

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20185> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia Elisabeth

Title: The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic : origin and accentuation

Issue Date: 2012-11-28

4 LANGUAGE CONTACT BETWEEN PROTO-SLAVIC AND GERMANIC TRIBES

4.1 THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC HOMELANDS

In this chapter, it will be investigated when and where the contacts between speakers of Germanic and Proto-Slavic arose. In order to do this, the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland and the time and direction of the movements of Proto-Slavs out of their homeland into the areas where they came into contact with Germanic tribes will be examined.

4.1.1 THE PROTO-GERMANIC HOMELAND

The handbooks often mention that the Germanic languages originated in the first millennium BC in the north of present-day Germany and in southern Scandinavia (cf., e.g., König/Van der Auwera 1994: 1, Mallory/Adams 1997: 218-219, Ringe 2006: 213). Bennett regards the waters in between not to have been a major obstacle: “the Skaggerak and the Kattegat were then scarcely more than small bays or fjords, and the Baltic was a fresh-water lake that covered a much smaller area than it does today” (1950: 234).

Udolph assumes that the Germanic homeland was originally located more to the south. On the basis of onomastic and hydronymic evidence, he places the original Germanic homeland in “ein relativ enges Gebiet in Deutschland” corresponding to the south-western part of the former GDR. The area bordered on the river Elbe in the east. The Erzgebirge and the Thuringian Forest formed natural barriers in the south. A clear border in the west is absent, whereas the river Aller, north of the Harz, formed the northern barrier of the supposed Germanic homeland (1994: 925-926). Udolph supposes that the area in northern Germany and southern Scandinavia was only inhabited by speakers of Proto-Germanic after population growth compelled them to spread from their homeland in the last centuries BC (1994: 927). This theory of an expansion of Proto-Germanic people to the north and west is consistent with the onomastic evidence that Udolph adduces in his monograph, whereas a spread from a supposed northern (Scandinavian) homeland to the south and west is, in view of the onomastic evidence, much harder to picture (1994: 932).

Proto-Germanic has been dated to the last centuries BC, but not earlier than 500 BC (e.g., Ringe 2006: 213). Proto-Germanic as such would have come to an end as a result of the migration of the Goths, which can probably be dated to the second century AD (cf. Nielsen 2000: 238, Jelinek 1926: 4). Northwest

Germanic has been regarded as a gradually dissolving dialect continuum “during the first four or five centuries AD”, which came to an end as a result of separate North Sea Germanic, early Norse and (Old) High German innovations (Nielsen 2000: 295).

There seems to be more or less general consensus in linking the Germanic homeland in northern Germany and in southern Scandinavia to the archaeological Jastorf culture. The Jastorf culture existed from around 600 BC until the turn of the millennium. The core area lies in northern Germany, in present-day north-eastern Lower Saxony, Holstein and western Mecklenburg. The southern part of the Jastorf territory shows archaeological influence of the La Tène culture, which is generally thought to be Celtic. The interaction between the Jastorf and La Tène cultures has been connected to the Celtic loanwords in Proto-Germanic (Mallory/Adams 1997: 218-219, 321-322). According to Dahl, the Germanic speaking tribes arrived in the area in northern Germany and Denmark shortly before the beginning of the first millennium AD. When Denmark became the major political power in the following centuries, the language spread to other areas of Scandinavia, which led to a homogeneous linguistic situation in Scandinavia in the first centuries AD (2001: 231).

The first mention of the Germanic people by the Romans stems from Julius Caesar in his *Commentarii de bello Gallico* (*Commentaries on the Gaulish War*). Caesar crossed the river Rhine during his conquests in Gaul in the middle of the first century BC. He describes the Germanic people he encountered along the Rhine (particularly the Suebi) as primitive and savage people, who had set their minds to invading the Gaulish territories across the Rhine. Roman knowledge of the interior of the Germanic lands remained scarce, although the advancement of the Roman army led to increasing contact with Germanic people from around the turn of the millennium (not only in the west, but also in other areas, for example, along the river Elbe and in Bohemia). From these contacts date the majority of Latin loanwords in Germanic. Almost all Latin loanwords are, however, supposed to have reached Old Norse only later or through mediation of other languages (Green 1998: 201).

4.1.2 THE GOTHIC HOMELAND

The Goths are probably the first Germanic tribe the Slavs came into contact with. The date and location of these contacts, however, remain subject to considerable debate, which is closely related to the question of the homeland of the Goths. The location of the homeland of the Goths and the way they travelled

from the Proto-Germanic homeland to the Black Sea coast, where they emerged in the early decades of the third century, is disputed among scholars.

The most important Roman work describing the early Germanic people is Tacitus' *De origine et situ Germanorum* (*On the origin and location of the Germani*, alternatively called *Germania*), that appeared in 98 AD. The work was probably partly based on material collected by the geographer Ptolemy. By the time Tacitus compiled his work, a sizable amount of information about the Germanic people had become available, mainly through writings of Roman commanders, emissaries and traders (Todd 2004: 2-5). Tacitus locates the *Got(h)ones*, who have of course been identified with the Goths because of the formal correspondence between the names, along the lower reaches of the river Vistula, but not directly bordering on the Baltic Sea coast:

[240] [...] Beyond the Lygii are the Gothones, [241] who live under a monarchy, somewhat more strict than that of the other German nations, yet not to a degree incompatible with liberty. Adjoining to these are the Rugii [242] and Lemovii, [243] situated on the sea-coast [...] (Tacitus 1854: 336).

It has often been suggested that the Goths originated in a homeland along the Baltic coast from where they moved east of the Carpathian Mountains towards the Black Sea (cf., e.g., Nielsen 2000: 326-330). Historical descriptions are the main reason that the Gothic homeland has commonly been placed in northern Poland (after the Goths had allegedly crossed the Baltic Sea from Scandinavia). Nielsen, for example, on the basis of the historical sources, "safely conclude[s] that the Goths were settled in the lower Vistula area at the beginning of our era" (2000: 326).

This traditional view is based upon the description by Tacitus as cited above, as well as a description by Ptolemy, and on claims made by the Gothic historian Jordanes in his *De origine actibusque Getarum* (*On the origin and deeds of the Goths*, also *Getica*). The *Getica* dates from around 550, and was probably intended as a summary of the now-lost *Gothic history* that was written by the Roman statesman Cassiodorus. Jordanes almost certainly made use of earlier works by classical writers like Strabo, Tacitus and Ptolemy (Barford 2001: 35). According to Jordanes' saga, the Goths originally came from Scandinavia. From there, they moved southwards through a marshy area, which presumably refers to the Pripet marshes (Jellinek 1926: 4). Jordanes writes:

IV (25) Now from this island of Scandza, as from a hive of races or a womb of nations, the Goths are said to have come forth long ago under their king, Berig by name. As soon as they disembarked from their ships

and set foot on the land, they straightway gave their name to the place. And even to-day it is said to be called Gothiscandza (Mierow 1915: 57).

Corroboration for the placing of the homeland of the Goths in Scandinavia has been found in Scandinavian toponyms as *Göt(a)land* (an area in southern Sweden) and *Gotland* (a Swedish island) (Nielsen 2000: 329).

Nevertheless, we have to be very careful with the use of the written sources. As Barford warns, “we tend to place too much faith in the truth of the written word”: people are inclined to hold on to the things written down in chronicles and histories (2001: 5). The written texts that have come down to us survived largely by chance: the existing texts were often saved because they were copied in later times (with the possibility of later editing, shortening or misinterpreting the contents by later scribes). The surviving texts might not be a sample selection of the original body of writings. Barford reminds us that the writers of texts often acquired their information by a variety of indirect means, which can significantly decrease the reliability of the text. Tacitus, for example, wrote *Germania* without probably ever having been to Germania and based his description on earlier accounts, for example by Pliny and Ptolemy. Furthermore, the information the writer provides is often the result of his own interpretation and it is not always clear what message the writer wanted to convey in the text (ibid.: 5-6). Jordanes wrote *Getica* to glorify the history of the Goths, and might have chosen an appealing story out of the several existing legends of the origin of his people. The Scandinavian toponyms *Göt(a)land* and *Gotland* do not necessarily prove that the Goths originated there because names denoting tribes and peoples spread easily from one people to another, cf. §4.2 on the Veneti and §5.2, s.v. PSl. **volxъ*.

An entirely different theory about the origins of the Goths has been proposed by Mańczak (1987). He locates the Gothic homeland in the very southern part of the continental Germanic area. Mańczak departs from the premise that the closer languages are in a geographical sense, the more lexical stock they have in common. He illustrates this by comparing parallel texts in a number of Germanic languages. In accordance to this idea, it follows that if the Gothic homeland were indeed in Scandinavia, Gothic should have most lexical similarities with Swedish. However, Mańczak demonstrates that Gothic surprisingly shares the least lexical correspondences with Swedish, out of all modern Germanic languages included in the research. The degree of lexical similarity between Gothic and the investigated languages increases towards the south of the continental Germanic language area: Mańczak observed the most lexical similarities between Gothic and the Upper German dialects of High German. Gothic is thus lexically closer to the southern West Germanic dialects

than to the languages of Scandinavia.¹⁹ On the basis of this, he concludes that the “homeland of the Goths was not in Scandinavia, but in the southernmost part of ancient Germania” (1987: 5). Much can be said about this method and the results that can be achieved by comparing the vocabulary in parallel texts are dubious. This is shown by the fact that Mańczak places the Proto-Slavic homeland in the Oder and Vistula basins, as a result of an investigation into the lexical convergences between the Slavic languages on the basis of fragments of the gospels in the modern Slavic languages (2009, cf. §4.1.4 about the “Weichsel/Oder theory”).

The idea of the southern location of the Gothic homeland is, however, supported by Kortlandt, who regards a “large-scale migration of Goths from the Baltic to the Black Sea [...] highly unlikely” (2002b: 2). The reasons he adduces for this are that there is firstly a “clear discontinuity between the Przeworsk culture in Poland and the Černjahov culture in the Ukraine which are identified with the Goths before and after the migration”, secondly that there is no evidence for a large-scale migration of Goths through the Slavic homeland before they were stirred by the arrival of the Huns in the fourth century. And as a further argument, he reasons that people tend to migrate towards areas of “more stable climatic conditions” and better living conditions. Bearing these factors in mind, it would be highly unexpected that the Goths moved “from the richer upland forest into the poorer lowland steppe” (ibid.).

The Roman Empire posed great attraction to the ‘barbarians’ living north of the Roman Empire and many groups moved towards the limes along the Danube in search of wealth (Barford 2001: 23ff.). Attacks of ‘barbarians’ led to considerable depopulation in the northern Roman provinces that bordered on the river Danube. We would therefore rather expect the Goths, like other Germanic peoples before them, to move southwards towards the Roman Empire. For these reasons, Kortlandt agrees with Mańczak in locating the homeland of the Goths in Lower Austria, where different East and West Germanic tribes may have met on their way towards the Roman Empire. From Lower Austria, they would have followed the river Danube until reaching the Black Sea (2002b: 3).

Gothic has a number of loanwords from Celtic that are attested only in Gothic and not in the other Germanic languages: Goth. *siponeis* ‘disciple’, *kelikn* ‘tower’,

¹⁹ It must, however, be noted that Gothic shares a number of phonological and morphological correspondences with North Germanic, which are not shared by West Germanic (cf. Jellinek 1926: 11–13).

alew 'oil' and *lukarn* 'lamp' (Green 1998: 156-158, cf. Kortlandt 2002b: 3).²⁰ It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that these words were borrowed after the Goths had split off from the Proto-Germanic dialect continuum. Green explores the possible areas where this contact between Goths and Celts may have come about and suggests Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia or the Balkans (1998: 156-158). The most obvious place of contact seems to be Moravia (cf. Kortlandt 2002b: 3), but this is difficult to connect with the idea of a Gothic migration from the Baltic east of the Carpathian Mountains to the Pontic area. The existence of Celtic loanwords in Gothic thus seems to corroborate the idea of a southern Gothic homeland.

Whichever way the Goths went, they are first recorded by the middle of the third century, when they started raiding the Roman Empire. In 238, the Goths raided the town of Histria on the coast of the Black Sea in the Roman province of Moesia inferior. In 271, after numerous other attacks on the Roman Empire, the Romans yielded the province of Dacia (that bordered the Danube in the south and the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains in the north) to the Goths. Hereafter, the Roman frontier was established along the Danube. In the course of the fourth century, most Goths became (Aryan) Christians, partly due to the works of Wulfila, who was the first Gothic bishop and translator of the Bible. However, already before Wulfila made his translation of the Bible around 369, the Goths had come into contact with Christianity (Jellinek 1926: 7ff.). When Christian Goths were persecuted in their home-province of Dacia, they were allowed to settle as *foederati* in the Roman province of Moesia, where they received protection in exchange for which they had to provide soldiers to serve in the Roman army.

From the fourth century onwards, a division can be made between Visigoths and Ostrogoths. The Ostrogoths had a large empire east along the river Dniestr, which became subjected to the Huns when they arrived in Europe. In the early fifth century, the Visigoths and Ostrogoths began moving westwards and established empires in present-day Spain and Italy, respectively. After the migration of the Goths to the west, smaller contingents of Goths remained in the Balkans, but they had lost their position of power. After the sixth century, no mention of presence of the Goths in south-eastern Europe is made, until the ninth century, when the Frankish monk Walafrid Strabo writes that in the

²⁰ Green mentions the possibility that the latter two words, and possibly Goth. *siponeis* as well, were transmitted from Celtic to Gothic through the Cimbri, probably a Germanic people (1998: 157-158).

Dobrudja area (a region in present-day eastern Bulgaria and Romania), the Gothic language was used in church (cf. §1.2.1.2). Up to the 16th century, a dialect of Gothic remained as a spoken language in the Crimea.

4.1.3 THE HUNS AND THE AVARS

Large-scale wanderings of people over Europe started during the Migration Period, which, in particular, consisted of raids of various Germanic tribes into the Roman Empire. The Migration Period was evoked by the emergence of the Huns in Europe and took place approximately from the fourth to sixth centuries. The Huns were a configuration of Central Asian tribes that roamed Europe and caused massive upheaval in the late fourth century and the first half of the fifth century. They first appeared around 370 north of the Black Sea, where they subjugated first the (Iranian) Alans and a couple of years later also the Ostrogoths. Soon, the Huns built a huge empire that, at its peak, stretched far into modern-day Germany. Almost immediately after the death of the Hunnic leader Attila in 453, the Hunnic empire collapsed.

The Huns were in all likelihood a relatively small group of horsemen, who were joined by other ethnic groups along their way into central Europe (Barford 2001: 33ff.). It is not entirely clear what language the Huns spoke, but they are often regarded as a Turkic tribe. Three words are recorded in the Hunnic empire. The Byzantine historian Priscus of Pannia, who travelled through the Hunnic lands, described two drinks: *medos* (a substitute for wine) and *kamon* (a drink made of barley that was offered to the servants). Jordanes uses the word *strava* to describe the wake at the funeral of Attila. These words give few clues about the language(s) spoken in the Hunnic empire: *medos* is very likely to be mead and might be a Slavic word, but could also be Germanic or another Indo-European language. The word *kamon* cannot be linked to any language. *Strava* exists in the modern West and East Slavic languages and means ‘food’, although it is unclear whether the Slavic word *strava* can be connected to the *strava* at Attila’s funeral wake (Schenker 1995: 6).

About a century after the disappearance of the Huns, another nomadic tribe entered Europe over the lowland plains in the east. These were the Avars. From the second half of the sixth century onwards, the Avars had their centre of power in the Carpathian Basin, but they held supremacy over the inhabitants of a large part of central Europe until they were ultimately defeated by Charlemagne around 800. After capturing the Avar fortress that was situated somewhere between Carinthia and the Danube in 795/796, Charlemagne established the so-called Avar March in the east of his empire in order to protect his empire from raids of the Avars. This made the (mainly Slavic) inhabitants of

the Avar March, which comprised present-day Lower Austria, Burgenland and northwest Hungary, tributary to the Frankish Empire. Hereafter, the Avars disappeared as rapidly as the Huns had done a couple of centuries earlier. As with the Huns, the ethnic origin of the Avars is not entirely clear. Many scholars regard the Avars to be a Turkic tribe from Central Asia. Nichols put forward the theory that the Avars were in fact an Iranian tribe (probably Alans, an East Iranian tribe deriving from the Sarmatians). She bases this on the fact that there is hardly any linguistic evidence that the Proto-Slavs had been in close contact with speakers of a Turkic language (1993: 387-388). Lunt suggested that Proto-Slavic functioned as a *lingua franca* within the Avar khaganate because this would explain how the language was able to spread over a large area in a relative short period of time and remained relatively stable until the beginning of the ninth century (1984-1985: 421-422).

The violent raids of the Huns caused Germanic tribes to start moving around in search of safety. They sought their refuge in the safer and economically more developed territory of the Roman Empire. The movements of the Germanic tribes are part of the first stage of the Migration Period and lasted from the last few decades of the fourth century until the first half of the fifth century.

The second half of the fifth century and the early sixth century are characterised by the arrival of the Proto-Slavs in the areas vacated by Germanic peoples. The areas newly populated by the Slavs were, however, not completely devoid of inhabitants. Although archaeological finds show a decrease of population density after the Migration Period, there are no archaeological signs that large areas were completely depopulated (Brather 2008: 61). Neither is there any evidence that the areas where the Proto-Slavs are supposed to have lived originally significantly depopulated when they made their appearance in central Europe. One must for that reason assume that the enormous spread of the Slavs in a short period of time is largely due to assimilation by other linguistic groups, probably mainly speakers of Germanic (Barford 2001: 46, cf. Brather 2008: 61). After their expansion, the Slavs inhabited the larger part of present-day central and eastern Europe.

4.1.4 THE PROTO-SLAVIC HOMELAND

No consensus exists about the location of the homeland of the Proto-Slavs before they had moved into central Europe. The following section gives an overview of the indications we have for establishing the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland.

The Slavs are not mentioned at all in writings by classical authors before the sixth century. This is significant, for the classical writers did show a lively interest in the Celtic and Germanic peoples inhabiting their neighbouring lands in central and northern Europe. This disparity can only be explained by the fact that the Proto-Slavs were unknown to the Romans until after the Migration Period and lived outside the sphere of influence of the Roman Empire.

In Roman times, the amber route formed a well-travelled trade route from the Baltic coast through contemporary western Poland, Silesia and the eastern part of the Alps to the Roman port of Aquileia. Through the trading of amber, the Romans had long been in touch with the peoples along this route. These were probably Germanic peoples, given the fact that the Romans borrowed the word for amber from Germanic (cf. §4.6.2). Had the Proto-Slavs lived along this trading route and occupied themselves directly or indirectly with amber trade with the Romans, then the Romans would certainly have mentioned the Slavs in their accounts. It follows that the Proto-Slavs did not originally live within the reach of the amber trading route between the Baltic Sea through present-day western Poland to the Mediterranean Sea. This negative evidence is corroborated by the absence of a word for amber in Proto-Slavic. Russian borrowed *jantar* from Lith. *gintāras* 'amber', and the word was borrowed from Russian into a number of other Slavic languages, e.g., Ukrainian, Czech, Serbian/Croatian and Slovene (cf. Schenker 1995: 4, Gołąb 1991: 338, REW 3: 491). P *bursztyn* stems from Germanic (cf. G *Bernstein*), and S *čilibar*, Bg. *kexlibar* stem from Turkic (cf. Turkish *kehribar*).

Evidence on the basis of tree names seems to place the Proto-Slavs even farther eastwards. Proto-Slavic lacks inherited words for beech, European larch, noble fir or yew tree. The occurrence of these trees has been placed west of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa. This might indicate that the Proto-Slavs lived to the east of the above-mentioned line (Juškova 2006: 148). However, pollen analysis has shown that the spread of, for example, the beech in the past was much more restricted than today. In prehistory, the eastern range of the beech reached only as far as the river Elbe, instead of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa (Birnbaum 1973: 407-408). If this is correct, it would place the Proto-Slavs only east of the river Elbe, but since there is no evidence that the Proto-Slavs originally lived across the Elbe anyway, this would add nothing new to our knowledge.

Proto-Slavic lacks nautical terminology: there are no words relating to seafaring, boatbuilding, sea fishing and sea trade that can be reconstructed for Proto-Slavic (Schenker 1995: 4). PSl. *morje* 'sea' probably originally meant 'marsh'; in Russian dialects, the word is attested in the meaning 'lake' (REW 2: 157-158). PSl. *ostrovъ* 'island' is a compound of the preposition **ob-* and **strov-* that derives

from the verbal root meaning ‘to flow, stream’ (Derksen 2008: 379). PSl. **ostrovъ* ‘island’ thus literally means ‘circum-flow’, which suggests that it originally referred to islets in rivers, rather than in the sea. According to Meillet, this “détail de vocabulaire confirme que les Slaves étaient essentiellement des terriens et que la mer est entrée tardivement dans leur vie, bien qu’ils en aient toujours eu quelque notion.” (1927: 8). The absence of a maritime vocabulary in Proto-Slavic indeed strongly indicates that the Proto-Slavs did not live along the coast.

So far, only negative linguistic evidence concerning the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland has been adduced. This evidence places the homeland: 1. out of the range of influence of the Roman Empire, 2. to the east of the amber trade route and possibly of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa and 3. away from the Baltic Sea.

This evidence combined makes the so-called “autochthonous theory” or “Weichsel/Oder theory” about the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland highly improbable. According to this theory, which has mostly been adhered to by Polish scholars, the Proto-Slavs originally lived in present-day western Poland, in the territory between the rivers Vistula and Oder from the second millennium BC onwards (a current adherent is, e.g., Manczak 2009). The theory connects the Proto-Slavs to the archaeological Lusatian culture (Schenker 1995: 1-2). Martynov is also one of the advocates of the “autochthonous theory” (1963: 5) and he connects the earliest contacts between the Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic peoples to this western location of the Proto-Slavic homeland (cf. §1.3.4). Historical and linguistic evidence, however, makes the presence of Proto-Slavs anywhere west of the river Vistula before the second century AD highly improbable.

The most extensive study of the Proto-Slavic homeland on the basis of hydronyms is made by Udolph (1979). He investigated the names for rivers, streams, marshes, etc., in the entire area that is today inhabited by Slavs. On the basis of this, he places the Proto-Slavic homeland on the northern and north-eastern foothills of the Carpathians “etwa zwischen Zakopane [near Kraków] im Westen und der Bukowina im Osten [approximately to the town of Chernivtsi in southwest Ukraine]” (1979: 619). Although the exact borders of the Proto-Slavic homeland cannot be determined, Udolph supposes an area of about 300 kilometres from east to west and about 50 to 150 kilometres from north to south (1979: 623). This location places the Proto-Slavs to the west of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa, which defies the already questionable evidence from the spread of trees and tree names. In the area on the north-eastern foothills of the Carpathians, Udolph has found: 1. the largest number of appellatives that are reflected in all branches of Slavic, 2. the largest concentration of hydronyms

derived from appellatives that are otherwise only attested in South Slavic, as well as 3. hydronyms that preserve old ablaut forms (1979: 619-620). This location is, I think, is the most likely site of the Proto-Slavic homeland. Udolph dates the residence of the Proto-Slavs in this homeland to the period before 500 because they shortly afterwards first appeared in the Balkans. He supposes that the Proto-Slavs occupied only a small area until the beginning of the first millennium (1979: 623).

Gołąb regards the location of the Proto-Slavs on the foothills of the northern Carpathians around the beginning of our era “demographically impossible” because he considers these areas (with its dense forests and poor soil) to be chiefly refuge areas. Rather than being a permanent habitat, the foothills of the mountains would have attracted Proto-Slavs in times of demographic upheaval (1991: 262). The concentration of Slavic hydronyms in the sub-Carpathian zone is explained by Gołąb by the general density of streams and brooks in this area because of the hilly territory, on the one hand, and by the general late colonization of the Carpathian foothills, on the other hand, as a result of which the Slavs would have been the first ones to name the waters instead of taking over pre-existing names as they might have done in the more exposed forest steppes.

The location of the Proto-Slavic homeland as supposed by Udolph places it south of the Pripet (Pinsk) Marshes. The Pripet Marshes form an immense territory of wetlands on both sides of the river Pripet and its tributaries. It is the largest swampland in Europe and consists of impenetrable woods that are interspersed with swamps and streams. The natural conditions and frequent floods in spring and autumn make the area unattractive for human population and make agriculture difficult (even today, the Pripet Marshes are not densely populated, which is one of the reasons why it was decided to build the ill-fated nuclear power plant in the town of Chernobyl). Being rather impenetrable, on the one hand, and unhealthy, on the other hand, the Pripet Marshes themselves form a very unlikely location for the Proto-Slavic homeland. It can rather be supposed that the Proto-Slavs originally lived in an area bordering the Pripet Marshes. Hydronymic evidence places the early Balts to the north of these marshes (Gołąb 1991: 248).

It has often been tried to connect the Proto-Slavs to one or more archaeological cultures. This is a hazardous undertaking and not one that has proven to be very

successful (Brather 2004: 214).²¹ According to Brather, all attempts to locate the Proto-Slavs before approximately 500 have remained unsuccessful or unconvincing. Archaeological traces are difficult to follow because of the rapid demographic changes during the Migration Period. The Proto-Slavs are especially difficult to trace because their material culture appears to have lacked many distinguishing features (ibid.: 216). Scholars have connected a number of archaeological cultures to the Proto-Slavs: the Przeworsk culture (second century BC to fourth century AD, upper and middle reaches of the Oder and Vistula), the (late-)Zarubintsy culture (first and second century, Pripet and middle Dniepr), the Černjaxov culture (third and fourth century, lower Danube and Dniepr) and the Kiev culture (third to fifth century, Middle Dniepr and Desna) (ibid.: 213-214). The Przeworsk culture has mainly been considered to be either of Germanic or of mixed Slavic and Germanic nature (Mallory/Adams 1997: 470). The Zarubintsy culture has often been connected to the Proto-Slavs (ibid.: 657). This was one of the archaeological cultures that influenced the Černjaxov culture, which shows influence from ethnically different tribes, of Slavic, (East) Germanic and Iranian (Scythian and Sarmatian) origin. Mallory/Adams consider the Černjaxov culture “a convenient contact zone to explain lexical borrowings between Germans and Slavs, and Iranians and Slavs” (1997: 106).

4.2 SLAVIC EXPANSION TOWARDS THE ROMAN EMPIRE

The Gothic historian Jordanes mentions the Slavs in his *Getica* and by doing so, he is the first to make note of the Proto-Slavs in writing. Jordanes mentions three tribes that have by later scholars been regarded as Proto-Slavic: the Veneti, the Antes and the Sclaveni. Although the Sclaveni (and the Antes, who, according to contemporary sources, spoke the same language as the Sclaveni) have generally been regarded as Slavs, there is, as Curta remarks, no concluding evidence of the language they spoke in the sixth century (2004: 140). One must, furthermore, be careful in connecting ethnonyms to ethnic groups, for

²¹ Nielsen calls the mixing of archaeological or prehistoric facts with linguistic ones a “trap” because there is not necessarily a connection between the two. Archaeological information cannot be indiscriminately connected to linguistic groups because those aspects of prehistoric life that can be discovered on the basis of archaeology (e.g., types of pottery or burial rites) can be transferred from one group to the other, without the necessity of a genetic relation between the two (2000: 31).

ethnonyms are easily transferred from one group to the other.²² Compare, for example, the name Veneti (Venedi or Venethi) that is known from historical sources to denote at least three different tribes: firstly, a people along the Adriatic coast, whose language Venetic is attested in ca. 300 inscriptions between 600 BC and 100 AD; secondly, a Celtic, seafaring tribe by the name of Veneti that lived in the southern part of the peninsula of Brittany. They were vanquished and sent into slavery by Caesar around 56 BC. The third group of Late Iron Age Veneti was a tribe along the river Vistula. Pliny the Elder, Ptolemy and Tacitus wrote about this people, which has not left any written records. Today, the name of the Veneti is retained as the German designation for those Slavs with whom they live in close contact, viz. G *Wenden* 'Sorbs', Austrian G *Winden* 'Carinthian Slovenes'.

Jordanes writes about the Veneti, the Antes and the Sclaveni:

- (34) Within these rivers [Tisia, Danube, Flutausis, Ister] lies Dacia, encircled by the lofty Alps [Carpathian Mountains] as by a crown. Near their left ridge, which inclines toward the north, and beginning at the source of the Vistula, the populous race of the Venethi dwell, occupying a great expanse of land. Though their names are now dispersed amid various clans and places, yet they are chiefly called Sclaveni and Antes.
- (35) The abode of the Sclaveni extends from the city of Noviodunum [present-day Isaccea (Rumania) on the banks of the river Danube] and the [unknown] lake called Mursianus to the Danaster [Dniestr], and northward as far as the Vistula. They have swamps and forests for their cities. The Antes, who are the bravest of these peoples dwelling in the curve of the sea of Pontus [Black Sea], spread from the Danaster to the Danaper [Dniepr], rivers that are many days' journey apart (Mierow 1915: 59-60).

This description is likely to reflect the historical situation in the sixth century, when Cassiodorus and Jordanes wrote their respective works.

The Byzantine historian Procopius, a contemporary of Jordanes, described the Slavic tribes in his work *Historia Arcana* (*Secret history*):

²² Gołąb, for example, readily connects ethnonyms given by classical writers to various peoples. In his discussion of Ptolemy's *Geography*, for example, he remarks that "the Goths (*Γύθωνες*)" did not border the Baltic coast because they were separated from the coast by the "*Οὐενέδαι* (i.e. the Slavs!)" (1991: 351).

“(VII. 14. 22-30). And both the two peoples [the Sclaveni and the Antae] have also the same language, an utterly barbarous tongue. [...] In fact, the Sclaveni and the Antae actually had a single name in the remote past; for they were both called Spori in olden times because, I suppose, living apart one man from another, they inhabit their country in a sporadic fashion. And in consequence of this very fact they hold a great amount of land; for they alone inhabit the greatest part of the northern bank of the Ister [Danube]. So much then may be said regarding these peoples.” (Dewing 1962: 273-275).

Procopius mentions raids of the Antes and the Sclaveni in the Danube frontier region and connects these raids to the beginning of the reign of the Byzantine emperor Justin I (reign 518-527) (Barford 2001: 35, Curta 2001: 75ff.). Procopius writes that the attack of the Slavs was averted by a man called Germanus, who was the *magister militum per Thraciam* (the “master of the soldiers” in the Roman diocese of Thrace, which comprised the Roman provinces on the eastern part of the Balkans, between Dacia and the Black Sea). The next mention of the Slavs in Procopius’ works is in relation to the reign of Justin’s successor Justinian, under whose rule the Romans started to invade the non-Roman lands across the Danube. These campaigns did not prove to be very successful, for soon afterwards the next *magister militum* got killed on a campaign into the barbaric lands, after which, as Procopius remarks, “the river became free for the barbarians to cross [and enter the Roman Empire] all times just as they wished” (Curta 2001: 76).

The descriptions by Jordanes and Procopius are the oldest remaining testimonies of contacts of the Proto-Slavs with the Goths and with the Roman Empire.

4.3 SLAVIC EXPANSION TOWARDS THE WEST AND THE LATER FRANKISH EMPIRE

On their way westwards and after their arrival in central Europe, the Proto-Slavs came into contact with speakers of Germanic too. The geographical situation suggests that these Germanic peoples spoke pre-stages of High and Low German dialects, the oldest attested forms of which are Old High German and Old Saxon, respectively. The extent of the initial spread of the Slavs into present-day Germany is evidenced by a large amount of Slavic place names in Germany. These show that the Slavs once occupied the entire territory east of the river Elbe (and in some regions also stretching across the Elbe on its left banks) in an area that by and large corresponds to the former GDR. Slavic place-names can be found almost as far west as Hamburg and the Lüneburger Heide, where, for

example, the name Wendland testifies that the area was inhabited by Slavs (viz., the Polabians).

The move of Proto-Slavs into central Europe is difficult to date archaeologically. Brather supposes that the Slavs arrived in Poland in the first half of the sixth century, while Moravia and Bohemia would have been settled by Slavs in the second half of the sixth century (Brather 2008: 58-61). Both Herrmann (1985) and Brather (2008) date the beginning of the slavisation of central and eastern Germany chiefly to the seventh century. On the basis of archaeological evidence, Herrmann assumes that the Elbe-Saale area was populated from Bohemia in the second half of the sixth or early seventh century: the Slavs would have followed the Elbe northwards from Bohemia and Moravia (areas inhabited by Langobards in the sixth century) into the Saale area (1985: 21-26). Brather supposes that from there, they gradually spread northwards, reaching Mecklenburg and Pomerania in the second half of the seventh century and finally arriving in Ostholstein, the most north-western part of their territory, at the beginning of the eighth century (2008: 60-61, cf. Herrmann 1985: 9-10). This idea is, however, contradicted by linguistic evidence: the similarities between the Lechitic languages (i.e., Polish, Pomeranian (Kashubian and Slovincian) and Polabian), on the one hand, and Czech and Slovak, on the other hand, indicate that the later West Slavic branch of languages divided into at least two subgroups soon after the migration from the Proto-Slavic homeland. It has been argued that Sorbian should be regarded as a separate subgroup within West Slavic. Sorbian has a number of features in common with Lechitic that are not shared by Czech/Slovak and it shares a number of features with Czech/Slovak that are not shared by Lechitic (Stone 1972: 91-97, Schaarschmidt 1997: 7, 155-156). According to Schaarschmidt, Upper and Lower Sorbian are, however, more closely related to Lechitic than to Czech and Slovak (1997: 155-156).

The early split of the West Slavic tribes was caused by the ranges of hills and mountains that the Slavs had to cross on their way to the west (Udolph 1979: 626-627). The Lechitic group passed the Świętokrzyskie Mountains in central Poland both to the north and the south and the strong concentration of Slavic toponyms in the region of Posen (Poznań) points to early Slavic settlement in this area. According to Udolph, the further spread of the Lechitic group, including the way the Polabians reached their territory in northern Germany, remains unclear (1979: 626). The Slavs that later became speakers of Czech/Slovak moved into their present living area through passes in the Carpathian Mountains, the main trails probably being the route along the river Orava and the route through the Moravian Gate (*ibid.*: 627).

The landscape in central Europe was characterised by dense forests, which separated the tribes inhabiting the area. These woods served as natural barriers

of the areas settled by the Proto-Slavs. In the lowland plains of eastern Thuringia (in the Saale basin), no natural barrier separated Slavic and Germanic tribes, so there they lived in close proximity. The close proximity of Slavs and Germans is reflected in toponyms and family names consisting of a mixture of a Slavic and a German part (e.g., the family name *Arnoltitz* < **Arnoltici*, a German name with a Slavic suffix, or the place-name *Bogumilsdorf*, now *Bommelsdorf*, a compound of a Slavic and a Germanic element). The forms *-winden/-wenden* or *Windisch-/Wendisch-* also occur in toponyms in areas where Slavs and Germanic people lived in close proximity (Herrmann 1985: 43), cf., for example, the neighbouring villages *Deutsch Evern* and *Wendisch Evern* south of Lüneburg.²³ When the Germans advanced to the east again (which started under the Merovingian dynasty in the sixth century), they mainly took over the existing Slavic toponyms and hydronyms.

In central Europe, the Slavs came under the influence of the increasingly eastwards expanding Frankish Empire. In the year 531, the Frankish Empire conquered Thuringia, whereas Swabia had already been incorporated in the Empire a couple of decennia earlier. Hereafter, the eastward expansion came to a halt until a second period of wars of conquest was initiated by Charlemagne in the second half of the eighth century. During his reign (that lasted from 768 until his death in 814), he undertook about 50 campaigns, and many of them were directed towards the lands across the eastern borders of the Empire. In 774, Charlemagne subjugated the lands north of Regensburg and in 778, Bavaria. In the last three decades of the eighth century, the Saxon Wars in the lower Elbe area led to the incorporation of Saxony into the Frankish Empire. Frankish annals testify that Slavic tribes took part in Frankish campaigns in the late eighth and early ninth century; the Obotrites and Sorbs are, for example, mentioned to have taken part in the campaign against the Slavic Veleti. Charlemagne's expansionism in the areas on the eastern side of the rivers Elbe and Saale came to a halt in the beginning of the ninth century (Herrmann 1985: 327-329). In the ninth century, the eastern frontier of the Frankish Empire was formed by the *limes Sorabicus*. The exact location of the *limes Sorabicus* is not clear but it is supposed to have mainly followed the course of the river Saale. This river is described by Charlemagne's chronicler as the border between the German Thuringians and the Slavic Sorbs (ibid.: 10). Slavic tribes across the

²³ The forms *-winden/-wenden* point to the settling of Slavs in a Germanic environment, the latter forms to later settling of Germans in close proximity of Slavic settlements (Herrmann 1985: 43).

borders of the Frankish Empire remained in a semi-independent position, but they were placed under tribute by the Franks (Hooper/Bennett 1996: 30).

The earliest written account that testifies of Slavic presence in central Europe stems from the Frankish chronicles of Fredegar (Brather 2008: 60). This chronicle was written in the middle of the seventh century and relates to the years 584-642. Fredegar describes a rebellion of Slavs living east of the Frankish Empire against the Avar rule in the year 623/624. The revolt was led by a man called Samo, a Frankish merchant who had become a warlord over Slavic troops. A group of Slavs had managed to free themselves from the Avar superiority and had chosen Samo to be their king (ibid.: 62). Samo and his Slavic men could apparently hold out in a number of subsequent battles against the Avars. Samo established a kind of independent principedom or empire and booked his greatest success in 631/632 when he triumphed over the Frankish army under king Dagobert I in the so-called Battle of Wogastisburg. After this battle, the Sorbian prince Dervanus, described by Fredegar as “dux gente Surbiorum que ex genere Sclavinorum”, declared his independence from the Franks and joined the empire of Samo (Brather 2008: 62, Curta 2001: 330-331). Samo died in 658, after which his empire vanished without a trace. Despite many attempts, it has been impossible to locate the mysterious Slavic empire or Wogastisburg where the Frankish army was beaten. All other sources relating to these events are of later date and based upon Fredegar’s chronicles.

For the remainder of the seventh century and the first half of the eighth century, Frankish chronicles do not mention the Slavs. After the eastward expansion of the Frankish Empire and the submission of the Slavic tribes by Charlemagne in the second half of the eighth century, they are again mentioned in Frankish chronicles of the ninth and tenth centuries (Brather 2008: 63-64). The Slavic tribes had been placed under tribute of the Frankish Empire, and Slavic monarchs tended to be present on the assemblies of the Frankish Empire in the early ninth century. It is mentioned, for example, that there was *In quo conventu* [a gathering in Frankfurt in 822] *omnium orientalium Sclavorum, id est Abodritorum, Soraborum, Wilzorum, Beheimorum, Marvanorum, Praedenecetorum, et in Pannonia residentium Abarum legationes* (ibid.: 65).

4.4 PROTO-SLAVIC LOANWORDS IN GERMANIC

It is well known that the contacts between Proto-Slavs and various Germanic tribes have resulted in dozens of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. The occurrence of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic, on the other hand, is not universally accepted. Holzer writes: “die Existenz einer urslavischen Lehnwortschicht im Germanischen [...] ist umstritten” (1990: 61). Birnbaum

states that “eine Übernahme aus dem Slawischen ins Germanische [sich] so gut wie nirgends nachweisen oder auch nur wahrscheinlich machen lässt” (1984: 9). In principle, it cannot, however, be excluded that the Germanic peoples borrowed words from Proto-Slavic as well. But although there might be several loanwords from Proto-Slavic in Germanic, their number is unquestionably lower than the reverse (pace Martynov 1963).

In view of the probable location of the Proto-Slavic and the Proto-Germanic homelands, it is highly unlikely that the contacts between the Slavic and Germanic tribes started before the time the Proto-Slavs began to spread into central Europe and onto the Balkans, and before the time the Goths had moved into the Pontic area. It can therefore be excluded that any Slavic loanwords were borrowed into Proto-Germanic, for when the first contacts came about, Proto-Germanic as a linguistic unity had ceased to exist. If it is possible to prove or put a convincing case for Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic, these must therefore be words that were either borrowed into Gothic or into West Germanic (or possibly even into Northwest Germanic); if an alleged loanword is attested in all branches of Germanic, the word is hardly likely to stem from Slavic.

Kiparsky adduces five possible Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic (1934: 96-101):

The only possible Gothic loanword from Proto-Slavic is Goth. *plinsjan* ‘to dance’ (unattested in the North and West Germanic languages) (Kiparsky 1934: 98-99). The semantic motivation for the borrowing of PSl. **plęsati* ‘to dance’ into Gothic is unclear. Lehmann suggests that the verb *plinsjan* might have represented an “older shamanistic ritual dance” for the Goths (1986: 273).

PSl. **drop-* ‘great bustard’ (*Otis tarda*, G. *Trappe*) is a bird that is found predominantly in present-day Poland, Galicia and Russia, which corresponds to the area of the supposed Proto-Slavic homeland (Kiparsky 1934: 97). The word is attested as Middle High German and Middle Low German *trappe* or *trap* from the early 13th century onwards.

A number of words related to fur trade are borrowed from Slavic into (West) Germanic. This is not surprising because the Slavs are known to have dealt with fur trade from their early history:

PSl. **kǫrzbno* ‘fur’. The word is attested from the 13th century onwards in West Germanic and occurs in OHG *chursina* ‘fur coat’ (G *Kürsch* ‘fur’), MDu. *corsene* ‘fur’, OFri. *kersne* ‘fur coat’ and OE *crusne*, *crusene* ‘robe made of skins’ (Kiparsky 1934: 97-98).

PSl. **sorka* ‘shirt’ or ‘bag for fur’ has also been thought to be a Slavic loanword in Germanic (Kiparsky 1934: 99-101). The word might be a late loanword, because it is primarily attested in Scandinavian, ON *serkr* ‘shirt’, tunic, Sw. (dial.) *sark*.²⁴ If the word is to be regarded as a loanword from Slavic, the borrowing must nevertheless date from before the Proto-Slavic metathesis of liquids.

PSl. **pvlxъ* ‘(edible) dormouse’ was probably the source of G *Bilche* ‘idem’ (Kiparsky 1934: 99). The dormouse lives in forests in large parts of Europe and was hunted for its meat, grease and fur. Dormouse was a popular delicacy for the Romans. In Slovenia, dormouse hunting is still commonly practised and dormouse figures on the menu to this day (Peršič 1998).

A possible Slavic loanword in Germanic that is not noted by Kiparsky, is PSl. **šuba*, which is probably the source of MHG *schûbe*, *schoube*, G *Schaube* ‘wide coat, often trimmed with fur’. The German word has often been derived from It. *giubba*, *giuppa* ‘coat, jerkin’ (cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Schaube*), but the phonological correspondence between the High German forms and the supposed Romance donor is difficult. Brückner supposed that the Germanic word was of Slavic origin (1927: 556, cf. also HEW 19: 1479). Both in Slavic and Germanic, the word refers to coats made of or trimmed with fur, which speaks for Slavic origin of the Germanic forms.

Another Slavic, though perhaps not Proto-Slavic, loanword in German is MHG *twarc* ‘curd cheese’ (G *Quark* ‘idem’ with High German *qu-* for *tw-*; Du. *kwark* ‘idem’ was borrowed from German). The word is first attested in the 14th century and has been thought to derive from LS *twarog* < PSl. **tvarogъ* ‘curd cheese’ (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Quark*, EWN: s.v. *kwark*, cf. HEW 20: 1563, REW 3: 85), but the word might equally well derive from another West Slavic language or dialect.^{25, 26}

²⁴ E (dial. Scottish and northern English) *sark* ‘chemise’, (late) OE *serc* ‘shirt’ are considered to be borrowed from Old Norse (De Vries 1979: 471).

²⁵ That is to say, the word could have been borrowed from a West Slavic language/dialect that had not (yet) undergone the spirantization of PSl. **g* to *h*. This spirantization went through an intermediate stage [ɣ] which is - on the basis of toponymic and textual evidence - supposed to have existed in Upper Sorbian in the 12th century. Upper Sorbian toponymic evidence of the 14th century shows that the development of PSl. **g* to *h* was completed (Schaarschmidt 1997: 95-97). On the evidence of (Latin) textual evidence, the development of PSl. **g* to *h* has often been dated to the 13th century in Czech and between the first half of the 12th century to the first half of the 13th century in Slovak (Andersen 1969: 557).

²⁶ For OHG *karmala* ‘revolt’, see §6.3.

Martynov (1963) and Gołąb (1991) dismiss the view that Germanic remained by and large untouched by Slavic lexical influence. Gołąb considers it, in view of the long period of contact between Slavs and speakers of Germanic languages, unlikely that the Proto-Slavs have not or hardly left traces in the Germanic languages especially because, according to him, their cultural level before their contacts with the classical world was likely to be very similar (1991: 355). Yet this reasoning takes no notice of the fact that the Germanic peoples came into contact with the Roman Empire much earlier than the Proto-Slavs did. Through the influence of the Roman Empire, the level of technological development of the Germanic peoples increased and this gave them prestige among their non-Latin neighbours. About the long-standing influence of the Roman Empire in the Germanic tribes, Wild writes that “the vocabulary of an advanced [Roman] society made an impact on the languages of less advanced [Germanic] peoples.” (1976: 57). This is shown by the direction of the borrowings (Green 1998: 183): there are many more loanwords from Latin into Germanic than the reverse and there are, similarly, more loanwords from Germanic not only into Proto-Slavic, but also into Baltic and Finnic than from these languages into Germanic. The reason that there are fewer Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic than vice versa is likely to be due to the higher level of technological development of the Germanic peoples.

4.5 CONCLUSION

The Slavs are first mentioned in writings by classical and Gothic authors in the mid-sixth century. Before that time, they had probably not spread very extensively beyond their homeland. As we have seen in the preceding sections, the homeland of the Slavs can most likely be located to the area north and northeast of the Carpathian Mountains on the foothills of the Carpathians and on the vast forest steppes around the river Dniester.

Speakers of Proto-Germanic were far removed from this area. The Germanic homeland has most commonly been placed in northern Germany and southern Scandinavia, but Udolph, for example, places the Germanic homeland more to the south in central Germany. Germanic must have been a linguistic unity in the last centuries BC probably until the second century AD, which dissolved when the Goths moved away from the homeland. When Germanic was still a linguistic unity, the speakers of the proto-language could not encounter any Proto-Slavs, for the two homelands were at best about 900 kilometres removed from each other. The first contacts could only have emerged when Germanic tribes had migrated southwards and eastwards and/or when the Proto-Slavs had spread beyond their homeland. If one adheres to the traditional view that the Goths migrated east of the Carpathian Mountains to the south,

they first encountered the Proto-Slavs in the area of the Proto-Slavic homeland and probably maintained contacts with the Slavs afterwards, when the Goths had established an empire in the Pontic area. Were one to accept Mańczak's and Kortlandt's view that the ethnogenesis of the Goths must be placed in Lower Austria, then the first contacts between Goths and Slavs came about after the Goths had assumed their position of power in the Pontic area.

The first contacts between Slavic and Germanic peoples probably came about either during the Gothic migration (if the migration took them through the Proto-Slavic homeland) or else shortly after the arrival of the Goths in the Pontic area in the middle of the third century. The contacts with the Goths are likely to have ended in the fifth century, when the latter lost their power in the Black Sea area. It is therefore less likely that the Slavs borrowed words from the Goths after the fifth century.

When the Slavs moved into central Europe, the first loanwords from West Germanic languages entered Proto-Slavic, but the contacts with speakers of West Germanic have remained until this very day. Loanwords from West Germanic languages could therefore enter Proto-Slavic until its disintegration at the beginning of the ninth century.

4.6 EXCURSUS I: LOANWORDS FROM AND INTO LATIN AND EARLY ROMANCE

Chapter 5 of this dissertation consists of a description of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. For a significant part, these words represent objects and concepts that were unknown to the Slavs before they came into contact with speakers of Germanic. Many of these words were relatively new to the Germanic people as well because they were borrowed from, e.g., Latin or Celtic. In this section, I will give a short description of the Latin loanwords in Germanic, the Germanic loanwords in Latin and the Latin loanwords in Proto-Slavic in terms of approximate number and semantic range. In §4.7, I will concisely describe a much earlier layer of loanwords in Proto-Slavic: the so-called 'Temematic' substrate supposed by Holzer (1989).

4.6.1 LATIN LOANWORDS IN GERMANIC

Long before their first contacts with the Proto-Slavs, the Germanic peoples had been under the influence of the Roman Empire and had taken over many objects and loanwords from the Romans. The contacts between the Roman Empire and the Germanic peoples reached its peak in the third and fourth centuries. In the Germanic dialects, there are about 400 loanwords from Latin

(mainly Vulgar Latin) that can be dated before the Anglo-Saxon migration to Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries (Wild 1976: 60). Green differentiates this number into “about 350 early Latin loanwords [...] for Germanic at large and about 50 for Gothic (with some degree of overlap)” (1998: 201). The semantics of these Latin loanwords in Germanic comprise technical terms, foodstuffs, viticultural terminology and trade-related terms such as weights, measures and names for coins (Wild 1976). According to Green, the most important group of Latin loanwords in Germanic is perhaps formed by army-related terms (1998: 202-204), whereas Wild thinks the Germans borrowed “surprisingly few Roman military expressions” (1976: 60). The loanwords indicate that the Germanic peoples received glass, pottery, metal vessels and coins from the Romans. The objects that the Germanic peoples got to know through contacts with the Roman Empire were mainly unknown to the Proto-Slavs as well, and the Proto-Slavs got acquainted with these objects primarily through their contacts with the Germanic peoples. The Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic that ultimately derive from Latin therefore form a large part of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

4.6.2 GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN LATIN

The Romans took over loanwords from Germanic, but much less so than the other way around. Wild mentions three Germanic loanwords in Latin, all of them resulting from trade relations between the Romans and Germanic peoples (1976: 61). These words are recorded by Pliny in *Naturalis historia* (*Natural History*): Lat. *ganta* ‘wild goose’, borrowed from Germanic **ganta* ‘goose’. According to Pliny, geese were imported from the Germanic provinces because they were used in making stuffing for cushions (Green 1998: 186, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. **gǫsb*). Lat. *glaesum/glesum* ‘amber’ from Germanic **glēsa-/glēza-* was borrowed in relation to the trade of amber from the Baltic Sea coast into the Roman Empire (cf. §4.1.4). According to Pliny, Lat. *sāpo* ‘soap’ (OHG *saiffa*, MLG *sēpe*) was used to dye the hair red, a practice that was apparently widespread amongst Germanic men (ibid.: 188).

4.6.3 LATIN LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

In her recent dissertation, Maja Matasović discussed approximately 300 loanwords from Latin and early Romance that were borrowed into Slavic before

the ninth century (2011). She discusses about 55 Latin and early Romance loanwords that are attested in all three branches of Slavic, whereas the majority of the loanwords that Matasović discusses are limited to South Slavic.²⁷ One of the reasons for this is that many of the Latin and early Romance loanwords refer to Mediterranean plants, animals and fish and were therefore in use only in the areas bordering on the Mediterranean Sea. Other prominent semantic groups are religious terms, building terminology (including terms for parts of the house or village) and words relating to trade (including words for various containers) (2011: 254-277).

4.7 EXCURSUS II: ‘TEMEMATIC’ SUBSTRATE IN PROTO-SLAVIC

A theory about a much earlier layer of loanwords into Proto-Slavic (or Balto-Slavic) has been put forward by Georg Holzer (1989). He supposes a layer of substrate loanwords into Baltic and Slavic from an unknown Indo-European language, which he calls “Temematisch”.²⁸ Holzer tentatively connects the Temematic loanwords to the unknown language of the Cimmerians, an Indo-European people that lived north of the Black Sea until the eighth century BC (1989: 177ff.). He distinguishes 45 loanwords, which have been divided into the following semantic fields: 1. agriculture; 2. cattle breeding; 3. bee-keeping; 4. provisioning; 5. society; 6. carpentry and 7. remaining words (1989: 5-7). As can be seen from the fields in which these loanwords can be divided, the words mainly relate to arable farming and stockbreeding, as well as domestic skills like bee-keeping and carpentry. As the Temematic loanwords have most cognates in Germanic and Greek, Holzer supposes that Temematic or a preliminary stage bordered preliminary stages of Germanic and Greek. For this reason, Kortlandt places the speakers of Temematic in the western part of Ukraine between “Germanic in the north and Greek in the south”, also because similar consonant changes to the ones reconstructed for Temematic are found in Germanic and

²⁷ A number of the words that Matasović lists as Latin loanwords in Proto-Slavic are regarded as Germanic loanwords in this dissertation. This goes for a number of words that ultimately derive from Latin and occur in Germanic as well as in Slavic. Matasović considers these words to be direct borrowings from Latin, whereas I see a Germanic language as the donor. These words are: PSL. **česarъ*/**cesarъ*, **čvrky*, **kotъlъ*, **kъbbъlъ*, **q̑borъ*(*kъ*), **orky*, **osъlъ*, **popъ*, **skrinja*, **vino* and **xrvъstъ*/**krvъstъ*.

²⁸ Holzer calls this language “Temematisch” after two of the distinctive sound changes it is supposed to have undergone after it split off from Proto-Indo-European: the Indo-European voiceless stops (*tenuēs*) **p*, **t*, **k* became voiced (*mediae*) **b*, **d*, **g* and the voiced aspirates (*mediae aspiratae*) **bʰ*, **dʰ*, **gʰ* became voiceless.

Greek: voicing of the voiceless stops (*tenuēs*) occurs in Germanic by means of Verner's law and devoicing of the aspirates (*mediae aspiratae*) is found in Greek (2003a: 258-260).