

Handbook of Comparative and  
Historical Indo-European Linguistics

HSK 41.2

# Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikations- wissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics  
and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et  
des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer  
Mitherausgegeben (1985–2001) von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par  
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 41.2

De Gruyter Mouton

# Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics

Edited by

Jared Klein

Brian Joseph

Matthias Fritz

In cooperation with Mark Wenthe

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-052161-0  
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-052387-4  
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-052175-7  
ISSN 1861-5090

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

*Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek*

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Meta Systems Publishing & Printservices GmbH, Wustermark

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

Cover design: Martin Zech, Bremen

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

# IX. Germanic

## 53. The documentation of Germanic

1. Proto-Germanic
2. North Germanic
3. East Germanic
4. West Germanic
5. References

### 1. Proto-Germanic (PGmc.)

Proto-Germanic (*Urgermanisch*) is the ancestral language of the attested old Germanic (Gmc.) languages. As the comparative method of historical linguistics requires, PGmc. is reconstructed dialect-free (*thesauri*: Falk and Torp 1909; Orel 2003; Kroonen 2013) but it is almost certain that it never was a uniform proto-language.

It is unclear when and where PGmc. evolved as a “condensation” of an individualized culture or of a quasi-individualized *ethnos*. A likely approximate date for the *Ausgliederung* of Gmc. is 500 BCE. Germanization can hardly be linked to the expansion of the Jastorf culture alone (Müller 1999: 316; Steuer 1999: 326).

Factual documentation from the earliest times is provided in only a few external sources (*Nebenüberlieferung*) of Latin and Greek provenience. In a *periplus*, Pytheas of Massilia (ca. 380–310 BCE) describes his journey to ancient North Sea territories reaching the island of Θούλη; unfortunately, the text has not survived – only one quotation and a few paraphrases remain – so that the names mentioned in the extant Pytheas excerpts are of no significance. By the medium of epigraphic sources we reach the late 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE; the oldest source is the so-called Protogenes inscription from Olbia on the northern coast of the Black Sea in which the (East) Gmc. tribe of the Σκίροι (‘the pure ones, purebreds’; cf. Goth. *skeirs*\* ‘clear’ etc.) is mentioned (Σκίρους acc. pl., Syll. 495; LaN I: 592). A few decades later, the antonymic tribe name of the Βαστάρνοι (‘the bastards, underbreds’; cf. NHG *Bastard* etc.) is recorded several times in Greek inscriptions as well as in literature (LaN I: 117 ff.). The first Gmc. *gentes* that came into contact with Rome were the *Cimbri* and the *Teutones*, who challenged the Roman empire at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE (LaN I: 218 ff., 656 ff.; substitutes for Gmc. \**Himbrōz* and \**Deudanōz*, cf. *Himber-sysæl* and *Thythæ-sysæl*, two areas in northern Jutland known from 1231 CE).

The most important record from pre-Christian times is the inscription on helmet B of Ženjak-Negau (Slovenia), presumably from the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE. Incised in north Italic (Venetic) letters, the inscription *Harigasti Teiwā* (cf. PGmc. \**harja-* ‘army’ < PIE \**korjō-*, \**gasti-* ‘stranger, guest’ < \**g<sup>h</sup>osti-*, \**teiwa-* ‘god’ < \**deijūó-*) is best interpreted as a possessor’s inscription (Nedoma 1995); it seems that the helmet belonged to a Gmc. soldier who was involved in combat in pre-Roman northern Italy. Another early Gmc. anthroponym is attested in east Celtic coinage: a set of Boiiian silver tetradrachms, coined in the Bratislava region in the mid-1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE, exhibits a legend *Fariarix* (LaN I: 267;

cf. PGmc. *\*farjan-* ‘ferryman’, *\*rīk-* ‘ruler’; see Birkhan 1971: 28 ff.), obviously a Gmc. name of a Celtic sovereign.

To a large extent, we have to rely on the data provided by Roman and Greek authors; most of them had never been in direct contact with Gmc. people. However, sets of Gmc. names are recorded first by Caesar (ca. 52–50 BCE); our major sources of the first two centuries CE are the geographical works of Strabon and Ptolemy, the *Naturalis historia* by Pliny the Elder and, particularly, the *Germania* written by Tacitus. There are several hundred Gmc. names from the Pre-Migration period (collected in LaN I–II; cf. furthermore Neumann 1953: 53 ff. [ad Scand. Θρουσκάνος, dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> c. CE]; Polomé 1994: 3 ff.; Tiefenbach 1995), sometimes mutated by means of sound substitution. The same occurs with Gmc. appellatives in early Latin and Greek texts (cf., e.g., Neumann 1994: 95 ff.; Nedoma 2008: 55 ff. [ad *\*álhiz* ‘elk’]). The earliest external sources – whether epigraphical or literary – provide no secure evidence for the *Ausgliederung* of the Gmc. dialects.

As for Gmc. loanwords in contact languages, the most important borrowings appear in the Baltic-Finnic and Sami branches of Finno-Ugric (dictionary: Kylstra et al. 1991–2012). The oldest loan layers – they can only be dated relatively – possibly trace back to PGmc. times; however, it is doubtful that there are any Pre-Gmc. borrowings (Ritter 1993; on the contrary, *inter al.* Koivulehtu 2002: 586 ff.). Because of the partially conservative phonetic character both of Baltic-Finnic and Sami, though, some of the borrowings reflect a rather archaic *Lautstand* of the Gmc. base form; thus, Finn. *rengas* ‘ring’ (← *\*hrengaz* masc.) and *kenno* ‘cell’ (← *\*hennōn* fem. > OIcel. *hinna* ‘membrane’) do not yet show the Gmc. raising of *e* to *i* before the cluster *NC*.

## 2. North Germanic (NGmc.)

### 2.1. Ancient Norse (AN)

During the first two centuries CE the Gmc. dialect continuum covered roughly the territory between the Rhine in the west, the Vistula in the east, and the Danube in the south, including Denmark and southern Scandinavia in the north (cf., e.g., Seebold 1998: 297 f.). The earliest internal documentation within this “core *Germania*” is of Scandinavian provenance, where ca. 350 runic inscriptions have survived, written in the so-called older *futhork* consisting of 24 letters.

The origin of the runes is controversial (cf. Düwel 2008: 175 ff.). However, there are more formal resemblances to letters of pre-Christian North Italic alphabets (in particular of the Val Camonica type; cf. Schumacher 2007: 336) than to Latin letters; admittedly, there is a chronological gap, since the earliest reliable runic inscriptions – the Vimose comb (RäF 26) and the Øvre Stabu lancehead (RäF 31) – are archaeologically dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE. The language of the early Scandinavian runic inscriptions, in some respects close to PGmc. (cf. Krause 1971: 23 ff.; Nielsen 2000: esp. 271 ff.; 2002: 615 f.), is called Ancient Nordic (or Proto-Nordic, NHG *Urnordisch*, Scand. *urnordisk*). Recently, Nielsen (2000: 77 ff., 89, 294 f.) has pointed out that unstressed PGmc.

Tab. 53.1: The older *fubark* (normalized forms) – The division in three groups (OÍcel. *ættir* literally ‘families’) of eight runes is long-established. The items in the 4<sup>th</sup> row are for presentational purposes only: as far as can be seen, the runes had no numerical values. Rune no. 4 𐌱 **a** in the early Scandinavian inscriptions seems to represent unstressed *ǣ*, too (Nedoma 2005). For the PGmc. rune names (*\*fehu*<sup>n</sup> ‘cattle, goods’, *\*ūruz* ‘aurochs’, ..., *\*ōþala*<sup>n</sup> ‘[inherited] property’), see Nedoma (2003: 558 ff. [with lit.])

|           |                           |              |                 |               |               |                             |              |                |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| rune      | ƿ                         | ᚱ            | ᚲ               | ᚳ             | ᚴ             | ᚵ                           | ᚶ            | ᚷ              |
| translit. | <b>f</b>                  | <b>u</b>     | <b>þ</b>        | <b>a</b>      | <b>r</b>      | <b>k</b>                    | <b>g</b>     | <b>w</b>       |
| phoneme   | /f/                       | /u(:)/       | /þ/             | /a(:)/        | /r/           | /k/                         | /g/          | /w/            |
| number    | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4             | 5             | 6                           | 7            | 8              |
| name      | <i>*fehu</i> <sup>n</sup> | <i>*ūruz</i> | <i>*þurisaz</i> | <i>*ansuz</i> | <i>*raidō</i> | <i>*kauna</i> <sup>n?</sup> | <i>*gebō</i> | <i>*wunjō?</i> |

|           |                |                |                          |                           |                            |                 |                           |                |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| rune      | ᚸ              | ᚹ              | ᚺ                        | ᚻ                         | ᚼ                          | ᚾ               | ᚿ                         | ᚰ              |
| translit. | <b>h</b>       | <b>n</b>       | <b>i</b>                 | <b>j</b>                  | <b>ī</b>                   | <b>p</b>        | <b>z (r)</b>              | <b>s</b>       |
| phoneme   | /h/            | /n/            | /i(:)/                   | /j/                       | /i(:)/                     | /p/             | /z/ (/r <sub>(2)</sub> /) | /s/            |
| number    | 9              | 10             | 11                       | 12                        | 13                         | 14              | 15                        | 16             |
| name      | <i>*haglaz</i> | <i>*naudiz</i> | <i>*īsa</i> <sup>n</sup> | <i>*jēra</i> <sup>n</sup> | <i>*ei<sup>h</sup>/waz</i> | <i>*perþō??</i> | <i>*algiz??</i>           | <i>*sōwulō</i> |

|           |                |                              |               |                |               |                |               |                            |
|-----------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| rune      | ᚰ              | ᚱ                            | ᚲ             | ᚳ              | ᚴ             | ᚵ              | ᚶ             | ᚷ                          |
| translit. | <b>t</b>       | <b>b</b>                     | <b>e</b>      | <b>m</b>       | <b>l</b>      | <b>ŋ</b>       | <b>d</b>      | <b>o</b>                   |
| phoneme   | /t/            | /b/                          | /e(:)/        | /m/            | /l/           | /ŋg/           | /d/           | /o(:)/                     |
| number    | 17             | 18                           | 19            | 20             | 21            | 22             | 23            | 24                         |
| name      | <i>*Teiwaz</i> | <i>*berkana</i> <sup>n</sup> | <i>*ehwaz</i> | <i>*mannaz</i> | <i>*laguz</i> | <i>*Ingwaz</i> | <i>*dagaz</i> | <i>*ōþala</i> <sup>n</sup> |

*\*-ō<sup>n</sup>* on the one hand and *\*-ō*, *\*-au<sup>o</sup>* on the other hand merged into AN *-ō(°)* – cf. **run-o** acc. sg. fem. *ō*-stem (Einang, 4<sup>th</sup> c.; RāF 63), **arbijan-o** gen. pl. masc. *n*-stem (Tune, ca. 400; RāF 72), **mag-o-z** gen. sg. masc. *u*-stem (Vetteland, 4<sup>th</sup> c.; RāF 60) > OÍcel. *-a*, *-a*, *-ar* – so that the language of the early Scandinavian inscriptions cannot represent the predecessor of (Ingvaemonic) WGmc. (PGmc. *\*-ō<sup>n</sup>* > OE OFris. *-æ* > *-e* vs. PGmc. *\*-ō*, *\*-au<sup>o</sup>* > OE OFris. *-a*). If there was something like a Northwest-Gmc. unity (as was claimed, among others, by Antonsen 2002: 31 ff.), the split occurred not later than the late 3<sup>rd</sup> c.; this is proved by the new found runic inscription **kab-a** = WGmc. *ka(m)b-a* ‘comb’ on the Frienstedt comb (Nedoma and Düwel 2012: 136 ff.) that shows WGmc. loss of final *z*.

“Classical” AN is a dialect-free *Trümmersprache* that remained practically unchanged for several centuries, viz. until the beginning of a transitional period in the late 5<sup>th</sup> c. (NHG *Spätturnordisch*, Scand. *yngre urnordisk*). Most of the AN runic inscriptions (the standard edition is RāF) are merely short texts found on portable objects like jewelry (esp. fibulae, bracteates) and weapons as well as on non-portable objects like stones. A considerable part of the runic texts is of a profane kind

(manufacturer's, possessor's and carver's inscriptions, memorial inscriptions) although there are a few religious and magic inscriptions as well. The runic epigraphic tradition assumes prime importance because it represents intentional, original, and contemporary documentation (within an oral culture of remembrance). One of the most famous AN inscriptions is engraved on the Gallehus gold horn B (ca. 400; RāF 43): *ek, Hlewagastiz Holtijaz, horna tawiðō* 'I, Hlewagastiz Holtijaz (a second name, a patronymic or even a denomination of provenance: 'wood-dweller'), made the horn' is the earliest example of a regular Gmc. alliterative verse.

## 2.2. Old Norse (ON)

Around 700 there is a caesura in the history of NGmc. epigraphical documentation, insofar as the 24-letter older *fupark* was replaced by the 18-letter younger *fupark* (cf. Schulte 2006 [with lit.]) that is attested in two main variants, long-branch and short-twig runes, as they are called. There are only a few extant runic inscriptions from the 8<sup>th</sup> c., but as of the beginning of the Viking Age (ca. 800) the source material increases significantly over the next centuries up to a total of ca. 6,000–6,100 inscriptions in the younger *fupark* known today, including ca. 3,500 inscriptions from Sweden alone (dictionary of Viking-Age runic Swedish: Peterson 1994). It is a very rare case in the history of script that a reduced grapheme inventory is used for an extended phoneme inventory (referring to ON, following umlaut and breaking processes during the transitional period; cf. Andersson 2002: 297 ff. [with lit.]). Because of the plurivalent phoneme-grapheme correlations it is difficult to examine the sound change processes that yield dialect divisions within ON (mainly, between East and West Norse varieties). The runic epigraphical tradition, however, lasts throughout the Middle Ages, with runes being used for "functional" texts of various kinds (memorial inscriptions on stones, situational private messages on wooden sticks, etc.).

Old Icelandic (OIcel.), the most conservative ON language and thus sometimes – inaccurately – called ON (*per se*), is definitely a *Großkorpussprache* (OIcel. texts are enregistered by Simek/Pálsson 2007; standard dictionaries: Fritzner [1886–1896] 1972; Egilsson and Jónsson 1931; ONP 1989 ff.; *etymologica*: de Vries 1962; Blöndal Magnússon 1989). The OIcel. vernacular literary tradition is extensive, and many of the texts reproduce ancient ("Gmc.") *fabulae*, plots, and motives. The earliest extant manuscripts can be dated to the mid-12<sup>th</sup> c.; the oldest written sources are, as expected, non-fiction texts on Christian, legal, and historical matters. One of the most important pieces is the *Íslendingabók* ('Book of Icelanders') written by Ari Þorgilsson, describing the early history of Iceland. Furthermore, several genres of prose literature – in particular Kings' Sagas (*konungasögur*), Family Sagas (*Íslendingasögur*), and Legendary Sagas (*fornaldarsögur*) – originate in the period from the late 12<sup>th</sup> to the early 13<sup>th</sup> c. As to date of origin, the oldest texts are poetic: several Eddic and Skaldic poems go way back even to the late 9<sup>th</sup> c.; probably the earliest text is the *Ragnarsdrápa* ('[laudatory] Poem addressed to Ragnarr') by Bragi Boddason. From the time of their composition, Eddic and Skaldic poems had been memorized and passed down orally for several centuries (cf. Jónsson 1921: 236 ff.), until they were fixed in 13<sup>th</sup> c. manuscripts (such as the



Codex regius of the famous *Poetic Edda*, containing a number of mythological and heroic poems, written ca. 1270).

Compared to OIcel., the other ON languages are documented to a lesser extent. The earliest of the few manuscripts of Old Norwegian – that was still close to OIcel. in the early 13<sup>th</sup> c. – are from ca. 1150–1200; the vocabulary is included in the “ON” dictionaries (see above). Similar to Iceland, the oldest written sources in Norway are non-fiction texts of Christian and legal kinds. During the reign of king Hákon Hákonarson (Hákon IV, 1217–1263), courtly literature flourished, especially prose translations of Arthurian romances and *chansons de geste* (Chivalric Sagas, *riddarasögur*).

The literary attestation of the East Norse languages is even more sparse. Most of the Old Swedish and Old Danish texts (recorded from ca. 1250) are on legal matters; fictional literature stays on the sideline (cp. Nedoma 2010: 157 ff., 166 ff. [with lit.]). Old Gutnish (on the isle of Gotland; recorded from 1350) is a *Trümmersprache*.

### 3. East Germanic (EGmc.)

#### 3.1. Gothic (Goth.)

Migrations of the EGmc. *gentes* from the Baltic Sea coast in a southeastern direction during the (2<sup>nd</sup> and) 3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE caused EGmc. to be separated from the common Gmc. dialect continuum. There is only a small number of EGmc. runic epigraphic texts (less than 10, most of them probably Goth.) spread over eastern and central Europe; the earliest inscriptions are from the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE. One of the most interesting of these is found on the golden neck-ring of Pietroassa in Romania (1<sup>st</sup> half of the 5<sup>th</sup> c.; *Gutanī ō(pal) wī(h) hailag* ‘property of the Goths, sacred and holy [or: sacrosanct]’ RÄF 41), where **ai** (in **hailag**) definitely renders a diphthong /ai/.

Goth. is the earliest Gmc. language preserved in a longer text; unfortunately, its documentation is rather limited in regard to both quantity and quality (Goth. texts are enregistered by Braune/Heidermanns 2007: 6 ff.; edition/glossary: Streitberg 2000; lemmatized concordance: Snædal 1998; standard *etymologicon*: Feist 1939 [or Lehmann 1986]). Except for another few short texts, there is one (main) source by one author, viz. the Bible translation of the Visigothic bishop Wulfila (Οὐλφίλας); thus we are familiar with only one variety of Gothic.

Wulfila’s Bible (ca. 350–380) is based on a Greek source; it has survived in one epigraphical testimony (a folded lead tablet from Hács Béndekpuszta in Hungary, late 5<sup>th</sup> c.; cf. Schwab 2005: 101 ff.) and several fragmentary manuscripts (5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> c.; the most famous is the Uppsala Codex argenteus) that cover the greater part of the New Testament. Wulfila invented his own alphabet, deriving most of the letters from Greek, whereas some seem to be borrowed from Latin (e.g., <h>, <r>) and the older *fupark* (e.g., <u>, <o>).

Late (i.e. post-biblical Goth.) developments can be observed in names, e.g., *ai* > *ē* in *Gesila* (6<sup>th</sup> c., LaN I: 353; cf. Wagner 2002: 266) vs. *Radagaisus* (died a. 406, LaN I: 546 f.). Gothic became extinct after the collapse of the *regna* of the Ostrogoths in Italy (mid-6<sup>th</sup> c.) and the Visigoths in Spain (early 8<sup>th</sup> c.).

Tab. 53.2: Wulfila's Gothic alphabet (S-type or type II) – /i:/ is rendered by <ei>, /e/ [ɛ] by <ai> *ai* and /o/ [ɔ] by <au> *ai*; runic and external evidence (**hailag**, s. above; *Radagaisus*, s. below) suggest that <ai> and <au> represent /ai/ and /au/, too. ↑, the sign for '900', is attested only in the so-called Salzburg-Vienna Alcuin codex (ÖNB Wien, MS 795, fol. 20<sup>v</sup>; entry ca. 800 or early 9<sup>th</sup> c.). The letter names are preserved *ibidem*, most of them exhibit somewhat curious forms (e.g., *eyz* ~ Goth. \**aihus* 'horse?', *noicz* = °*ts* ~ Goth. *naups* 'need'). Most (but not all) of these "crypto-Goth." terms are identical with the rune names of the older *futhorc* (see above, Tab. 53.1)

|            |            |               |              |             |            |                   |             |             |              |
|------------|------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| letter     | ᚦ          | ᚷ             | ᚱ            | ᚳ           | ᚹ          | ᚰ                 | ᚹ           | ᚱ           | ᚰ            |
| translit.  | a          | b             | g            | d           | e          | q                 | z           | h           | þ            |
| phonem     | /a(:)/     | /b/           | /g/          | /d/         | /e:/       | /k <sup>w</sup> / | /z/         | /h/         | /p/          |
| num. value | 1          | 2             | 3            | 4           | 5          | 6                 | 7           | 8           | 9            |
| name       | <i>aza</i> | <i>bercna</i> | <i>geuua</i> | <i>daaz</i> | <i>eyz</i> | <i>quertra</i>    | <i>ezec</i> | <i>haal</i> | <i>thyth</i> |

|            |            |               |             |              |              |             |             |               |    |
|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----|
| letter     | ᚱ          | ᚷ             | ᚱ           | ᚳ            | ᚹ            | ᚰ           | ᚹ           | ᚱ             | ᚰ  |
| translit.  | i (i)      | k             | l           | m            | n            | j           | u           | p             | –  |
| phonem     | /i/        | /k/           | /l/         | /m/          | /n/          | /j/         | /u(:)/      | /p/           | –  |
| num. value | 10         | 20            | 30          | 40           | 50           | 60          | 70          | 80            | 90 |
| name       | <i>iiz</i> | <i>chozma</i> | <i>laaz</i> | <i>manna</i> | <i>noicz</i> | <i>gaar</i> | <i>uraz</i> | <i>pertra</i> | –  |

|            |             |              |            |               |           |              |                   |             |     |
|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-----|
| letter     | ᚱ           | ᚷ            | ᚱ          | ᚳ             | ᚹ         | ᚰ            | ᚹ                 | ᚱ           | ᚰ   |
| translit.  | r           | s            | t          | w             | f         | x            | h                 | o           | –   |
| phonem     | /r/         | /s/          | /t/        | /w/           | /f/       | [x]          | /h <sup>w</sup> / | /o:/        | –   |
| num. value | 100         | 200          | 300        | 400           | 500       | 600          | 700               | 800         | 900 |
| name       | <i>reda</i> | <i>sugil</i> | <i>tyz</i> | <i>uwinne</i> | <i>fe</i> | <i>enguz</i> | <i>uuaer</i>      | <i>utal</i> | –   |

### 3.2. Minor EGmc. languages

The documentation of the other old EGmc. languages – according to Procopius (*de Bello Gothico* III,2,5), they were close to Gothic – is very poor (cf. Francovich Onesti 2002; Tischler 2003: 340 ff.). Most of them have only survived in a few names. There are two Vandalic syntagmata (viz. *froia arme* [cf. Tiefenbach 1991: 251 ff.] and *eils ... scapia matzia ia drincan* [Anth. Lat. I, no. 285; the "Gothic" epigram]) and one (probably) Burgundian runic inscription (on the Charnay fibula, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 6<sup>th</sup> c.; R&F 6).

The latest attested EGmc. language is called Crimean Gothic. It was not until 1560–1562 that Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, a Habsburg diplomat in Constantinople, handed down a list of several dozen vocables and three lines of a *cantilena* in a Gmc. dialect spoken in the Crimea (cf. Stearns 1989 [with lit.]); most of the 101 recorded forms (e.g., *ada* 'ovum' ~ Biblical Goth. \**addi*, showing *Verschärfung*) suggest a late EGmc. dialect.

## 4. West Germanic (WGmc.)

### 4.1. Early West Germanic

The N/WGmc. “residual” dialect continuum was broken after Angles, Jutes, and (parts of the) Saxons left their homelands to settle in Britain: thus, a language border developed between NGmc. and WGmc. by the 6<sup>th</sup> c CE. The most important early sources from the WGmc. area are Latin dedication inscriptions addressed to *matronae* (or *matres*) in the Rhineland, dated ca. 160–250/260 CE. The majority of the venerated mother goddesses bear Gmc. (by-)names (cf. Neumann 1987), and a few of the theonyms exhibit post-PGmc. loss of unstressed short vowels in disyllabic endings \*<sup>o</sup>ǃmǃz > \*<sup>o</sup>ǃmz (e.g., *Aflims* CIL XIII 8157, *Vatvims* CIL XIII 7892 < PGmc. \*<sup>o</sup>miz dat. pl.). The Fienstedt comb runic inscription *ka(m)ba* ‘comb’ dating to the late 3<sup>rd</sup> c. (s. above) is of particular interest, since it proves that apocope of *z* occurred before loss of thematic vowel *a* (thus, PGmc. \**-az* > WGmc. *-a* > OS OE OFris. OHG *-Ø*; cf. Nedoma/Düwel 2012: 141 ff.).

### 4.2. Old Saxon (OS; also Old Low German)

We know of only a few runic texts from Saxony. As for their linguistic significance, two 5<sup>th</sup> c. inscriptions indicate WGmc. gemination (pre-OS **kunni** < PGmc. \**kunja-* ‘kin, kind’, Weser bones) and weakening of the linking vowel after a heavy syllable in compounds (**algu-skapi** = (*a*)*lgǣ-* < \**algiskapi* ‘stag damage’, Wremen footstool; cf. Nedoma 2008: 57 f.).

Like Goth., OS is a *Kleinkorpussprache*, and like in Goth., the documentation focuses on biblical works (OS texts are enregistered by Krogh 1996: 111 ff.; dictionary: Tiefenbach 2010). The major OS literary source is the *Heliand* (‘Savior’), a gospel harmony that was probably composed between 830–840; this voluminous work with its 5,983 alliterative verses is preserved in two large codices, one of them nearly complete, and four fragments (including that from Leipzig; Schmid 2006). Apart from the *Heliand*, only a limited number of shorter (mostly Christian) texts of different kinds have survived. The OS onomastic evidence is meagre.

The descendant of OS is called Middle Low German (MLG; ca. 1200–1600), the language of the Hanseatic merchants.

### 4.3. Old English (OE)

The English runic tradition starts in the late 5<sup>th</sup> c. Some 80–90 inscriptions have survived, written in an extended Anglo-Frisian runic alphabet called *futhorc* (better: *futha<sub>3</sub>rk<sub>1</sub>*) consisting of 26–33 characters: the inclusion of additional runes was caused by sound changes (no. 26 ǃ **a<sub>1</sub>** renders /æ(:)/, no. 25 ǃ **a<sub>2</sub>** /a(:)/, no. 4 ǃ **a<sub>3</sub>** /o(:)/, no. 24 ǃ **o** /ø(:)/, etc.) that had probably occurred already on the continent. Familiarity with and usage of runes outlasted the time of the Anglo-Saxon Christianization: the latest inscriptions date from the 10<sup>th</sup> c.

It is worth mentioning that in England from the very beginnings of the Anglo-Saxon settlement both Latin and the vernacular language were employed as media for writing (most of the OE texts are enregistered by Wenisch 1979: 19 ff.; [outdated] dictionary: Bosworth, Toller, and Campbell 1898–1972, cf. furthermore DOE; etymological concordance: Holthausen 1963). The earliest known OE text is king Æþelberht's code of Kentish laws that was written around 600 CE but has survived only in a 12<sup>th</sup> c. manuscript; the earliest extant texts are glossaries and charters of the (early) 8<sup>th</sup> c. The great bulk of OE poetry is preserved in four manuscripts, all of them written in the decades around 1000 CE in (late) West Saxon; the original texts, most of them of Anglian provenience, date back a few centuries earlier. The most famous piece is *Beowulf*, a heroic epic poem in 3,182 alliterative verses that is set in Scandinavia; the text, an artificial meshwork of intertextuality, represents a kind of *summa litterarum* (Harris 1985: 260 ff.) but also contains quite a few oral-formulaic patterns. Aside from further heroic lays in ancient (“Gmc.”) tradition, a number of OE poems deal with religious heroes. As for prose, many Latin texts were translated into the vernacular in the time of Alfred the Great; comprehensive medical texts and annalistic literature (in particular the important *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) date to the 9<sup>th</sup> c., too. Representative for late OE (or, to be more exact, late West Saxon) are the numerous works of abbot Ælfric, named *Grammaticus*.

The descendant of OE is Middle English (ME; ca. 1100–1400/1500), the most prominent text of which is Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.

#### 4.4. Old Frisian (OFris.)

Approximately 20 runic inscriptions are associated with early medieval Frisia, written in (a variant of) the Anglo-Frisian *futhorc*. The pre-OFris. inscriptions, dating from the 6<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> c., preserve an archaic feature: PGmc. nom. sg. \*-az > WGmc. -a is retained as -u = -ǝ (e.g., in **a<sub>2</sub>dug<sub>2</sub>islu** = -gīslǝ < \*-gīslaz on the Westeremden weaving slay, ca. 800; cp. Nedoma 2014) as against the other WGmc. languages, where it has been lost.

The literary tradition starts with psalter glosses from ca. 1200. OFris. is a *Kleinkorpusssprache*: apart from the late charters, there are somewhat more than 20 extant manuscripts that stem from a period ranging from the late 13<sup>th</sup> c. to ca. 1600. Most of the manuscripts were written in the area east of the Lauwers (enregistered by Johnston 2001: 571 ff.; cf. furthermore Bremmer 2004; dictionary: Hofmann and Popkema 2008; *etymologicon*: Boutkan/Siebinga 2005 [merely deals with one codex, R<sub>1</sub>]). Most of the OFris. texts concern laws, treatises, privileges, and statutes (some of them probably originating in the 11<sup>th</sup> c.). Though the extent of the Old Frisian legal tradition is unique within the old Gmc. languages, it reflects only a particular segment of medieval Frisian culture.

#### 4.5. Old High German (OHG)

Some 80–90 runic inscriptions have been discovered in the (later) High German area, all on portable objects. The majority of the inscriptions are found in southwestern Germany and date from the 6<sup>th</sup> c.; soon after 600 CE the runic tradition ends abruptly due

to the growth of Christianization and the change of mortuary practice. The attested forms exhibit clearly pre-OHG features (Nedoma 2006: 129 ff.) with the sole exception of **dorih** = *Dōr(r)īχ* on the Wurmlingen lancehead (RäF 162), the first attested instance of the second sound shift (< \*-rīk). Vernacular terms in the *leges barbarorum* (6<sup>th</sup>–8/9<sup>th</sup> c.), in particular the so-called Malberg glosses of the *Lex Salica*, and a mass of OHG names (as of ca. 730 CE) provide further early evidence.

During the Carolingian period, canonized Latin texts were glossed, translated, and annotated in ecclesiastical scriptoria, almost each of them using different dialects or dialect mixtures (OHG texts are enregistered by Schützeichel 2006: 9 ff.; dictionaries: Karg-Gasterstädt 1968 ff. and Schützeichel 2006, cf. furthermore Seebold et al. 2001; *etymologicon*: Lloyd et al. 1988 ff.). It deserves mention that approximately two-thirds of the OHG vocabulary is preserved by means of glosses: there are ca. 250,000 entries (representing ca. 27,000 lexemes) in manuscripts covering the whole of the Middle Ages. The earliest OHG glosses are found in the *Maihinger Evangeliar* from Echternach (dry-point; early 8<sup>th</sup> c., Middle Franconian); the famous *Abrogans* glossary (ca. 750–770, Bavarian) was written a few decades later. The first literary texts, such as the *Isidor* and the Monsee-Vienna fragments, date to the late 8<sup>th</sup> c.; the only OHG example of ancient (“Gmc.”) heroic poetry, the *Hildebrandslied* (a fragment of 68 [64] alliterative verses), may be even older. Unique pre-Christian remnants are the two *Merseburg charms*, recorded in a 10<sup>th</sup> c. manuscript; their actual age remains uncertain. Most of the longer OHG texts were written in the 9<sup>th</sup> c., e.g., the *Tatian* (East Franconian) and Otfrid’s Gospel harmony (South Rhenish Franconian); the most important author of the late OHG period was the St. Gall monk Notker, named *Labeo* (died 1022).

The successor of OHG is Middle High German (MHG; ca. 1050–1350); its most prominent works, such as the *Nibelungenlied* and the Arthurian romances, were written in the classical period of MHG (ca. 1170–1250).

#### 4.6. Minor WGmc. languages

Langobardic is a *Trümmersprache*: except for three 6<sup>th</sup> c. runic inscriptions, the only extant material consists of vernacular appellatives and names in *Nebenüberlieferung* (6<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> c.; cf. Francovich Onesti 1999). However its linguistic status is to be defined, Langobardic in Italy shows the second sound shift (e.g., *zāva* ‘[seditious] uniting’ : Goth. *tēwa\** ‘order’).

Old Dutch is a sparsely attested Franconian variety that did not undergo the second sound shift (called also Old Low Franconian, cf. Krogh 1997). Its most important source is the Limburgish psalter fragments of the now lost Wachtendonck codex (10<sup>th</sup> c.). Old Dutch is succeeded by Middle Dutch (ca. 1150–1500).

### 5. References

- Andersson, Thorsten  
 2001 Nordgermanische Sprachen. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 21, 289–306.  
 Antonsen, Elmer H.  
 2002 *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Bandle, Oskar, Kurt Braunmüller, Ernst Hakon Jahr, Allan Karker, Hans-Peter Naumann, and Ulf Teleman (eds.)  
 2002 *The Nordic Languages. An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 703–719.
- Beck, Heinrich, Dieter Geuenich, Hans Kuhn, Kurt Ranke, Heiko Steuer, and Richard Wenskus (eds.)  
 1968–2007 *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, begründet von Johannes Hoops*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. 35 Vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Birkhan, Helmut  
 1971 Die “keltischen” Personennamen des boiischen Großsilbers. *Die Sprache* 17: 23–33.
- Blöndal Magnússon, Ásgeir  
 1989 *Íslensk orðsifjabók* [Icelandic etymological dictionary]. Reykjavík: Orðabók Háskólans.
- Bosworth, Joseph, T. Northcote Toller, and Alistair Campbell  
 1898–1972 *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boutkan, Dirk and Sjoerd Michiel Siebinga  
 2005 *Old Frisian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Braune, Wilhelm and Frank Heidermanns  
 2004 *Gotische Grammatik*. 20<sup>th</sup> edn. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Bremmer, Rolf H. Jr.  
 2004 *Hir is eskriven: Lezen en schrijven in de Friese landen rond 1300* [Here is written: Reading and writing in the Frisian lands around 1300]. Leeuwarden: Hilversum.
- CIL I–XVI [+ no.] = *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*  
 1862 ff. Berlin: Reimer.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm  
 1915–1924 *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4 vols. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- DOE see di Paolo Healey, 2005.
- Düwel, Klaus  
 2008 *Runenkunde*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Egilsson, Sveinbjörn and Finnur Jónsson  
 1931 *Lexicon poeticum antiquae linguae septentrionalis*. (= *Ordbog over det norske-islandske Skjaldesprog* [Dictionary of the Norse-Icelandic poetic language]). 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Copenhagen: Møller.
- Falk, Hjalmar and Alf Torp  
 1909 *Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit*. Unter Mitwirkung von Hjalmar Falk gänzlich umgearbeitet von Alf Torp. (*Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* von August Fick. 4. Auflage.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Feist, Sigmund  
 1939 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache: mit Einschluß des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen*. 3. neubearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Leiden: Brill.
- Francovich Onesti, Nicoletta  
 1999 *Vestigia longobarde in Italia (568–774). Lessico e antroponomia*. Rome: Artemide.
- Francovich Onesti, Nicoletta  
 2002 *I Vandali. Lingua e storia*. Rome: Carocci.
- Fritzner, Johan  
 1972 [1886–1896] *Ordbog over Det gamle norske Sprog* [Dictionary of the Old Norse language]. 4 vols. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. [Kristiania: Norske forlagsforening.]
- Harris, Joseph  
 1985 Die altenglische Heldendichtung. In: Klaus von See (ed.), *Europäisches Frühmittelalter* (Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 6). Wiesbaden: Aula, 237–276.
- Hofmann, Dietrich and Anne Tjerk Popkema  
 2008 *Altfriesisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Holthausen, Ferdinand

1962 *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Heidelberg: Winter.

Johnston, Thomas S. B.

2001 The Old Frisian Law Manuscripts and Law Texts. In: Horst Haider Munske, Nils Århammar, Volkert Faltings, Jarich Freark Hoekstra, Oebele Vries, Alastair Walker, and Ommo Wilts (eds.), *Handbuch des Friesischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 571–587.

Jónsson, Finnur

1921 *Norsk-islandske Kultur- og Sprogforhold i 9. og 10. århundrede* [Norwegian-Icelandic cultural and linguistic relations in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries]. Copenhagen: Høst.

Karg-Gasterstädt, Elisabeth, Theodor Frings (Vol. 1), Rudolf Grosse (Vol. 2–4), Gotthard Lerchner, and Hans Ulrich Schmid (Vol. 5–6)

1968 ff. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 6 vols. published (6: M–N). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Koivulehtu, Jorma

2002 Contact with non-Germanic languages II: Relations to the East. In: Bandle et al. (eds.), 583–594.

Krause, Wolfgang

1971 *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Krause, Wolfgang and Herbert Jankuhn

1966 *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Krogh, Steffen

1996 *Die Stellung des Altsächsischen im Rahmen der germanischen Sprachen*. (Studien zum Althochdeutschen 29). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Krogh, Steffen

1997 Zur Entstehung des Niederländischen. In: Elvira Glaser, Michael Schlaefter, and Ludwig Rübekeil (eds.), *Grammatica ianua artium. Festschrift Rolf Bergmann*. Heidelberg: Winter, 21–31.

Kroonen, Guus

2013 *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.

Kylstra, Andries Dirk, Sirkka-Liisa Hahmo, Tette Hofstra, and Osmo Nikkilä

1991–2012 *Lexikon der älteren germanischen Lehnwörter in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. 3 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

LaN I–II: see Reichert 1987–1990.

Lehmann, Winfred P.

1986 *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary. Based on the third edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*. Leiden: Brill.

Lloyd, Albert L., Otto Springer, and Rosemarie Lühr, with the assistance of Karen Purdy et al.

1988 ff. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. 5 vols. published (5: iba–luzzilo). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Müller, Rosemarie

1999 Germanen, Germania, Germanische Altertumskunde: Die Bewertung von Realien für die Gesch[ichte] der Germ[anen]. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 11, 309–317.

Nedoma, Robert

1995 *Die Inschrift auf dem Helm B von Negau. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Deutung norditalischer epigraphischer Denkmäler*. Vienna: Fassbaender.

Nedoma, Robert

2003 Runennamen. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 25, 556–562.

Nedoma, Robert

2004 *Personennamen in südgermanischen Runeninschriften*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Nedoma, Robert

2005 Urnordisch **-a** im Nominativ Singularis der maskulinen *n*-Stamme. *Northwestern European Language Evolution* 46/47: 155–191. (= *Papers on Scandinavian and Germanic*

*Language and Culture. Published in Honour of Michael Barnes on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday 28 June 2005).*

Nedoma, Robert

2006 Schrift und Sprache in den sudgermanischen Runeninschriften. In: Alfred Bammesberger and Gaby Waxenberger (eds.), *Das fuþark und seine einzelsprachlichen Weiterentwicklungen* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reall. 51). Berlin: De Gruyter, 109–156.

Nedoma, Robert

2008 Voraltsächsisch **lguskapi** auf dem Schemel von Wremen. In: Barbara Theune-Großkopf and Robert Nedoma. Ein Holzstuhl mit Runeninschrift aus dem frühmittelalterlichen Gräberfeld von Trossingen, Lkr. Tuttlingen (Baden-Württemberg). *Die Sprache* 46 (2006): 52–64.

Nedoma, Robert

2010 *Kleine Grammatik des Altisländischen*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Heidelberg: Winter.

Nedoma, Robert

2014 Voraltfriesisch **-u** im Nominativ und Akkusativ Sg. der maskulinen *a*-Stämme. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 73: 343–368. (= Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Stephen Laker, and Oebele Vries [eds.], *Directions for Old Frisian Philology*.)

Nedoma, Robert and Klaus Düwel

2012 Die Runeninschrift. In: Christoph G. Schmidt, Robert Nedoma, and Klaus Düwel. Die Runeninschrift auf dem Kamm von Friestedt, Stadt Erfurt. *Die Sprache* 49 (2010/2011): 123–186.

Neumann, Günter

1953 Thruskanos. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 4: 53–55.

Neumann, Günter

1987 Die germanischen Matronen-Beinamen. In: Gerhard Bauchhenß and Günter Neumann (eds.), *Matronen und verwandte Gottheiten*. Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 103–132.

Neumann, Günter

1994 Früheste Zeugnisse unserer Sprache. *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 93–110.

Nielsen, Hans Frede

2000 *The Early Runic Language of Scandinavia. Studies in Germanic Dialect Geography*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Nielsen, Hans Frede

2002 Delimitation of Ancient Nordic from Common Germanic and Old Nordic. In: Bandle et al. (eds.), 615–619.

ONP = *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog, A Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*

1989 ff. Register and 3 vols. published (3: de-em). Copenhagen: The Arnamagnæan Commission. Available online: URL <http://onp.ku.dk> [Last accessed 9 April 2016].

Orel, Vladimir

2003 *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden: Brill.

di Paolo Healey, Antonette with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang

2005 *The Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* Online: URL <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca> [Last accessed 9 April 2016].

Peterson, Lena

1994 *Svenskt runordsregister* [Swedish rune word register]. (Runrön 2). 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Uppsala: Inst. för Nordiska Språk, Uppsala Univ.

Polomé, Edgar C.

1994 Proto-Germanic and the Reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European. *Northwestern European Language Evolution* 23: 3–40.

RäF [+ no.] see Krause and Jankuhn, 1966.



- Reichert, Hermann  
1987–1990 *Lexikon der altgermanischen Namen*. 2 vols. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Ritter, Ralf-Peter  
1993 *Studien zu den ältesten germanischen Entlehnungen im Ostseefinnischen*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Rübekeil, Ludwig  
1992 *Suebica. Völkernamen und Ethnos*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Schmid, Hans Ulrich  
2006 Ein neues ‘Heliand’-Fragment aus der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 135: 309–323.
- Schulte, Michael  
2006 The transformation of the older fuþark. *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 121: 41–74.
- Schumacher, Stefan  
2007 Val Camonica, Inschriften. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 35, 334–337.
- Schützeichel, Rudolf  
2006 *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 6<sup>th</sup> edn. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schwab, Ute  
2005 Bemerkungen zur siebenten Auflage des ‘Streitberg’ durch Piergiuseppe Scardigli mit Blicken auf das ‘Gotische Elementarbuch’ von Wolfgang Binning. *Die Sprache* 44 (2004): 91–116.
- Seebold, Elmar  
1998 Germanen, Germania, Germanische Altertumskunde: Sprache und Schrift. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 11, 275–304.
- Seebold, Elmar, Brigitte Bulitta, Elke Krotz, Judith Stieglbauer-Schwarz, and Christiane Wanzeck  
2001 *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes. Der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Simek, Rudolf and Hermann Pálsson  
2007 *Lexikon der altnordischen Literatur*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Stuttgart: Kröner.
- Snædal, Magnús  
1998 *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic*. 2 vols. Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press.
- Stearns, MacDonald Jr.  
1989 Das Krimgotische. In: Heinrich Beck (ed.), *Germanische Rest- und Trümmersprachen* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reall. 3). Berlin: De Gruyter, 175–194.
- Steuer, Heiko  
1999 Germanen, Germania, Germanische Altertumskunde: Die Germ[anen] und der Norden. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 11, 318–327.
- Streitberg, Wilhelm (ed.)  
2000 *Die gotische Bibel*. 2 vols. 7<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> edn. (by Piergiuseppe Scardigli). Heidelberg: Winter.  
Syll. [+ no.] see Dittenberger, 1915–1924.
- Tiefenbach, Heinrich  
1991 Das vandalische *Domine miserere*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 104: 251–268.
- Tiefenbach, Heinrich  
1995 Älteste germanische Namen der Völkerwanderungszeit in lateinischen und griechischen Quellen. In: Ernst Eichler, Gerold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, and Ladislav Zgusta (eds.), *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*. Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 774–778.
- Tiefenbach, Heinrich  
2010 *Altsächsisches Handwörterbuch*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Tischler, Johann  
2003 Ostgermanen: Sprachliches. In: Beck et al. (eds.), vol. 22, 338–344.

- de Vries, Jan  
 1962 *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Leiden: Brill.
- Wagner, Norbert  
 2002 *Gaisericus und Gesiric. Zu ai und au im späteren Ostgermanischen und bei Wulfila. Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, N.F. 37: 259–270.
- Wenisch, Franz  
 1979 *Spezifisch anglisches Wortgut in den nordhumbrischen Interlinearglossierungen des Lukasevangeliums*. Heidelberg: Winter.

*Robert Nedoma, Vienna (Austria)*

## 54. The phonology of Germanic

- |                 |                         |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Introductory | 4. Post-tonic Syllables |
| 2. Consonants   | 5. References           |
| 3. Vowels       |                         |

### 1. Introductory

#### 1.1. Preliminaries

This account will concentrate on Proto-Germanic (PGmc), with side-glances at important developments in the daughter languages. No systematic notice will be taken of fragmentarily attested idioms, such as Langobardic or “Crimean Gothic”. The emphasis will be on correspondences rather than change processes and on data rather than phonological “theories”. Reconstructions of the parent language will incline to “classical” late (1) Proto-Indo-European (PIE) – even though this is a convenient fiction.

Conventions: \**word* represents a (posited or reconstructed) lexeme that is not attested; *word* \* a particular spelling or form (typically nom. sg. or infinitive as a headword) that is not found in the texts although the lexeme itself is attested (this is common for Gothic forms, given the limited nature of the corpus); \*\**word* indicates hypothesized pre-forms that presumably existed but have not left a (direct) reflex; †*word* designates an unattested form that might be expected to result from a given reconstruction but shows a different reflex. Laryngeals are depicted by  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ , and  $x_3$  for  $e$ -,  $a$ -, and  $o$ -colouring respectively,  $X$  for when the quality is unknown or unspecified; resonants, by  $R$ , semi-vowels by  $W$ ;  $C$  = any consonant;  $V$  = any vowel. A small circle under a resonant indicates syllabicity. Analogical forms are enclosed in [ ]. For reasons of space, references will be kept to a minimum. I apologize that not all scholars will receive due acknowledgment. For a recent treatment, see Ringe (2006).