

Names of Germanic Origin in Latin and Romance Sources in the Study of Germanic Phonology

JAMES W. MARCHAND

SINCE FRIEDRICH KLUGE'S *Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte* (1891) it has been the custom for Germanic scholars to cite Germanic names in Latin sources in dealing with the absolute chronology of sound changes in Germanic and in differentiating between Common Germanic and Proto-Germanic sound changes. Since the work of E. Mackel, W. Bruckner, F. Wrede, and W. Meyer-Lübke in the last few decades of the previous century, Germanic names in the Romance languages and in Vulgar Latin have formed the principal source for the study of the pronunciation and grammar of the East Germanic languages (with the exception of Wulfilian Gothic), such as Gothic, Vandalic, and Burgundian, all of which have no modern descendants and no written documents of any extent. Since these names are so widely cited and their evidence is taken so seriously by scholars,¹ it seems proper that they be investigated from the point of view of onomastic method, since most of the early writers operated with an implicit methodology which is often difficult for the present-day investigator to grasp,

¹ Cf. E. Gamillscheg, *Romania Germanica*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1934–36); Fr. Kluge, *Pauls Grundriss*, Vol. I (Strassburg, 1891), 316 ff., 356 ff.; A. Noreen, *Abriss der urgermanischen Lautlehre* (Strassburg, 1894), 14 ff., passim; W. Streitberg, *Urgermanische Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1896), § 55, passim; E. Schwarz, *Goten, Nordgermanen, Angelsachsen* (Bern, 1951), 48 ff.; O. Höfler, "Stammbaumtheorie, Wellentheorie, Entfaltungstheorie," *PBB* (Tübingen) LXXVII (1956), 30–66, 78–130; LXXVIII (1957) 1–44; idem, *Die zweite Lautverschiebung bei Ostgermanen und Goten* (Tübingen, 1958). Höfler's work is based almost entirely on onomastic sources. A more sober view of onomastic evidence is taken by Fr. van Coetsem, *Das System der starken Verba und die Periodisierung im älteren Germanischen* (Amsterdam, 1956), though he makes rich use of such material.

and especially since onomastic science has made such great advances since the turn of the century.

In attempting to use onomastic sources in the study of pronunciation, the investigator must constantly keep the following points in mind: 1. The sound system of the two languages in question; the situation may be such that a particular phoneme in one language may have the range of two phonemes in the other language, so that it may be rendered now by the one, now by the other phoneme. 2. The possibilities of sound substitution; an unfamiliar sound or sound sequence may be replaced by a familiar one. 3. The transmission of the name; if we do not have the name in the form given to it by the person originally reporting it, but only in later sources, we must determine what the influence of the later source is. 4. The informant from whom the name was originally gotten; is the information first-hand, or has it gone through another language or dialect, where it may have been distorted? 5. The orthographic practices of the scribes reporting the name; a seeming alternation may actually be merely graphic in nature. 6. The treatment of names from other languages; if the treatment of Germanic names, for example, is assumed to reveal a sound change, we must check names from other sources; if they have undergone the same change, it is probably not Germanic. 7. The tradition of handling foreign names and words; is there a fixed tradition which may have influenced the transmission of the words? If these questions are not continually asked, the investigator runs the risk of vitiating a fine piece of collecting work by using unsound methodology. The following discussion is meant to point out some particularly glaring errors in previous work, caused by the lack of observance of proper onomastic method. The material is arranged according to points of pronunciation.

1. *Proto-Germanic Umlaut*. It is widely assumed by Germanic scholars that, sometime during the Proto-Germanic period, PIE *e became umlauted through the influence of a following *i*-sound, and perhaps also **u*, the resulting sound being Proto-Germanic **i*.² Several scholars, however, beginning with F. Kluge, have pointed out that the evidence of Germanic names in Latin sources contradicts the assumption of a Proto-Germanic umlaut of **e* to **i*, since several names, such as *Segimerus*, *Segimundus*, *Herminones*, *Gepides*,

² For a discussion of views and bibliography see my article: "Germanic **i* and **e* — Two Phonemes or One?" *Language* XXXIII (1957), 346–354.

which are attested in the first and second century A. D., still show *e* before *i*.³ It is thus assumed by such scholars that the umlaut of **e* to **i* is Common Germanic, not Proto-Germanic. Indeed, this assumption of the late date of the sound change is the cornerstone for the new theories of umlaut in Germanic presented by O. Höfler and Fr. van Coetsem.⁴ In order to uphold the usual theory of Proto-Germanic umlaut, scholars have offered several assumptions to account for the *e* in these Latin sources. H. Collitz assumed Celtic influence, which he assumed also to cause the hesitation observed in Latin MSS between *e* and *i* since this hesitation is particularly frequent in the Latin of France.⁵ Several scholars assumed that the Germanic **i* had a wide range of actualizations, so that Latin speakers could hear it now as *i* now as *e*.⁶ The problem has been, it seems to me, posed in the wrong way. Until the Latin transmission of the name and Latin scribal practices have been thoroughly explored, we should not try to offer an explanation. The forms with Σεγϛ- often cited from Strabo do not exist, but are conjecture of the editors, based naturally on Tacitus.⁷ The *Segi-* of Cass. Dio (LVI 19, 2) is probably based on Tacitus. Thus the only real source of *Segi-* is Tacitus (Ann. I, 71), who was writing in the latter half of the first century A. D. But Velleius Paterculus (II, 118,2), writing before the middle of the first century has *Sigimerus*. The question is then naturally: which of the two is the more trustworthy? There can be no doubt as to this; in spite of the esteem in which Tacitus is generally held by Germanic scholars, it must be Velleius. Tacitus was probably never in Germany, but Velleius was not only in Germany, he was personally acquainted with Arminius, and had ample opportunity to hear the names of Cheruscian princes at first-hand.⁸

³ Kluge, op. cit., 356 ff.; O. Bremer, *ZfdPh* XXII (1890), 251 ff.; E. Schwarz, op. cit., 51 ff.; Noreen, op. cit., p. 15; D. B. Shumway, "IE *i* and *e* in Germanic," *Modern Philology* III (1906), 385-394.

⁴ Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie," 89 ff.; van Coetsem, op. cit., 32 ff. It is necessary for both scholars to assume that umlaut took place in the separate languages, not in Proto-Germanic, cf. my review of van Coetsem soon to appear in *Language*.

⁵ H. Collitz, "Segimer oder: Germanische Namen in keltischem Gewande," *JEGPh* VI (1906-7), 253-306.

⁶ R. C. Boer, *Oergermaansch Handboek*, 2nd ed. (Haarlem, 1924), § 40, Anm. 1; M. Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen* (Heidelberg, 1911), XVIII ff.

⁷ Cf. Schönfeld, op. cit., 204 ff.

⁸ Cf. Collitz, op. cit., 254 f.; E. Schwarz, *Germanische Stammeskunde* (Heidelberg, 1956), p. 10.

What might account for the *e* in Tacitus? From the beginning of our era, we hear of a confusion of *e* and *i* in Latin noted by Quintilian and Varro.⁹ We can also observe an interchange of *e* and *i* on inscriptions and occasionally in manuscripts.¹⁰ Since both Quintilian and Varro consider the pronunciation of *e* for *i* to be "rustic", we must assume that it was found among the common folk, especially of the outlying territories, those who would be likely to be fighting the Germans. If Tacitus' informant was a "rustic," as he might well have been, it would be natural to expect an *e* for an *i* in his speech. All this is speculation, however; in order to prove that this assumption is approximately correct, we must ask what was the Latin treatment of names from other sources. In Greek names borrowed during this period and later, we find *e* for *iota* quite frequently, especially in popular borrowings.¹¹ Since there is no evidence in Greek for an change of *i* to *e*, we must assume that the rendering of *iota* by *e* is based on the situation of *i* and *e* (i. e. ĩ and ē etymologically) Latin, which, as is known, often fell together in Vulgar Latin. As to *Gepides*, this name is attested only in sources from around 300 A. D., first with the form *Gipedae*, so that it does not come into question. In view of all these facts, the evidence of Latin for the late date of the Germanic umlaut of **e* to **i* is invalid. This is demonstrated by an investigation of the transmission of the names, the phonological and graphic situation of *i/e* in Latin, and the manner of handling names and words from other languages.

2. *Germanic e + ŋ + guttural > i + ŋ + guttural*. It is almost universally assumed that the latin reflexes of Germanic **eŋg* (i. g. *ing*) afford us a terminus ante quem for the change of **eŋg* > **iŋg*,¹² and that this change is Common Germanic rather than Proto-Ger-

⁹ Cited by E. Seelmann, *Die Aussprache des Latein* (Heilbronn, 1885), 166.

¹⁰ Cf. Seelmann, op. cit., p. 202; W. Lindsay, *Die lateinische Sprache* (Leipzig, 1897), 263; Fr. Stolz, *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1894), 137. In the *Appendix Probi* (Keil IV, 199, 10) we read: *Sirena non Serena* and (198, 5) *senatus non sinatus*, which attests to the confusion of *e* and *i*. The confusion in Vulgar Latin manuscripts is too well known to need confirmation, but see below.

¹¹ Cf. Th. Claussen, "Die griechischen Wörter im Französischen," *Romanische Forschungen* XV (1904), 855–857.

¹² K. Helm, "Die Chronologie des Überganges von germ. *e* zu *i* vor $\eta + k g \chi$," *PBB* XXIII (1898), 555–58; Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie," pp. 78 ff.; E. Schwarz, *Goten, Nordgermanen, Angelsachsen*, p. 52.

manic. Names such as *Inguaeones*, *Mars Thingsus*, *Tulingi* (Caesar), etc. are supposed to show that the change of **eng* > **ing* was already accomplished by the middle of the first century B. C., while Finnish *rengas* (< Gmc. **hrengaz*) is supposed to have been borrowed before the change. In both cases, however, we probably have to do with sound substitution. In Latin, the well known sound change of *eɣ* to *iɣ* removed *eɣ* from the sound system, so that a Germanic **eɣ* would naturally be pronounced *iɣ* and spelled *in* + guttural. In Finnish, both *-engas* and *-ingas* are possible, but *-eng-* could well represent sound substitution for *-ing-*, as is shown by the modern Finnish loan word *renki* "bucket" borrowed in modern times (cf. the ending) from Norwegian dialectal *ring* "milk-pail."¹³

Although it is my personal opinion that **eng* became **ing* in Proto-Germanic, it must be pointed out that, because of the comparison of the two systems, i. e. the lack of *eng* in Latin, the Latin evidence is worthless. The Finnish evidence for the late preservation of **eɣ* is likewise invalid, since we have a modern loan with *-eng-* from a word with *-ing-*.

3. *The loss of Germanic ɳ before velar spirant.* It is almost universally assumed that Germanic **aɳχ* became, at least in most dialects, **āχ*. The time of this change in the various Germanic languages is disputed, especially since we have the evidence of the "Oldest Norse Grammarian" for the retention of the nasal in 12th century Norse.¹⁴ It is usually assumed that the name *Hanhavaldis* (CIL XIII, 3682) shows that Burgundian still had *aɳχ* in the 5th/6th century.¹⁵ First, we must point out that it is improper to cite hapax legomena as evidence of pronunciation in dealing with onomastic sources; we all know how personal names may get distorted in

¹³ H. Fromm, "Die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Finnischen," *ZfdA* LXXXVIII (1957), p. 95.

¹⁴ The evidence offered by the "Oldest Norse Grammarian" is disputed; for a history of the problem and a translation, see Einar Haugen, "The Oldest Norse Grammarian," *Language Monograph No. 25* (Baltimore, 1950).

¹⁵ Schwarz, *Goten, Nordgermanen, Angelsachsen*, p. 54; R. Much, *ZfdA* XXXV (1892), 363; H. Hirt, *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, Vol. I (Heidelberg, 1931), 111f.; E. Schröder, "Nasalschwund vor ɰ außerhalb des Sächsischen," *ZfdA* LX (1923), 198f.; Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie," p. 47, footnote 4. Finnish *hanko* "drinking vessel," which was often cited in this question, was demonstrated by Bj. Collinder, *Die urgermanischen Lehnwörter im Finnischen*, Part I (Uppsala, 1932), p. 72, to be not a Germanic loan, but an internal Finnish development. Cf. also Fromm, op. cit., p. 85.

borrowing. Secondly, we should not be at all surprised to find *Hanhavaldus* for Burgundian **Hāha-* in Latin, since the writing of *Vn* for *V* before spirants (i. e. *s*) is a common feature of Late and Vulgar Latin.¹⁶ Thus, the evidence of *Hanhavaldus* for the retention of *anyx* in Burgundian is shown to be invalid by an investigation of scribal practices in Latin, which, of course, may ultimately go back to a sound change in Latin.

4. *The retention of PIE o in unaccented syllables in Germanic.* It is generally assumed that PIE **o* became Proto-Germanic **a* with the exception that, in unaccented syllables, *o* was retained until ca. 300 A. D.,¹⁷ so that the change of **-o-* to **-a-* is a common Germanic change. The basis of this assumption is the Latin evidence, Germanic names such as *Chariovalda*, *Inguiomerus*, *Langobardi*, *Gundomadus*, *Chonodomarius*, *Hariobaudus*, *Vadomarius*, *Mallobaudes*, etc., where **o* is changed to **a* in accented syllables, but is rendered by *o* in unaccented syllables. O. Bremer, however, has shown that IE**o* was only retained in unaccented syllables in Gmc. words in three cases: the ending *-os* in Greek, the ending *-ones* in Latin, and the thematic vowel.¹⁸ In other cases in unaccented position, however, we find *a*: *Adrana* (Tacitus, Ann. 1, 56), *Arbalo* (Pliny 11, 55), *Marsaci* (Tacitus, Hist. 4, 56), *Gannascus* (Tacitus, Ann. 11, 18. 99), *Gavadiae*, *Idisiaviso* (Tacitus, Ann. 2, 16), *Abiaman*, *Alateiviae*, *Arvagastiae*, *Halamardus*, etc. Thus the rule that unaccented *-o-* is retained is incorrect. K. Eulenburg, noting that all the cases of *-o-* for *-a-* occur before labial, wants to make the labial a condition for its retention, pointing to the fact that West and North Germanic seem to have reflexes of a Germanic *-om-* dative instead of the **-am-* dative presupposed by Gothic.¹⁹ This cannot be true, since we find such names as *Abiaman*, *Halamardus*, *Idisiaviso* with *-a-* before

¹⁶ Fr. Stolz-A. Debrunner, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1953), p. 104, mention *occansione*, *herens*, *Inside*, *thēnsaurus*; a large number are mentioned by W. Corssen, *Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1868), 255 ff. Cf. also Fritz Werner, *Die Latinität der Gética des Jordanis* (Halle, 1908), 18.; where examples from the Jordanes manuscripts are cited. The *Appendix Probi* has an orthoepic statement against *occansio* for *occasio*.

¹⁷ Kluge, op. cit., 316 f.; Noreen, op. cit., p. 17 Anm. 2; Streitberg, op. cit., p. 46; O. Bremer, "Urgermanisches *a* in unbetonter Silbe, *IF* XIV (1903), 363–367; Schwarz, *Goten, Nordgermanen, Angelsachsen*, 49 ff.

¹⁸ Bremer, loc. cit.

¹⁹ K. Eulenburg, *IF* XVI (1904), p. 37; Boer, op. cit., § 71.

labials, as well as such names as *Austrogoti*, *Gomoarius*, *Odoleus*, *Theodoricus*, *Vitrodorus* with *-o-* not before a labial. Since we find Gothic names about 300 A. D. with medial *-a-*, such as *Alaricus*, Noreen has assumed that this change of **-o-* to **-a-* took place in Gothic about that time, in the West Germanic languages even later.²⁰ In the earliest North Germanic inscriptions we find already *-a-*, as in *AljamarkiR* (Kärstad, 3rd century). Bremer has certainly shown that the rule "IE unaccented *-o-* remained in Germanic, whereas accented *o* became *a*" is incorrect; Eulenburg's reservation for *-o-* will not bear up under close scrutiny. How can we account for the Latin hesitation between *-o-* and *-a-* in these Germanic names? The Romans always had difficulty with the unaccented *a* and *o* of foreign words, especially Greek words, since Latin compound words usually had *-i-* rather than *-o-* as a thematic.²¹ After the use of Greek names became common, it was the custom to use the medial *-o-* in Latin, even in names which had no *-o-* in Greek, such as *Tolomaeus* (< Πτολεμαῖος), and in Latin names such as *Ahenobarbus*. Also, the first authors in which we find such Germanic names are Greek;²² the Romans already had the custom of writing *-o-* as the thematic in Greek names and in Celtic names, and the Germanic names, which contained a vowel in an unfamiliar position were simply placed in the mold of tradition. That this is true is seen by the number of times *-o-*, *-io-* are written falsely, as in *Langiobardi*, *Graotingi*, *Gundobadus*, *Aiulfus*, *Augoflada*, *Baioarii*, etc. It is also to be noted that many of the Germanic names, such as *Ambiomarcae*, *Belsoaldus*, have Celtic first components, and have certainly undergone Celtic influence. The names with *-o-*, *-io-* are found for the most part in works of historians, whereas the inscriptions definitely prefer *-a-*, *-ia-*, when the first component is not Celtic. Thus, the assumption of a retention of unaccented *-o-*, based on onomastic sources, is shown to be invalid by: 1. citing contrary evidence; 2. bringing in the Latin traditions of writing foreign names; 3. showing how this tradition has been applied also in names

²⁰ Noreen, loc. cit.

²¹ Claussen, op. cit., pp. 802 ff., especially 806 ff.

²² With the exception perhaps of Caesar, where Celtic influence is obvious. Since Strabo was used so often in later works as a source, it is natural to assume that his Greek manner of writing, with *-o-* as the thematic vowel in compounds, would have a great deal of influence.

which could not have had *-o- in Germanic; 4. pointing out known cases of Celtic and Greek transmission of names.

5. Germanic *ei > *ī. It is generally assumed that, sometime in the Proto-Germanic period, *ei > *ī. Many scholars think, however, that the existence of *ei* in a Latin inscription of uncertain date (CIR 197), containing the name *Alateiviae* (Dat. Sg.), on the Negau helmet (*teiva*), and in the name of the Carelian rye-god (*Runkoteivas*, *Rukotiivo*, *Runkateira*, *Runkoteera*, *Runka tei vai*, *Runkat ei vaan*, *Runkas ei vaan*, *Rukitahvana*, *Rukitehvana*)²³ speaks unequivocally for a retention of *ei past the Proto-Germanic period.²⁴ It has been assumed by A. Holder that the name *Alateivia* is Celtic in origin and has nothing to do with the Germanic tribes.²⁵ If it is Germanic, as most seem to think, the existence of *ei* here would not offer evidence for the retention of *ei into Common Germanic times, since *ei* is merely a common Latin spelling for *ī*, as we know from inscriptions and manuscripts as well as from orthoepic and grammarians' statements.²⁶ As for *Runkoteivas*, the transmission of the name wavers, as can be seen. Whatever the tradition, however, this word cannot be cited for the existence of *ei in late Proto-Germanic, since *-teiva* is a loan-word from Baltic and not from Germanic, as numerous scholars have shown.²⁷ As for the evidence of the helmet of Negau: it is of unknown date and provenience, written in an alphabet of a North Italic type, but not yet localized. If we accept the common dating on external grounds it comes from about the turn of the 1st century, that is, the time when Latin influence was being more and more felt in the North Italic alphabets. If we assume Latin influence, as is probable, the *ei* for *ī* is perfectly normal. Even if we do not assume Latin influence, the use of *ei* for *ī* in a Greek/Etruscan

²³ All these forms are cited by K. B. Wiklund, *IF* XXXVIII (1917), 95f.

²⁴ Schwarz, *op. cit.*, p. 55; Hirt, *op. cit.*, 38f.; K. Reichardt, *Language* XXIX (1953), p. 307; van Coetsem, *op. cit.*, p. 18. The names cited in support of the theory of the retention of *ei by S. Gutenbrunner, *Die germanischen Götternamen der antiken Inschriften* (Halle, 1936), p. 14 (*Freioverus*, *Freio*, *Freiatte*, beside *Friatto*, *Friattius*) are all of Celtic origin; cf. Schönfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

²⁵ Cf. A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, cited by Schönfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 11. R. Much, *Wörter und Sachen* VI, 219, thinks that Holder has a tendency to call Germanic names Celtic and that he went too far in many cases.

²⁶ Cf. Stolz-Debrunner, pp. 71, 87, 89, 101; van Coetsem, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Hirt, *op. cit.*, p. 39; Corssen, *op. cit.*, 330ff.

²⁷ H. Fromm, *op. cit.*, 85f.; Chr. Stang, *Die Welt der Slaven* I, 136ff.; P. Skardzius, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* XXVI (1958), 375-382.

derived alphabet has nothing incongruous about it. The Messapic alphabet (though not North Italic) which is derived from Greek has *ei* for \bar{i} , as is seen by the existence of *deiva*, *diva* side by side.²⁸

It has been shown in this section that the Latin, Finnish, and inscripational evidence is untenable in discussing **ei* in Proto-Germanic. This was demonstrated by considering the scribal tradition in Latin inscriptions, by pointing out that the Carelian word in question is not Germanic in origin, and by pointing out the tenuous nature of the evidence offered by a hapax legomenon on an inscription on a movable object of unknown date and provenience, and by pointing out the possibility that *ei* here is written for \bar{i} ,

6. *What is the value of early onomastic sources in the study of Germanic?* One may well ask after so many negative criticisms on my part if I think there is any thing of value to be found in the study of Germanic names in Latin sources. As is almost always the case, a careful scrutiny of the names, with regard for proper onomastic method, will yield some results. Thus, for example, the inscriptions containing the matron-names *Vatvims* (CIL XIII, 7892; 8510) and *Aflims* (CIL XIII, 8157) offer us welcome evidence for the fact that the dative plural in West Germanic still preserved the *-s/-z* of Proto-Germanic,²⁹ since no explanation from Latin or Celtic could account for the *-ims* ending. Words such as *Chariovalda* (Tacitus, Ann. II, 11), *Nasua* (Caesar, I, 37, 7) offer evidence that *-a* existed also in West Germanic beside **-ō* as the Nom. Masc. *n*-stem ending, since Germanic **-ō*, corresponding as it does to a common Latin ending, would have been rendered by an *-o*.³⁰ These two points illustrate the kind of morphological and (marginally) phonological evidence which can be abstracted from the Germanic names in Latin sources if the evidence is sifted carefully. Of course, these are of great value for the history of Germanic names, often providing us with insights into Germanic name-giving and, *mutatis mutandis*, Germanic life which we could not have gotten otherwise.

²⁸ Cf. J. Whatmough, *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*, Vol. II (London, 1933), p. 596 and Nos. 484, 459, 460; p. 619.

²⁹ J. Kern, "Germaansche Woorden in Latijnsche Opschriften aan den Beneden-Rijn," *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afd. Letterkunde, 2de reeks, 2de deel (Amsterdam, 1872), 334 ff.; R. Much, *ZfdPh* XXXI (1899), 357; XXXV (1903) 316; Streitberg, *op. cit.*, § 172.

³⁰ Cf. H. van Helten, *PBB* XXVIII (1902) 512, footnote 2 and XXIX (1903) 344 ff.

East Germanic Names in Romance Sources

Ever since F. Dietrich first introduced Gothic names in Romance into the study of Gothic pronunciation in 1862, these names have been used by scholars in determining the pronunciation of Late Gothic.³¹ The most ambitious of these attempts was that of F. Wrede, who not only used these names to write a phonetic description of "Ostrogothic" phonemes, but also used this description to determine the pronunciation of Wulfilian Gothic.³² Wrede's attempt to write such a description of "Ostrogothic" failed because of his collection method, and because he failed to take Vulgar Latin scribal practices into consideration.³³ Nevertheless, though no one would take Wrede's conclusions seriously today, his method is still followed. This much should be evident: 1. no one should make definite statements about what can and cannot occur until the material has been exhausted; 2. all the considerations mentioned above must be kept in mind in interpreting the data after collection.

7. *Umlaut in Gothic?* Various scholars have expressed the opinion that Wulfilian Gothic could have had phonetic umlaut, without the spelling having indicated this.³⁴ E. Gamillscheg and, following him, O. Höfler have expressed the opinion that Gothic names and loans in the Romance languages demonstrate the existence of umlaut in Gothic, which was, according to Höfler, phonemic.³⁵ The following evidence is cited by these two scholars:

³¹ F. Dietrich, *Über die Aussprache des Gotischen* (Marburg, 1862); W. Bruckner, *Charakteristik der germanischen Elemente im Italienischen* (Strassburg, 1899); E. Mackel, *Die germanischen Elemente in der französischen Sprache* (Strassburg, 1884); F. Wrede, "Die Sprache der Ostgoten in Italien," *Quellen und Forschungen* LXVIII (Strassburg, 1891); E. Gamillscheg, "Romania Germanica," *Pauls Grundriss*, 3d ed., Vol. XI, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1934-36); Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie."

³² Cf. F. Wrede, *Stamm-Heyne's Ulfilas*, 11th ed. (Paderborn, 1908), 286-315; for others who have cited such evidence, see M. H. Jellinek, *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1926), p. 30; W. Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, 3rd and 4th ed. (Heidelberg, 1910), p. 53f.

³³ Cf. Streitberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 55, 61, § 16.3, Anm. 1; Fr. Kauffmann, *ZfdPh* XXXI (1899) 92 ff. On the inadequacy of Wrede's collecting, see especially R. Kögel, *AfdA* XVIII (1892) 43 ff., 313 ff.

³⁴ On this possibility see J. Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik* 2nd ed., Vol. I, p. 42; 3rd ed., Vol. I, p. 75; Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie," p. 49, footnote 1.

³⁵ Gamillscheg, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 24, 33 ff.; Höfler, "Entfaltungstheorie," (1958) p. 35 ff. Höfler's statement (p. 36) that there was a phonemic distinction between the unlauded and non-unlauded vowels is based on a misunderstanding of phonemic

1. Gothic accented *-o-* is rendered in Romance by *-ō-* (i. e. close *o*). When it appears before *-j-*, however, it is rendered by *-u-* (i. e. close *u*). Only one word, Vulgar Latin *rutiare*, Toscan *ruciare*, Italian *sgarucciare* (<Goth. **wrotjan*) "to root of pigs", can be cited in proof of this sound-law, and Gamillscheg himself points out that this makes it uncertain.³⁶

2. Gothic accented *-i-* is usually rendered in Romance by *-e-*. In certain words, however, it appears as *-i-*: words compounded with *wilja-*, such as *Guilhafonse*; words compounded with *giba-*, such as *Gibila*, *Gipelinus*, *Gibaleaux*; in the loan words *grimms*, *grimmjan*, *grimmija*; in the loan word *priskan* in Spanish and Portuguese but not in Italian; *skilla* in Italian and South French dialects. Only these few words are cited by Gamillscheg in support of his sound law. He explains *wilja* and *grimmjan* as the result of *-j-* umlaut; the *i* of *grimmjan*, he thinks, must have influenced the other forms of this stem. In the case of *giba* and *priskan*, the surrounding consonants may have caused the retention of *-i-* after borrowing into Romance, as also in the case of *skilla*, where the palatal *k*, *g* may have caused the "change" of *-e-* to *-i-*. Only the *-j-* umlaut is Gothic according to him.

3. Gothic accented *-u-* is usually replaced in Romance by *-ō-* (i. e. close *o*). That is, just as in Romance, Gothic **-ō-* and **-ū-* fall together upon being borrowed. In some words, however, we find not *-ō-* but *-u-* for Gothic *-u-*: *kruski*, *bruk*, *ufjo* everywhere; *brusti*, *brustja* and *buggja*, except in Southern France. The loan word *mudw-* has *-ō-* in the West, *-u-* in Italian. Gamillscheg and Höfler explain these forms as due to *-j-* umlaut or to related forms with *-j-* umlaut. In the case of *mudw-* Gamillscheg thinks of *w-* umlaut.

First, it must be pointed out that a phonetic law based on only six forms (the number containing *-j-*) is rather a doubtful one. Gamillscheg's method of collection leaves much to be desired, and he has not by any means exhausted the material.³⁷ Moreover his materials

theory. Since the umlauted vowels appeared, according to his theory, only before *-j-* of the next syllable, and the non-umlauted vowels never appeared in that position, they were in complementary distribution and were members of the same phoneme.

³⁶ Op. cit., p. 33, footnote 1.

³⁷ Cf. J. Jud, *Vox Romania* II, 1 ff.; G. Rohlfs, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* CLXXI, 88 ff.; W. von Wartburg, *ZrP* LIX, 302 ff.

are gathered from every period in the history of the languages in question, without regard to the scribal peculiarities or the dialects involved. Gamillscheg and Höfler fail to note contrary evidence in their own materials: **ingrimjis*, for example, yields Portuguese *ingreme* "terrible," thus contradicting the assumption of a uniform **grim-* base for **grimmjan*, etc. *Geba-* occurs alongside of *Giba-* (cf. *Geberic* [Cassiodor IV, 20], *Gebamundus* [Chronica Minora II, 1, p. 198]), so that Gamillscheg's statement that *Giba-* is universal is incorrect. Thus, the hesitation between *e* and *i*, *o* and *u* can be merely a result of the common scribal hesitation in Vulgar Latin and later.³⁸

In addition to these considerations, which lessen our opinion of Gamillscheg's trustworthiness, since we know he did not consult many Romance name collections, there is another of a more serious nature: he failed to assure himself that the "change" in question did not also take place in Romance. In Ibero-Romance Latin *-ǔ-* and Latin *-ō-* fall together in the *-o-* phoneme. This phoneme has two main allophones: [o] and [u], the latter occurring before consonant + *j* and *k*-clusters.³⁹ Vulgar Latin *-e-* (< **ē, i*) becomes in Spanish and Portuguese *-i-* before consonant + *j* and *k*-clusters.⁴⁰ Thus the *-u-* for Gothic **-ō-*, **-u-* (i. e. Romance /-o-/) before consonant + *j* and before *k*-clusters, and the *-i-* for Gothic **i* (i. e. Romance /-I-/ in the same position represent the normal Romance development of these phonemes, and have nothing to do with the phonetics of Gothic.

8. A "second sound-shift" in Gothic? Gothic names in Romance sources have been used by three scholars to demonstrate the existence of a sound-shift of voiced stops (?) to voiceless stops in Late Gothic.⁴¹ By far the most ambitious of these attempts is that of

³⁸ Cf. above. For a statistical survey of the scribal alternation between *e* and *i*, *o* and *u*, see Frieda N. Politzer and Robert L. Politzer, *Romance Trends in 7th and 8th Century Latin Documents*, University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures XXI (Chapel Hill, 1953).

³⁹ Cf. H. Lausberg, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Vol. I (Berlin, 1956), p. 124f.

⁴⁰ Lausberg, op. cit., p. 125.

⁴¹ F. Dietrich, op. cit., p. 81ff.; Theodor Steche, "Zeit und Ursache der hochdeutschen Lautverschiebung," *ZfdPh* LXII (1937), 1-56; O. Höfler, "Die hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung und ihre Gegenstücke bei Goten, Vandalen, Langobarden und Burgundern," *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse (1957), 294-318; idem, *Die zweite Lautverschiebung bei Ostgermanen und Westgermanen* (Sonderabdruck aus *PBB* [Tübingen], 1958).

O. Höfler, who has written an entire book on the subject, so that it is primarily at Höfler's attempt that our remarks must be directed. Höfler assumes that the fact that Gothic *b d g* are occasionally rendered in Romance names by *p t k* entitles us to the assumption that *b d g* had shifted in Gothic to *p t k*, "not to pure tenuis, not to speak of a tenuis aspirata, but, comparable to OHG, rather to a voiceless semi-fortis, perhaps in part only to a voiceless media."⁴² In other words, Höfler is attempting to read a detailed phonetic description out of the treatment of foreign names, a daring procedure, to say the least, and one which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any present-day situation known to me.

Several points unite to vitiate the fine collecting work which Höfler has done: 1. The argumentation is based solely on onomastic sources, without regard to the evidence of other loans; 2. he fails to take the time and place of the borrowing or reporting into consideration; 3. he fails to concern himself with the orthographic practices of the reporting scribes; 4. he neglects the time and place of the borrowing or reporting and the phonemic structures in question.

His assumption of a Gothic sound shift is based, as mentioned, on the following evidence: Gothic *b d g* are often rendered in names borrowed in Spain, Southern France, and Northern Italy as *p t k*, though only sporadically. He points out that there is nothing in the history of Spanish, Portuguese, French, or Italian which might account for this occasional writing of *p t k* for *b d g*, and that, therefore, the orthographic hesitation must indicate something about the phonetics of Gothic. But it is not proper to concern ourselves with the history of these languages in the matter of Gothic loans, since these loans and names were transferred to Romance during the Vulgar Latin (Proto-Western Romance?) stage. In other words, the question has been wrongly posed, and we should rather ask: Is there anything in the structure or writing system of Vulgar Latin (respectively, Proto-Western Romance) which might account for the occasional writing of *p t k* for *b d g*. First, let us look at the system of the Western Romance consonants concerned:

⁴² "... kaum bis zur Tenuis pura, geschweige denn bis zu einer Tenuis aspirata ..., sondern — vergleichbar dem Althochdeutschen — eher zu einer stimmlosen Semifortis, vielleicht z. T. nur einer stimmlosen Media." (op. cit., p. 8).

	Post-consonantly and after pause	Post-vocalically ⁴³
I.	p t k	b d g
II.	b d g	,

and compare it with the Gothic system:

p t k	p t k
b d g	b d g. ⁴⁴

Gothic intervocalic *b d g* are naturally associated with Row I of the above Western Romance system, Gothic *p t k* falling together for the most part with the products of medial *-pp-*, *-tt-*, *-kk-* of Latin.⁴⁵ In the writing system of Vulgar Latin, the sounds of Row I above are written interchangeably as *p t k* or *b d g*, that is, we find *b d g* written for Latin *p t k*, but also *p t k* written for Latin *b d g*.⁴⁶ In other words, we find the same treatment of Latin and Gothic *b d g*; if we consider the treatment of Gothic names to offer evidence of a sound-shift, then the Latin words offer evidence of a sound-shift in Latin, which is absurd. Indeed, if we look at Greek names and words borrowed during the Vulgar Latin period, we find that Greek . . . are often rendered as *p t k* in Romance.⁴⁷ Höfler, perceiving the possibility of a like argument, pointed out that, since *p t k* in Germanic words never becomes *b d g* in Romance, we cannot explain the occasional *p t k* for *b d g* as due to a reaction (he probably means hyper-correction) against the Western Romance lenition. Whether this criterion is applicable or not, we have numerous loans and also names in Romance which show *b d g* for Germanic *p t k*, such as Spanish *brida*, *embajada*, *estribo*, *graba*, *Jabón*, *figar*, *grupo*, *gro-*, *sella*, etc., Old Portuguese names: *Asgarigus*, *Ardega*, *Visterga*, *Goldrogodo*, *Sesgudus*, etc.

⁴³ That is, not only in post-vocalic position within the word, but also in the sentence, cf. Lausberg, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 98 ff. For a demonstration of the necessity for the assumption of such a system in Western Romance, see H. Weinrich, *Phonologische Studien zur romanischen Sprachgeschichte* (Münster, 1958), 43–144.

⁴⁴ Since Gothic *b, d, g* are often rendered in Greek and Latin sources by geminates, it seems likely that they were stops also in medial position, cf. J. Frank "Germanisches *b d g*," *ZfdA* LIV (1913) 1–23.

⁴⁵ Cf. Gamillscheg, op. cit., p. 48f.

⁴⁶ C. H. Grandgent, *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1907), 108f. For a fuller citation of sources and an extensive list, see my review of Höfler's book, to appear soon in *Indogermanische Forschungen*.

⁴⁷ Cf. Claussen, op. cit., pp. 833 ff., for an extensive list.

The assumption of a "second sound-shift" has then been demonstrated to be unfounded on the basis of the fact that: 1. Romance words show the same development; 2. Greek words are treated in the same manner as the Germanic names; 3. the scribes constantly confuse *b d g* and *p t k* in writing and presumably also in speaking in some positions.

9. *The value of onomastic sources in the study of East Germanic.* Again I hope I have not sounded overly negative in my approach to the problem of using onomastic sources in the study of East Germanic. What we must recognize are the limitations placed upon our interpretations by the nature of the material at hand. At best, using names to determine the pronunciation (phonetics) of a language is a hazardous business; at worst, as in the case of most of the name-material dealt with in this paper, it is hopeless. A study of the scribal practices and language of each scribe, point by point, with due consideration for outside influences and later developments in the language, along with the possibilities of traditional influence, might yield some results of a rather questionable nature for the pronunciation of the East Germanic languages, where we are sure of the source.

Although the onomastic sources are of little use in the study of pronunciation, they are, however, of great value in any lexical study of the Germanic languages, for the study of etymology, customs of name-giving, and, by extension, culture and institutions. It is only recently, through the work of Piel, Aebischer, Corominas et al. that we have come to have reliable collections of these names, but the work of collection still has to be done for the most part. It seems incredible that these monuments to the thought, feeling, and culture of our Germanic forebears have not long since been collected in their entirety and studied. I hope that this article may be a step in the right direction.

University of California, Berkeley