period, have been selected and reviewed, where: 1) at least one of six mythologemes described by Praetorius – *Perdoytus* (P), *Wejopattis* (*Weipons* / *Weidiews*) (V), *Gardouten* (G), *Luobgelda* (L), *Bardaitis* (*Bardaitis*) (B1), *Bangpjts* (B2) – is analysed and scientific arguments are provided; 2) the researcher X clearly indicates the problem of reliability of Praetorius's work<sup>1</sup>.

In respect of the context of researches (the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries) the analysed creatures should be firstly divided into three groups: 1. G – P – B1, 2. V – B2, 3. L. It should be noted that this work does not attempt to analyse the mythologeme B1 separately, however, when analysing deities G and P, it is impossible to dismiss the existence of B1. When the research objects are divided into groups, it becomes clear that they form two oppositions (groups 1–2). The first opposition is interesting because the researchers do not agree which of the above mentioned lexemes is the most authentic, but traditionally it is thought that god-names B1 and G are more reliable, while god-name P is considered as little probable. Opposition of the second group is specific because it divides the researchers who had analysed mythologemes V and B2 into two subgroups: 1) those who claim that V and B2 are two independent deities; 2) those who believe that V and B2 is one and the same god. Further in this work researchers will be presented in a chronological order (from the earliest (19<sup>th</sup> century) to the latest (21<sup>st</sup> century) and their interpretations will be discussed.

From the perspective of modern mythology, researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and their studies are interesting within the aspect of history of science. Since they reveal that the first studies of “Baltic religion and mythology” (BRM) were more like closed reflections than a developed debate (see below). However, in writer's opinion, when examining the research context of a mythologeme X it is necessary to remember this period because it reflects the initial period of Baltic religion and mythology as an emerging science. Speaking about analyses on G/P/B1/V/B2/L that were accomplished in the mentioned period, the following researchers must be distinguished: 1. Józef Ignacy Kraszewski (1847) – B2; 2. August Schleicher (1853) – B2; 3. Antoni Julian Mierzyński (1892) – B2; 4. Konstancija Skirmuntaitė (1892) – B2; 5. Hermann Karl Usener and Felix Solmsen<sup>2</sup> (1896) – B2, V, P, G, L. Taking into account their research strategies, those scientists can be divided into two groups: 1. d e c l a r e r s : J. I. Kraszewski, K. Skirmuntaitė, A. Mierzyński; 2. l a n g u a g e r e s e a r c h e r s : A. Schleicher, H. Usener and F. Solmsen. The members

of the first group declare the fact X, which, according to them, is correct, and do not provide any substantial reasoning. For example, Kraszewski writes that “favourable winds were sent to rowers by *Bang-putis* (from Lith. words “banga” ‘wave’ and “putis”, “pucis” ‘wind’)”<sup>3</sup>, and in Skirmuntaitė’s opinion, “*Bangputis* .. the idol of waves”<sup>4</sup>. Mierzyński, on the one hand, states the same what is claimed in Praetorius’ work in Book IV, Chapter IX, Section III, which has a direct correlation with Section II. On the other hand, he seems to be trying to question the information supposing that “among .. the deities of home there is .. *Bangputis* .. it is doubtful, that sacrifices to water deity, blowing the waves, could be made at home”<sup>5</sup>, but he does not provide any substantial reasoning on this note. Finally, it must be concluded that the researchers that are attributed to the group of declarers of the 19th century did not contemplate on the issue of authenticity of Praetorius’ data thoroughly, but considered it to be sufficiently reliable and used it in their scientific works.

Authors that belong to the second group – Usener, Solmsen<sup>6</sup> and Schleicher<sup>7</sup> – behave differently. The attempts by the latter two authors to reconstruct B2, V, G enable them to be treated as the first researchers of BRM who had tried to linguistically explain the formation and functions of the extended god-names. It is interesting that Usener and Solmsen in their study mention not only deities B2, V and G, but also indicate P as a god of “.. traders – *Pardūtojis* ..”<sup>8</sup>. One can reason that researchers, with reference to Praetorius’ description, make the form of *Perdoytus* sound Lithuanian – \**Pardūtojis*; they also indicate the socio-economic sphere of god’s activity – selling (trading) (Lith. “pardavimas” (“pirkliavimas”)). On the one hand, Usener and his colleague Solmsen linguistically classified god-names of Baltic origin, that had been described by Praetorius and other authors of BRM, into six sections: 1) names of courageous and live derivation (nomina agentis) (*Bangpūtys*, *Pardūtojis*, *Birbulis* / *Birbius*, *Lyginczus* (“leveller” (Lith. ‘lygintojas’)), *Budintojis*, *Budintaia*, *Dvargantis*, *Laukosárgis*, *Tiklys* and others), 2) adjectival derivatives denoting dependence (*Ēratinis*, *Medeinis*, *Valgina* and others), 3) origin (*Karvāitis*), 4) a diminutive form (*Warpulis*), 5) old god-names (*Laũkpatis*), 6) new god-names (*Wějopatis*, *Žēmēpatis*, *Žemyna*, *Raugupatis*). On the other hand, researchers fail to provide valid evidence to support reconstructions of B2 – V, G – P, therefore, those reconstructions should be considered as not very successful. Even though they have tried to linguistically measure deities described by Praetorius, they have not attempted to solve the question of authenticity. Schleicher is probably the first researcher of BRM who had paid attention to the fact that among the songs collected by Martin Ludwig Rhesa there is

a piece (“Du žveju”), where B2 is mentioned – in the song it is sometimes alternated with “idol of Waves”<sup>9</sup> (Lith. *Bangu dievaitis*). A parallel combination of cultural (i. e. Rhesa’s songbook) and linguistic contexts in an attempt to restore a certain mythologeme is applied to the present day (see below). Schleicher is sceptical about Rhesa’s and Friedrich Kurschat’s interpretations on the name of *Bangpūtys*, but he does not elaborate such reasoning. It must be stated that language researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century did not attempt to solve the question of verification of mythological material described by Praetorius, but provided the first linguistic and/or cultural interpretations of the analysed creatures. Overview and analysis also revealed that evaluators of BRM of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: focused on interpretation of B2 – five researchers; were less interested in analysis of V, P, G – two researchers; were not interested in mythologemes B1, P, L.

Further we will discuss the interpretations of G / P / B1 / V / B2 / L by current researchers (20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries). As to how the BRM interpreters of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century viewed the previous studies, they can be divided into three groups: 1) adapted the technique of declarers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: Victor Jungfer (1926) when speaking about V<sup>10</sup>; 2) followed the works of language researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: Jonas Basanavičius (1926) reasoning about mythologemes B2, V, G, P relied mainly on Usener and Solmsen’s study<sup>11</sup>, Pranas Skardžius (1954)<sup>12</sup>, partly Marija Gimbutienė (1963)<sup>13</sup> and Jonas Balys<sup>14</sup> referred to Schleicher’s comments about B2; 3) contradicted the opinions of language researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: Petras Klimas (1919) who negatively viewed linguistic insights by Usener and Solmsen<sup>15</sup>. It should be noted that the problem of verification of the mentioned six – both of Praetorius and of other sources of the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries – was noticed by Skardžius only, but he did not develop his remark<sup>16</sup>.

The case of Jonas Šliūpas (1932) is worth to be mentioned separately, because in interpreting the spheres of activity of deities V and P he relied on forged Edmund Veckenstedt’s collection “Žemaičių (lietuvių) mitai pasakos ir legendos” (*Die Mythen, Sagen und Legenden der Žamaiten (Litauer)*) (1883)<sup>17</sup>; author did not try to solve the question of reliability of Praetorius’ data and his insights ought to be viewed as unreliable<sup>18</sup>. Kazimieras Būga (the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) was the first to notice that the god-name *Gardouten* can be “.. associated with the Lithuanian word garda “laivas” ‘ship’, and “aitas” “kas eina, ėjėjas” ‘what goes, the goer’<sup>19</sup>, as a matter of fact, the meaning of a ship of the word *gardas* is known only from a single source – Mikolaj Akielewicz’s grammar<sup>20</sup>, therefore, this interpretation does not seem very reliable. Walter Jaskiewicz (1952) is perhaps the only researcher who in fact tried to linguistically

restore the mythologeme L. His reconstruction showed that L is not a god-name at all; according to him, it should be treated as a part of a folk riddle / spell (and/or its guess)<sup>21</sup>. It is interesting that Jaskiewicz, interpreting *Audros dievas* (*Audros deo*)<sup>22</sup> ‘god of Storm’, first mentioned in the historical source written by Jan Łasicki, identifies it with deities B2 – V described by Matthaeus Praetorius. He considers that “.. *ãudros diivas* (the God of Storm) .. [ought to be called so ] because during the storm the waves are particularly high and dangerous”<sup>23</sup>. However, such declarative observation could hardly be regarded as an argument. Moreover, what concerns Jaskiewicz’s study, it should be noted that it was intended to determine the linguistic probability of Łasicki’s mythical material, thus, the author did not analyse the verification of Praetorius’ mythical material in detail. A certain reconstruction of B1 – “*laivų dievybė*” ‘deity of ships’ – is formulated by Vladimir Toporov (1980), who associates it with sememe “*barzdotas*” ‘bearded’, according to him, B1 could previously mean the epithet of *Patulas*, that had finally separated and gained independence<sup>24</sup>. Referring to the text of the mentioned study, it can be stated that Toporov viewed mythical data described by Praetorius favourably enough that he used it, but he realized that there exists a problem of verification of ancient written sources<sup>25</sup>.

Pranė Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė (1990; 1969) discussed deities B2, V, G<sup>26</sup>; the author thought that mythologemes B2 – V are the same (see Table 1):

Table 1.

**Comparison of Praetorius’ and Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė’s material**

	<b>Praetorius<sup>27</sup></b>	<b>Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė<sup>28</sup></b>
1.	“23. About <u>now known Nadruvian gods</u> ”	“God .. <u>known to Lithuanians</u> ..”
2.	“ <u><i>Bangputijs</i> is the god of storm</u> ..”	“.. <u>the god of the sea and lagoon wind, is called <i>Bangpūtys</i></u> ..”
3.	“.. I once saw at one fisherman’s [ <u>in a village</u> ] <u>in Karklė</u> ”	“M. Praetorius found at one fisherman’s from the <u>village Karkeliai</u> (Klaipėda county) ..”
4.	“ <u>From the bark of a tree he had made the image of a man</u> ..”	“.. in a boat a handmade <u>clay image</u> of this god ..”
5.	—	“It was a man [B2 or V – <u>Ž. V.</u> ] <u>with a beard</u> ..”
6.	“.. in the right [he is holding – <u>Ž. V.</u> ] – <u>a cask</u> ..”	“.. and in the right [hand he was holding – <u>Ž. V.</u> ] – <u>a small tub</u> ”
7.	“.. this god’s purpose cannot be better understood from anything else but the true meaning of the word <i>Gardoutis</i> ; “ <u>gardu</u> ” actually means “ <u>gardu</u> ” (understand it as tasty)”	“M. Praetorius writes, that the name of <u>god <i>Gardaitis</i> (<i>Gardoytis, Gardoutis</i>) is derived from the word “<u>gardas</u>” ..”</u>

Comparing the data it becomes clear, that Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė's material is full of inaccurate information. First of all, Praetorius in the title of the Subchapter 23 (Chapter 9, Book 4) of the analysed work clearly indicates that the text will focus on gods worshiped by "current Nadruvians", i. e. in Praetorius' understanding by "the descendants of the ancient Prussians". Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, referring to unknown, states that they are Lithuanian gods or gods known to Lithuanians. Secondly, Praetorius says that "*Bangputijs* is the god of storm", while in Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė's opinion, "*Bangpūtys* is the god of the sea and lagoon wind". Third, the monograph of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century inaccurately indicates the title of the village, where the author had documented the phenomenon V – Karkeliai (it should be Karklė)<sup>29</sup>. In addition, as it has been noted previously, referring to the text of the 17<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, it can be stated that Praetorius did not establish personal contact with the man who owned the described weathercock-"statue" or V, on the contrary, his data about the weathercock-"statue" / V was collected by intermediaries (N. Isingius)<sup>30</sup>. Fourth, the author of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century inaccurately indicates Praetorius material by saying that the wind arrow is made of clay (it should be the bark of a tree). Fifth, the appearance of the weathercock –"statue" or V is inaccurately conveyed; in the primary text and in a sketch by Praetorius the creature is designed beardless, and in Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė's text, beard is one of the distinguishing features of the weathercock – "statue" / V. Also, attention should be paid to the fact that the author altogether omits the fact that in Praetorius' drawing and in the text of a manuscript on V's head there is depicted a rooster. Sixth, a cask, mentioned in the original text, which a creature is holding in his right hand, is nominated as a small tub (a diminutive form of the word "tub") by Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė. Seventh, and, perhaps, the most "expressive mistake", proving a tendency of inaccurate information, is that, according to Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Praetorius derives the name of *Gardaitis* (*Gardoytis*, *Gardoutis*) from the word "gardas", while in the original text we find the opposite information: ".. (*Gardouten's* – Ž. V.) purpose cannot be better understood from anything else but the true meaning of the word *Gardoutis*; "gardu" actually means "gardu" (understand it as tasty) .."<sup>31</sup>. It is most likely that such confusion of facts was inspired by the previously mentioned linguistic interpretation by Būga ("gardas" 'ship').

Moreover, it should be mentioned that Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė does not provide the precise date and locality of field research or information about presenters (their age, gender, etc.), method of data collection and other circumstances, but still claims that "already in the 19<sup>th</sup> century

fishermen from Vorusnė when going fishing took a wooden idol of a god *Bangpūtys*, which had to protect them from various accidents during fishery. Besides, they worshiped evil feminine being, whose upper half was in the form of a woman, and the lower – in the form of a fish. Together with god *Bangpūtys* it used to show up to fishermen”<sup>32</sup>. The scientist not only expands the sphere of activity of *Bangpūtys* (protected the fishermen from accidents during fishery), but also names, in her opinion, the female equivalent of *Bangpūtys*, which she describes as an austere hybrid of a woman and fish. It is thought that the female equivalent of *Bangpūtys* is inspired by the image of mythical creatures mermaids and since a precise data source of the description is not specified, the expanded material as an ethnographic source should be valued negatively. In addition to this, Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, seemingly following the material by Dionizas Poška, states that *Gardaitis* is “the patron of seamen” to whom four subordinate idols of the wind submitted: *Šiaurys*, *Pietys*, *Rytvėjis*, *Vakarīs*, that the ploughmen had also worshiped<sup>33</sup>. In conclusion, it can be stated that in her work the author uses declarative sentences not attempting to justify the constructed interpretations. The analysis has also revealed that there is a tendency of inaccurate information in mythological studies by Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė. And in terms of the verification problem, it is stated that she did not try to evaluate the issue of reliability of mythical data described by Praetorius<sup>34</sup>.

Algirdas Julius Greimas (1990) referring to folklore, mythology of other nations (Latvian, Ukrainian, Indian), lexicographical data and partly approving of Poška’s hypotheses, reconstructed the model of V and his family, which consists of: 1) *Vėjas* – *Vėjas’* (ill) brother, 2) *Rytis* – *Pietys* – *Vakarīs* – *Šiaurys* (or *Auštrinis*)<sup>35</sup>. He considered that V and B2 are identical creatures. Greimas attributed curiosity / knowledge to the family of *Vėjai* (Winds), a specific feature which was manifested both in the spheres of geography and cosmography<sup>36</sup>. The author also tried to collate *Vėjas* and *Aitvaras*, but did not dare to examine, in his opinion, more probable typological similarities separately<sup>37</sup>. Considering Greimas’ attempt to reconstruct certain elements of Baltic religion and mythology it is assumed that he understood the problem of verification, but did not assess the mythical material described by Praetorius in terms of reliability.

Norbertas Vėlius (1995; 1996) deserves an exceptional mentioning since he was one of the first Lithuanian analysers of BRM who actually noticed and evaluated the fact that Praetorius’s manuscript is a combination of old chronicles and authentic information, written by contemporaries<sup>38</sup>. Vėlius was well familiar with the old written sources, it allowed him to see

the whole system of written material and the position of Praetorius's data in it. At the same time, he drew attention to the fact that, "It was Praetorius' wish to document the religion and mythology of ancient Prussians, thus in Lithuanian customs and beliefs of that time he was searching for such data, that have been witnessed in the old Prussian sources .. such desire could affect objectivity, since what one seeks in the living tradition one is almost always able to find"<sup>39</sup>. Vėlius formulated the problem of reliability of all ancient written documents of BRM in general, which in his words is "the most common and the most difficult to solve"<sup>40</sup>. Ignas Narbutas (1998) debated on the previously extended Toporov's hypothesis that B1 emerged directly from the image of *Patulas*. In Narbutas opinion, this is impossible, since B1, whose name and being is thought to derive from sememe "beard", is not the only bearded member in the Prussian pantheon; he thinks that, B1 should rather be identified with a winged and bearded Greek god *Borėjas*<sup>41</sup>.

Gintaras Beresnevičius (2001) discussed mythologemes<sup>42</sup> B1, B2, V, G, L; he believes that deities B2 and V are the same. Analysing mythologemes the researcher used a less unified scheme: 1. indicates Lithuanized form(s) of god-name(s): *Bangpūtis, Vėjopatis, Bardoayts, Laibegelda, Luibegelda?*; 2. provides a brief summarizing sentence and defines the function of a deity X in the pantheon, e. g. B2 – "Lithuanian god of the sea"<sup>43</sup>; V – "Lithuanian god of the wind, mentioned by Praetorius"<sup>44</sup>; 3. identifies the first mentioning of the creature X in the ancient written sources and provides a quote in the original language (but he does it not systematically)<sup>45</sup>; 4. briefly presents the history of previous research, e. g. Toporov: B2 = marine *Perkūnas*' hypostasis associated with winds; B1 is more authentic than G, because it should be associated with Prussian "bordus" – "barzda"<sup>46</sup> 'beard'. In some cases, his overview is developed into polemic discussion, after which Beresnevičius, figuratively speaking, submits the verdict in the case of the authenticity of a deity X<sup>47</sup>.

The case of interpretation of mythologeme L deserves to be described broader. Beresnevičius speculates that, "this (*Laibegelda, Luibegelda?* name of god – Ž. V.) may yet be an artificial goddesses' name which may have appeared due to the inaccurate transcription; *Luibegelda, Laibegelda* – maybe just a beginning of a salutation, prayer, suppose "luobo gelda" or likewise"<sup>48</sup>. Interpretation is, most likely, a direct rephrasing of previously mentioned Jaskiewicz's comments. The author is attributed to the group of researchers who have realized that certain mythical data noted by Praetorius is rewrite / interpretation and partly tried to solve the issue of authenticity. Dainius Razauskas in his study prepared in 2004 also focused on deities B2, V that had been described by



Praetorius, but he did not attempt to treat the mentioned creatures as they were the same. According to the author, B2 is V – “as the king of all winds” – as a personification of manifestation or functions, which, however, leads to a partial / conditional sameness of deities<sup>49</sup>. The fact that the researcher is aware that the material of the analysed source is not fully reliable is revealed by the text of the study – “this and other mentioned links with folklore of the image described by Praetorius is also a serious confirmation of its authenticity”<sup>50</sup>. Nevertheless, he does not develop a separate section / subsection in the mentioned work in order to comprehensively assess the reliability of Praetorius’ data.

Rimantas Balsys in his second edition of a basically corrected and amended<sup>51</sup> monograph “Lithuanian and Prussian Gods and Spirits: From Ritual to Superstition” published in 2010 is considering the probability of B1, B2, V, G, P, L in BRM pantheon<sup>52</sup>. The object of Balsys’ research is not only a reconstruction of functions of Baltic origin deities noted by Praetorius, he also pays a great attention to determining the authenticity of mythologemes. In order to implement cultural and linguistic reconstruction and evaluation of mythologemes the author applies the methodology which is comprised of four main features: 1) all ancient historical sources mentioning the Baltic name of a god X are reviewed (from the earliest to the latest), by presenting the original text and its Lithuanian translation or paraphrase; 2) the author is trying to discuss and evaluate reconstructions of mythologemes accomplished by other researchers that had been previously described by Praetorius; 3) after Balsys discusses predecessors’ reconstructions or possible hypotheses, he usually starts to develop, in his opinion, the most probable variant of reconstruction; for example, interpreting the concept of L – he agrees with Jaskiewicz’s reconstruction, and comparing deities V – B2 the author agrees with the statement formulated by researchers Usener and Solmsen in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the god-name *Vėjopatis* should not be regarded as a word of old derivation<sup>53</sup>.

Developing the opportunity of reconstruction of the name/function of one or another deity mentioned in the source of the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Balsys refers to: Lithuanian, Latvian, Prussian toponymy<sup>54</sup> (oikonyms, hydronyms, micro-toponyms, etc.). In order to determine etymological relations, he uses the material of “Lithuanian dictionary” (*Lietuvių žodynas*). It’s interesting why the analysed author fundamentally rejects the form of a god-name P, mentioned by Praetorius; he conceives it as a conscious Praetorius’ attempt from G to make P – the god of selling (trading). Taking into account the latest scientific debate, it’s probable that such parallel form of a god-name had existed<sup>55</sup>. As a reliable tool for

possible reconstruction/presumption of the sphere of activity of a deity, author applies the material of Lithuanian folklore: folk beliefs, spells, incantations, superstitions, interpretations of dreams, fairy tales<sup>56</sup>, texts of folk songs, games, etc. Proposing the linguistic reconstruction, Balsys refers to Baltic (and other Indo-European) languages, i. e. uses the comparative method of Baltic languages reconstruction. Fulfilling the verification of deities described by Praetorius, the researcher reflects a considerable amount of mythological-cultural elements of different nations of the world. The author tries to classify the Baltic pantheon into activity spheres (starting from the highest gods and ending with deities of health, home and family). Finally, after providing a wide context of ethnological, linguistic material, Balsys formulates what, according to him, would seem absolutely probable, i. e. possible/probable functions of a god (his spheres of activity) or the structure of a god-name. Summarising all that has been said, the study is a consistent attempt to systematise the Baltic pantheon<sup>57</sup>. Balsys perceives the problem of verification of written sources, including mythical data by Praetorius, and tries to solve it.

Rolandas Kregždys (2008) is one of the recent researchers who has linguistically analysed the authenticity of deities B1, G, P. First of all, the author reasons that Prussian names of gods: B1 = pr. *\*bara-* “spree: vibrancy, boiling” – *\*Bar-daitis*; G = pr. *\*gara-* “heat: steam(s)” – *\*Gar-daitis*; P = pr. *\*para-* “steam(s)” – *\*Par-daitis* ought to be treated as synonyms and all three forms are authentic; secondly, their .. functions ought to be associated not with chthonic, but with heavenly deity .. pr. *Bardoayts / Gardoayts / Perdoayts* could be the epithets not of *Patulas*, but of *Perkūnas*<sup>58</sup>. Analysis of Kregždys’ study reveals that some fundamental aspects of the work ought to be distinguished:

1. The scientist always begins his analysis by providing a theonym. He is sceptical towards all previously carried out interpretations of deities that had been recorder by Praetorius, since “until now all attempts to clarify the question of correlations of the analysed god with other members of the pantheon or IE archetype are not successful .. lacking motivation not only linguistically but also mythologically. In addition to the already mentioned pseudo etymologic debates, it is necessary to pay attention to the lack of detailed analysis of description of a deity”<sup>59</sup>. It seems that such closed statement can be agreed only partly. Having accomplished the review of works of scientists who had previously analysed Praetorius’ mythical data, and referring to available results, it can be stated that already in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the researchers of theonyms B2, V, P and G attempted to apply the philological and/or cultural interpretation of lexemes. On the one hand, interpretations of those scientists are generally only in the form of folk

etymology, nevertheless it does not eliminate the fact that certain linguistic analysis has been applied.

2. Interpreting names of gods noted by Praetorius, Kregždys provides hypotheses of earlier scientists on interpretation or etymology of a theonym, he also tries to provide arguments why the given examples are doubtful or unreliable or inappropriate. For instance, research by Būga on G = folk etymology<sup>60</sup>; research by Toporov on B1 = problematic and doubtful both linguistically and mythologically<sup>61</sup>. Beresnevičius = relied on doubtful reasoning by Toporov on B1<sup>62</sup>. Balsys study is viewed in two ways: the question formulated by the author which of the names of gods (G or B1?) is more authentic is approved of<sup>63</sup> but the rejection of the form P as unreliable is not approved of<sup>64</sup>. Analysis by Narbutas = is completely unbelievable and the hypothesis on B1 is possessed by Renaissance spirit<sup>65</sup>. Also, evaluations are provided on reasoning by Jakobs Lange, based on “accidental homophonic accord of *Gardehdis* and Latvian. *gardehdīs* “gourmand”<sup>66</sup>, due to which he ascribed the mythologeme G to Latvian pantheon<sup>67</sup> and his colleague’s Gothard Frydrich Stender’s etymological interpretation stating that G (*Gardēts*) is a god of wind and weather that seaside fishermen had worshiped<sup>68</sup>.

Kregždys views many of his colleagues’ works negatively, but his generalizations of analyses also consist of assumptions. A simplified or the most typical Kregždys’ scheme of analysis on a god-name X is the following: a) the assumption allowing to predict the first element of the solution is formulated (let’s say, Y1); b) the argument, which is based on the first element of the solution is designed; c) the argument is developed until the second element of the solution is formulated (Y2). Finally, considering the previously determined elements (Y1 + Y2) and arguments that emerged from them, the essential generalization is constructed which clarifies etymological and morphological peculiarities of a mythologeme (Y1 + Y2 = indisputable evidence<sup>69</sup>).

3. Kregždys exploring the names of gods described by Praetorius refers to different languages of the world (old Greek, Prussian, Latvian, Sanskrit, Slavic).

4. Analysing names of gods described by Praetorius, Kregždys reflects a wide range of cultural, geolinguistic context or in other words, extends “the method of composition of cultural and linguistic levels” “initiated” by Schleicher. Summarizing Kregždys’ research on B1, G, P it must be said that many of his deductive statements about morphological and etymological reconstruction of god-names described by Praetorius are based on sequences of hypotheses. On the one hand, it is evident that Kregždys has very carefully collected and systematized many

philological-cultural facts about the obscure god-names noted by Praetorius. In the end the accomplished reconstruction of mythologemes ought to be viewed as a hypothetical attempt to solve the issue of authenticity of “Praetorius’ deities”. Viewing and estimating the material from the perspective of identification of authenticity, it must be said that the author is aware that Praetorius’ data is not equal in authenticity, and when he discovers interpretations in the source of the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, he views them ambiguously<sup>70</sup>.

In conclusion, the review and analysis of the researchers of the 20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> century has revealed that the interpreters of BRM, of the defined period, paid the biggest attention to: analysis of B2 – nine interpreters and analysis of V – eight; were moderately interested in B1 – five interpreters or G – six; were the least interested in P – four researchers and L – three.

### **Conclusions**

The accomplished research on interpretations of Praetorius’ mythological data has revealed that the selected researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries viewed and used Praetorius’ mythical material differently:

1. The early researchers of Praetorius’ mythical data did not consider the issue of authenticity fundamentally, but viewed the data as reliable enough and used it in their scientific works (Kraszewski, Skirmuntaitė, Mierzyński, Schleicher, Usener and Solmsen, Jungfer, Basanavičius, Gimbutienė, Balys, Klimas, Šliūpas).

2. Later researchers did not develop the verification issue too, but understood the problem of reliability (Skardžius, Būga, Jaskiewicz, Toporov, Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Greimas, Razauskas, Narbutas).

3. The latest researchers of Praetorius’ material conceived the problem of authenticity and tried to solve it (Vėlius, Beresnevičius, Balsys, Kregždys).

### **Abbreviations**

B1 – *Bardoayts*

B2 – *Bangpjtijs*

BRM – Baltic religion and mythology

G – *Gardouten*

IE – Indo-European

Y1 – the first element of the solution

Y2 – the second element of the solution

L – *Luobgelda*

P – *Perdoytus*

V – *Wejopattis / Weipons / Weidiews*

MATEJA PRETORIJA MĪTISKO MATERIĀLU PAR *PERDOYTUS*,  
*WEJOPATTIS*, *GARDOUTEN*, *BANGPJTJS*, *LUOBGELDA*  
INTERPRETĀCIJAS 19.–21. GADSIMTA  
LIETUVIEŠU UN PRŪŠU MITOLOĢIJAS PĒTNIEKU DARBOS

**Kopsavilkums**

Mateja Pretorija (*Matthäus Prätorius*) (~ 1635–1704, 1707 (?)) 17. gadsimta otrās puses apjomīgais manuskripts *Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne* tiek uzskatīts par vienu no bagātākajiem baltu reliģijas rakstu avotiem. Šī vēsturnieka un ceļotāja savāktās liecības un datus daudzkārt savos darbos izmantojuši (19.–21. gadsimtā), izmanto un, visticamāk, arī turpmāk izmantos baltu kultūras un reliģijas pētnieki. Šajā rakstā apkopoti un analizēti zināmākie darbi lietuviešu un prūšu mitoloģijā. Izvēles pamatā bijuši divi kritēriji: pirmkārt, pētījumā analizēta vismaz viena no sešām M. Pretorija minētajām mitoloģēm (*Perdoytus*, *Wejopattis* (*Weipons / Weidiews*), *Gardouten*, *Bangpjts*, *Luobgelda*, *Bardaitis*); otrkārt, tajā izteikts skaidrs viedoklis par M. Pretorija manuskripta uzticamību (19. gadsimta zinātniekiem abi vērtēšanas kritēriji piemēroti tikai daļēji).

Paveiktais M. Pretorija izdotā materiālā interpretāciju pētījums ļauj secināt, ka 19.–21. gadsimta zinātnieki (kas tika iekļauti šajā pētījumā) to novērtējuši dažādi.

1. Pirmie pētnieki, kas savu uzmanību veltījuši M. Pretorija materiālam, vēsturnieka datu autentifikāciju būtībā nav apšaubījuši un tos uzskatījuši par uzticamiem un izmantojamiem savos zinātniskajos pētījumos (Juzefs Ignacijs Kraševskis, Konstancija Skirmuntaite, Antonijs Mežinskis, Augusts Šleihers, Hermans Uzeners, Fēlikss Zolmsens, Viktors Jungfers, Jons Basanavičs, Marija Gimbutiene, Jons Balis, Petrs Klima, Jons Šļūps).

2. Verifikācijas jautājumu nav apsprieduši arī vēlāki zinātnieki, taču materiālu uzticamības problēma tika apzināta (Prans Skardžus, Kazimirs Būga, Valters Jaskevičs, Vladimirs Toporovs, Prane Dunduliene-Stukenaite, Aļģirds Juļus Greims, Daiņus Razausks, Igns Narbutis u. c.).

3. Jaunākajos M. Pretorija materiālu pētījumos autentifikācijas problēmai pievērsta liela uzmanība un ir mēģināts to atrisināt (Norberts Veļius, Gintars Beresnevičs, Rimants Balsis, Rolands Kregždis).

**Raksturvārdi:** Matejs Pretorijs, Baltijas reliģija un mitoloģija, zinātnes vēsture.

**References**

- Akielewicz, Mikolaj. *Gramatika języka litewskiego. Głosownia*. Pozna, 1890.
- Ališauskas, Vytautas. *Jono Lasickio pasakojimas apie žemaičių dievus. Tekstas ir kontekstai*. Vilnius : Aidai, 2012.
- Balsys, Rimantas. *Lietuvių ir prūsų dievai, deivės, dvasios: nuo apeigos iki prietaro*. Klaipėda : Klaipėda University Publishing House, 2010.
- Balys, Jonas. *Lietuvių mitologiškos sakmės*. London : Nida, 1956.
- Beresnevičius, Gintaras. *Trumpas lietuvių ir prūsų religijos žodynas*. Vilnius : Aidai, 2001.
- Būga, Kazimieras. *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol 2. Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958.

- Būga, Kazimieras. *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 3, Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1961.
- Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė. *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*. Vilnius : Mokslas, 1990.
- Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė. *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*. Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras, 2007.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julius. *Tautos atminties beiėškant: apie dievus ir žmones*. Vilnius : Mokslas; Chicago : Algimanto Mackaus knygų leidimo fondas, 1990.
- Jaskevičius, Valteris. Jono Lasickio žemaičių dievai: lietuvių mitologijos studija Translation from English language by Dainius Razauskas. *Liaudies kultūra*, No. 4. Vilnius : Grafija, 2010.
- Jaskevičius, Valteris. Jono Lasickio žemaičių dievai: lietuvių mitologijos studija Translation from English language by Dainius Razauskas. *Liaudies kultūra*, No. 5. Vilnius : Grafija, 2010.
- Klimas, Petras. *Lietuvių senobės bruožai*. Vilnius, 1919.
- Kregždys, Rolandas. Teonimų, minimų “Sūduvių knygelėje”, etimologinė analizė – dievybių funkcijos, hierarchija: Bardoayts / Gardoayts / Perdoyts. *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. 4. Klaipėda : Klaipėda University Publishing House, 2008.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas (accessible online)*, editorial board: Gertrūda Naktinienė (editor in chief), Jonas Paulauskas, Ritutė Petrokienė, Vytautas Vitkauskas, Jolanta Zabarskaitė. Vilnius : Institute of the Lithuanian Language, 2005.
- Narbutas, Ignas. *Senieji lietuvininkų tikėjimai*. Kaunas : Vytautas Magnus University Press, 1998.
- Pretorijus, Matas. *Prūsijos įdomybės, arba Prūsijos regykla = Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : The Lithuanian Institute of History, 2006.
- Razauskas, Dainius. *Vėjūkas: Lietuvių vėjo demono vardo ir įvaizdžio rekonstrukcija, atsižvelgiant į vieną skitų atitikmenį (osetinių wæjug / wæjyg)*. Vilnius : The Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, 2004.
- Rėza, Liudvikas Martynas. *Dainos oder Litthauische Volkslieder gesammelt, übersetzt und mit gegenüberstehendem Urtext herausgegeben von L. J. Rhesa*. Königsberg, 1825.
- Šilas, Sambora. *Mažosios Lietuvos kultūros pėdsakai*. Vilnius : Mintis, 1990.
- Šlekonytė, Jūratė. Komparatyvistikos korifėjus: 150-ąsias Johano Boltės gimimo metines paminint, Vol. 35. *Tautosakos darbai*, 2008.
- Usener, Hermann. *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*. Bonn, 1896.
- Vėlius, Norbertas. *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*, Vol. 1. Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.
- Vėlius, Norbertas. *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Science and Encyclopaedia Publishing House, 2003.
- Vėlius, Norbertas. *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*. Vol. 4. Vilnius : Science and Encyclopaedia Publishing House, 2005.
- Vėlius, Norbertas. *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 1. Vilnius : Mintis, 1995.
- Vėlius, Norbertas. *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 2. Vilnius : Mintis, 1997.
- Vičinskas, Žydrūnas. Mato Pretorijaus mitinės medžiagos apie Perdoytus, Wejopattis, Gardouten, Bangpjts, Loubgelda autentiškumas XVI–XVII a. rašytinių šaltinių kontekste, *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. 18. Klaipėda : Klaipėda University Publishing House, 2015.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Both evaluation criteria are applicable to the researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century only partially.
- <sup>2</sup> In his work “Names of Lithuanian Gods” (*Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*) published in 1896, we find Usener’s attempt to investigate Praetorius’ – Jan Łasicki’s – Maciej Strykowski’s – god-names recorded in the resolutions of “Bishops Synods of 1530”. The initiator of the above mentioned study indicates that dr. Solmsen had helped him to accomplish the linguistic analysis of Baltic god-names: “Linguistic support, without which I could not have managed, was very willingly provided to me by my colleague Mr. dr. Felix Solmsen; he not only phonetically corrected and linguistically explained the god-names that were in my list, but also added valuable amendments from the sources and encouraged me to endeavour. So I can consider the alphabetical list provided here to be our joint work ..” (**Usener, Hermann.** *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung.* Bonn, 1896, p. 84). It should be emphasized that, among the researchers of BRM of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries there formed a tradition, with reference to the data of the mentioned work, to indicate Herman Usener as the main and the only author of the work.
- <sup>3</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 1, Vilnius : Mintis, 1995, p. 209.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 414.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 390.
- <sup>6</sup> “.. sailors and fishermen worshiped *Gardoytis* and the king of winds *Wėjopatis* ..; clearly the biggest part of names of Lithuanian gods are the names of characters of courageous and live derivation (nomina agentis) such as .. *Bangputỹs* – to name the producer of waves and storms .. . In addition to these, there are much newer names .. *Wėjopatis* ... It reveals how weak the power of imagination has become, so that one cannot create a new image, when to the concept of god one has to give a deity’s name which can be sensory perceived; one better yields to inertia requiring no effort and god’s name is made by adding any word the strand “patis” (**Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 1, Vilnius : Mintis, 1995, pp. 428, 429–430).
- <sup>7</sup> “*Bangpuỹs* which in the 32<sup>nd</sup> Rhesa’s song alternates with words “bangũ dėvąitis” (idol of waves), comprised of the Lithuanian word banga (wave) and a derivative of the root put- “pũsti” (blow) (pu czũ, pũsti derive from put-ju, put-ti), and thus means “bangũ pũtėjas” (a wave-blower). There are many words of such formation, cf. e. g. žmogũdỹs (murderer) from žmogũs (man) and žiui-aũ, žudỹti (to murder); krauleidỹs “kraujo leidėjas” (blood-lower) – from kraũjes (blood) and léid-mi “leidžiu” (I lower) .. “Bangũ pũtėjas” (Wave-blower) – this word is also interpreted by Nesselmann and associated with puczũ. Rhesa, and following him Kurschat (*Beiträge zur Kunde Litauischen Sprache.* Königsberg, 1849. Bd. 2. S. 72), translates it as “bangũ putotojas” (wave-splasher); puta (splash), putinu “darau putas” (I make splashes), putoju (I am splashing) (intr.). To me this interpretation seems less successful; at least, I have never come across such derivatives of a causative meaning” (*Ibid.*, p. 229).
- <sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 428–429.
- <sup>9</sup> **Rėza, Liudvikas Martynas.** *Dainos oder Litthauische Volkslieder gesammelt, übersetzt und mit gegenüberstehendem Urtext herausgegeben von L. J. Rhesa,* Königsberg, 1825, pp. 106, 108.
- <sup>10</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 2, Vilnius : Mintis, 1997, p. 255.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 20, 21.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 3, Vilnius : Mintis, 2004, p. 105.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 121–122.
- <sup>14</sup> **Balys, Jonas.** *Lietuvių mitologiškos sakmės*. London : Nida, 1956, pp. 13–14; **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 2, Vilnius : Mintis, 1997, pp. 401–402.
- <sup>15</sup> **Klimas, Petras.** *Lietuvių senovės bruožai*, Vilnius, 1919, pp. 164–165.
- <sup>16</sup> “Hence, when considering individual mythological names their authenticity and validity of derivation are very important” (**Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Mintis, 2004, p. 90).
- <sup>17</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 2. Vilnius : Mintis, 1997, p. 310.
- <sup>18</sup> It must be noted that not only one researcher had been misled by Edmund Veckenstedt’s fake work, it also came into Johannes Bolte’s range of vision. At first, Lithuanian cultural figures (first of all Jonas Basanavičius) did not notice any signs of faking in the mentioned work and even viewed the collection very favourably, but soon it was understood that the works are worthless (**Šlekonytė, Jūratė.** *Komparatyvistikos korifėjus: 150-ąsias Johano Boltės gimimo metines paminint*. Vol. 35, *Tautosakos darbai*, 2008, p. 332).
- <sup>18</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 2. Vilnius : Mintis, 1997, p. 310.
- <sup>19</sup> **Kazimieras, Būga.** *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 2. Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958, pp. 98–99; **Kazimieras, Būga.** *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 3. Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1961, p. 810.
- <sup>20</sup> **Akielewicz, Mikolaj.** *Gramatika języka litewskiego. Głosownia*. Pozna, 1890, p. 124.
- <sup>21</sup> **Jaskevičius, Valteris.** Jono Lasickio žemaičių dievai: lietuvių mitologijos studija. Translation from English language by Dainius Razauskas. *Liaudies kultūra*, Nr. 5. Vilnius : Grafija, 2010, p. 49.
- <sup>22</sup> Cf. **Ališauskas, Vytautas.** *Jono Lasickio pasakojimas apie žemaičių dievus. Tekstas ir kontekstai*. Vilnius : Aidai, 2012, p. 108.
- <sup>23</sup> **Jaskevičius, Valteris.** Jono Lasickio žemaičių dievai: lietuvių mitologijos studija. Translation from English language by Dainius Razauskas. *Liaudies kultūra*, Nr. 4. Vilnius : Grafija, 2010, p. 46.
- <sup>24</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Mintis, 2004, pp. 352–353.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.
- <sup>26</sup> 1) 1990 – **Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė.** *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*, Vilnius : Mokslas, 1990, p. 130; 2) 1969 – **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Mintis, 2004, p. 205. It must be noted that the monograph published in 1990 was published anew in 2007 – **Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė.** *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*, Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras, 2007 (editor Bendorienė, Aldona). This version is different from the original only that its bibliography is presented in the form of footnotes, which means that all the established factual inaccuracies (see Table 1) are reprinted.
- <sup>27</sup> **Pretorijus, Matas.** *Prūsijos įdomybės, arba Prūsijos regykla = Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2006, p. 273 (item I); 301 (II); 279 (III, IV, VI); 283 (VII).
- <sup>28</sup> Cf. **Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė.** *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*. Vilnius : Mokslas, 1990, p. 130 (items I–VII).
- <sup>29</sup> Mysovka (Lith. “Karklė”, Ger. “Karkeln”, Russ. “Каркельн”) is a settlement of Lithuania Minor in the northern part of Kaliningrad Oblast, in Slavsky District (cf.



- 
- Šilas, Sambora.** *Mažosios Lietuvos kultūros pėdsakai*. Vilnius : Mintis, 1990, pp. 201–202).
- <sup>30</sup> In this case the familiar priest Gotthard Isingius (in the manuscript incorrectly listed as N. Isingius). For more information cf. **Vičinskas, Žydrūnas.** Mato Pretorijaus mitinės medžiagos apie Perdoytus, Wejopattis, Gardouten, Bangpjts, Loubgelda autentiškumas XVI–XVII a. rašytinių šaltinių kontekste. *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. 18. Klaipėda : Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 2015, p. 188.
- <sup>31</sup> **Pretorijus, Matas.** *Prūsijos įdomybės, arba Prūsijos regykla = Deliciae Prussicae, oder Preussische Schaubühne*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2006, p. 283.
- <sup>32</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Mintis, 2004, p. 205.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 205.
- <sup>34</sup> It is paradoxical, but in the introductory theses of her monograph written in 1990 the author notices that “the functions of activity attributable to some gods are often unreliable, since each chronicler tried to add his own fantasy” (**Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė, Pranė.** *Senovės lietuvių mitologija ir religija*, p. 5). This implies that Dundulienė-Stukėnaitė seems to have realized the verification problem of the ancient written sources (as a whole), but she did not discuss the reliability of Praetorius’ data.
- <sup>35</sup> **Greimas, Algirdas Julius.** *Tautos atminties beiėskant: apie dievus ir žmones*. Vilnius : Mokslas; Chicago : Algimanto Mackaus knygu leidimo fondas, 1990, p. 128.
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 100–101.
- <sup>38</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*, Vol. 3. Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 2003, pp. 103–104.
- <sup>39</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Lietuvių mitologija*, Vol. 1. Vilnius : Mintis, 1995, p. 19.
- <sup>40</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas.** *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*, Vol. 1. Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996, p. 22.
- <sup>41</sup> **Narbutas, Ignas.** *Senieji lietuvininkų tikėjimai*. Kaunas : Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla, 1998, pp. 29–30.
- <sup>42</sup> Cf. **Beresnevičius, Gintaras.** *Trumpas lietuvių ir prūsų religijos žodynas*. Vilnius : Aidai, 2001, pp. 66–67, 104, 189–190.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 189–190.
- <sup>45</sup> On B2 – “It is mentioned by Praetorius in the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century: Bangputtys ein Gott des Sturms, hence it would be the god of storm, for the honour of which, according to Praetorius, a spoon would be stolen and later burned (a spoon is probably some kind of analogy of liquid, water)” (*Ibid.*, p. 66).
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- <sup>47</sup> On the other hand, in the analysed work there are positions where the author does not undertake to solve the problem of verification of a certain being – the issue of authenticity is left open, for example, when writing about L: “Another question – what are those goddesses? Narbutas thinks that it is the Goddess Žinia, spreading news, honour, rumour, but it is hardly credible” (*Ibid.*, p. 104).
- <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

- 
- <sup>49</sup> **Razauskas, Dainius.** *Vėjūkas: Lietuvių vėjo demono vardo ir įvaizdžio rekonstrukcija, atsižvelgiant į vieną skitų atitikmenį (osetinių wæjug / wæjyg).* Vilnius : Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004, p. 127.
- <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- <sup>51</sup> The first edition of the mentioned work by Rimantas Balsys appeared in 2006. It received valuable comments from reviewers (Libertas Klimka, Lina Petrošienė, Nijolė Laurinkienė), therefore in 2010 the book was republished. The second edition is different from the first that Balsys provides a larger number of systematised researches on deities and thus “30 new deities” appear in the monograph.
- <sup>52</sup> **Balsys, Rimantas.** *Lietuvių ir prūsų dievai, deivės, dvasios: nuo apeigos iki prietaro,* Klaipėda : Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 2010, pp. 286–292, 292–294, 442–443.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 294.
- <sup>54</sup> Geolinguistic research, in order to disclose authenticity of a god-name X, is a rational decision. However, we would like to note that when searching for toponyms that are related to theonym and showing links with mythologeme X it would be a good idea to present them on the map. It seems that such method would facilitate the solving of authenticity issue. Since Balsys uses tables of god-names, where he puts the systematised and the most essential information about mythologeme X, which implies that he is seeking the most systematic approach possible. Perhaps presenting toponyms on the map would allow to better “harmonise” the available geolinguistic data.
- <sup>55</sup> **Vičinskis, Žydrūnas.** Mato Pretorijaus mitinės medžiagos apie Perdoytus, Wejopattis, Gardouten, Bangpjts, Loubgelda autentiškumas XVI–XVII a. rašytinių šaltinių kontekste; **Kregždys, Rolandas.** Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė – dievybių funkcijos, hierarchija: Bardoyts / Gardoyts / Perdoyts. *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. 4. Klaipėda : Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 2008.
- <sup>56</sup> It should be noted that even though in some places of his monograph Balsys states that tales for their internationality are not the best tool when restoring functions and authenticity of a deity or mythical creature X (**Balsys, Rimantas.** *Lietuvių ir prūsų dievai, deivės, dvasios: nuo apeigos iki prietaro*, p. 162), but elsewhere, contradicting himself, when reconstructing functions of *Ragaina* he uses the material from tales (*Ibid.*, pp. 357–358).
- <sup>57</sup> Most probably, as a prototype of this type of work could be considered the already mentioned work “Trumpas lietuvių ir prūsų religijos žodynas” by Gintaras Beresnevičius which appeared in 2001 and where the author partly applies a similar scheme of research.
- <sup>58</sup> **Kregždys, Rolandas.** Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė, p. 101.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- <sup>60</sup> “Discussing the problem of the origin of a god-name, it is useful to start from the presumption by Kazimieras Būga (RR II 98 Vol.) (**Būga, Kazimieras.** *Rinktiniai raštai*, Vol. 2. Composed by Z. Zinkevičius. Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1959.) that the name of a deity is to be interpreted as an old compound consisting of Lith. dial. gārdas “ship” (such lexeme is witnessed only in Mikalojus Akelaitis’ dictionary) and Lith. dial. áitas “who goes and goes = tomboy” Kp. Further Buga’s (cf. II, 99 RR) patronymic interpretation of a suffix presupposes the fallacy of such hypothesis – it is impossible to understand why a

---

compound is suddenly interpreted as a derivative, i. e. it is stated that the idol *Gardaitas* is the son of Prussian god \*Gardas. It is evident that such Būga's reasoning is merely an example of folk etymology, not credible both linguistically and mythologically. It is known that a number of unsuccessful hypotheses presented in the work "Aistiški studijai" .. (**Būga, Kazimieras**. *Rinktiniai raštai*, Vol. 3. Composed by Z. Zinkevičius. Vilnius : Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1961) had been later abandoned, although this hypothesis remained because of the origin of the name of this deity" (**Kregždys, Rolandas**. Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė, p. 82).

<sup>61</sup> **Kregždys, Rolandas**. Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė, pp. 83–85.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 84–85.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 87–88.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>67</sup> **Vėlius, Norbertas**. *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*. Vol. 4. Vilnius : Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 2005, p. 164.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>69</sup> E. g. "It may be so that the name that has been until now considered as an absolutely obvious is much more complex and informative in design, which reflects functions of this deity (see further). All three elements *Bardoaitis* A et. al, *Gardoaythus* C et. al, *Perdoytus* J et. al of a theonym can be interpreted as compounds, where the first component is different: Prussian \*bara- "spree; popple, boiling, heating" // Prussian \*gara- "heat; steam(s)" // Prussian \*pāra "steam(s)", and the second component is the same: *dāit*- 3 sg. praet. "gave" .. should be reconstructed theonyms: v. bl. \**Bar-dāitis*, \**Gar-dāitis*, \**Pār-dāitis* \*"the one who makes the [water] popple, boil, spree" → \*"the one who causes the storm" = \*" god of storm" .. (**Kregždys, Rolandas**. Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė, pp. 88–89).

<sup>70</sup> **Kregždys, Rolandas**. Teonimų, minimų „Sūduvių knygelėje“, etimologinė analizė, p. 97.