



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul: language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology

Kerkhof, P.A.

### Citation

Kerkhof, P. A. (2018, October 9). *Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul: language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66116>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66116>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/66116> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Kerkhof, P.A.

**Title:** Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul: language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology

**Issue Date:** 2018-10-09

## 5 As the Falcon flies: Common Slavic \*sǫkolъ and Malberg <socelino>

### Introduction

The Pact of the Salic Law, a codification of the customary law of the Merovingian Franks, addresses the legal concerns of the Germanic-speaking peoples that had settled in the sixth century between the Ardennes forest in Belgium and the river Loire in France (see Rivers 1986; Drew 1991). A lot of these legal concerns had to do with the contingencies of everyday life on the farmstead (cf. Quak 1983: 6; Drew 1991: 49). The provisions of the Salic Law show that animal husbandry was especially important to the Merovingian Franks, as is clear from the following facts:

- The Salic Law starts with legal provisions for the theft of livestock (Höfinghoff 1987: 255-56).
- The articles on the theft of livestock indicate a specialized knowledge of animal husbandry, that is, the raising and breeding of livestock (Höfinghoff 1987: 256).

In the manuscripts that preserve the Salic Law, many corrupted glosses are found that are preceded by the abbreviation <malb> or by the full word *mallobergo* (< Gm. \**maþlaberg*- ‘court of law’, see chapter 1). These glosses are known in the scholarly literature by the name ‘Malberg glosses’ and from etymological analysis it is clear that many of them go back to Germanic lexis. It is likely that the Malberg glosses at one time belonged to a spoken Frankish vernacular that was used during the administration of justice in Early Merovingian society (see chapter 1). In the later Merovingian period, the corruption and reinterpretation of the glosses show that the words became part of a legal register which was no longer understood.<sup>153</sup> This present investigation concerns one of these obscure glosses from the Salic Law whose origin might touch upon some interesting aspects of cultural transmission between Late Antique Europe and the Eurasian steppes.

### Birds

Law article VII of the Salic Law (*de furtis avium* or *de avis furatis*) provides the different compensation tariffs that had to be paid in case one was successfully charged with the theft of birds. The law article singles out domesticated birds that were reared on the farmyard for meat and eggs and wild birds that were hunted in traps. We can divide these different birds into three categories.

- Hunting birds (falcon, kites and sparrow-hawk)

---

<sup>153</sup> It may therefore be practical to translate the sequence [mallobergo X] as ‘in judicial speech this is X’ and view the language of the glosses as a fossilized remnant of Late Merovingian legalese.

- Fowl (geese, chickens and swans)
- Doves and birds caught in traps

Relevant to this present investigation are the hunting birds, the theft of which is covered in four articles.<sup>154</sup> The value of a falcon or a sparrow-hawk was estimated to be the same at 120 denarii (silver pieces) whereas the most costly was the theft of a falcon from a cage at 1800 denarii. The fact that the latter hawk was kept in a cage and valued higher is probably commensurate to the amount of training the bird had received; nevertheless, in comparison to other articles dealing with the theft of animals these compensation tariffs were probably not extraordinarily high (cf. Höfinghoff 1987: 161). It seems therefore likely that we are dealing with the hunting birds of ordinary farmers and not with the finer bred birds of the aristocracy.

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Theft of a falcon from a tree in a garden | (accipitrem de arbore)      |
| 2. Theft of a falcon from a perch            | (accipitrem de pertica)     |
| 3. Theft of a falcon from a cage             | (accipitrem deintro clavem) |
| 4. Theft of a sparrow-hawk                   | (sparuarium)                |

In the law articles that concern hunting birds, three Malberg glosses are featured. The following etymologies for the glosses are found in Quak<sup>155</sup> (1983; 52-55; 2017) and repeated by Höfinghoff (1987).

- |   |                            |             |
|---|----------------------------|-------------|
| • § 1, § 3) Malb. <i>ortfocla</i> ( <i>orfloccla</i> , <i>arthoccla</i> ) | < Rom. *orto- + Gm. *fugal | ‘yard bird’ |
| • § 2 Malb. <i>uueiano</i> ( <i>uueippe</i> , <i>uegano</i> )             | < Gm. *wīwan-              | ‘kite’      |
| • § 4 Malb. <i>socelino</i> ( <i>sucelin</i> )                            | < Gm. *sōkil-              | ‘seeker’    |

The first etymology interprets the Malberg gloss *ortfocla* as an etymological hybrid with a Romance first element \*orto- (cf. Lat. *hortus* ‘garden’) and a Germanic second element \*fugal- ‘bird’. Both elements are clearly recognizable within the spelling of both the early Merovingian A-tradition and the late Merovingian C-tradition and the interpretation is etymologically supported by similar hybrid compounds in the other Germanic languages (e.g. OE *ortgeard* ‘orchard’); the etymology therefore convinces completely. The second etymology connects the Malberg gloss *uueiano* with OHG *wio/weho* ‘kite’ and MidDu. *wiwe*, *wuwe* ‘id.’, words that go back to a Proto-Germanic form \*wīwo ~\*wīwan- (Quak 1983: 54). The spelling is only supported by the Late Merovingian C-tradition but the post-Merovingian D and K traditions which rarely contain Malberg glosses had also included the word, suggesting that for these scribes the meaning was still transparent. This etymology is also satisfactory.

<sup>154</sup> We may also note that the Salic Law only provides law articles concerning the theft of the hunting birds, whereas the Pact of the Alamannic Law also ventures into the illegal hunt with these birds (cf. Rivers 1977: 101).

<sup>155</sup> Also to be found in the database (URL: <http://gtb.inl.nl>) of the Old Dutch dictionary project (ONW) of the Dutch lexicography institute (INL).

## Sparrow-hawk

The present investigation concerns the etymology of the third Malberg gloss, i.e. Malb. <*socelino*>, found in the fourth clause of the relevant law article. This clause is about the theft of a sparrow hawk, a small bird of prey (*Accipiter nisus*), which translates Merovingian Latin *sparuarium* in the Latin text. Curiously, the clause is absent from the early Merovingian A-tradition and can only be found in the later Merovingian C-tradition, the Herold manuscript and the post-Merovingian K-tradition. The Malberg gloss is only contained in manuscript C6 and the Herold manuscript (H), giving us just two spelling variants to work with. The full Latinate text of the clause is as follows:

§ 4 *Si quis sparuarium furauerit, mallobergo socelino* (C6)/*sucelin* (H), *sunt denarii CXX qui faciunt solidos III culpabilis iudicetur excepto capitale et dilatura.* (MGH LL Nat. Germ. IV; 40).

“Whoever will have stolen a sparrow-hawk, in judicial speech *socelino/sucelin*, this is 120 denaries which is 3 solidos if he is judged guilty, not including the value and the reparation payment.”

Quak (1983: 54-55; *contra* Kern 1900) suggest that we may connect Malb. <*socelino*> to Old Norse *sækja* ‘to seek, to visit, to attack’ and Old English *sēcean* ‘to pursue’ that was combined with the Germanic agent noun suffix *\*-ila* (cf. Krahe-Meid 1967 § 86; 85). This would give us ‘seeker, pursuer’ as etymological naming motive for the Malberg sparrow-hawk word which is not necessarily unconvincing.<sup>156</sup> A similar naming motive has been suggested for Germanic *\*habuk-* in its connection to the root *\*hab-* ‘to grab, to snatch’, making the hawk a ‘grabber, a catcher’ although Kroonen has shown that this etymology is untenable (cf. Kroonen 2013: 197). Also, no reflexes of this formation, i.e. PGm. *\*sōk-* + *-ila*, can be found in the other Germanic languages, nor can we point to any chance survivals as loanword in the Romance languages. Quak’s explanation of the Malberg gloss <*socelino*> as reflecting OFrnk. *\*sōkil-* is therefore completely dependent on its inner-Germanic etymology and derivation.

---

<sup>156</sup> Maslo (2015) has shown that most simplex bird names related to falconry characterize physical aspects or traits of the bird leading to semantic narrowing; exceptions are the compounds in which the first element could highlight the function of the bird, for example designate the animal that is hunted with the bird (see also the Old Bavarian hawk names in Rivers 1977: 170).

## Germanic–Slavic isogloss

I would like to contend that a better and more convincing etymological connection is present in the Slavic languages where we find highly similar looking words in the meaning ‘falcon’<sup>157</sup> (cf. Vasmer 1957 vol II: 688). The Slavic word family may be illustrated by the following cognates:

ORuss. *sokolъ* ‘falcon’

Bulg. *sokól* ‘falcon’

Pol. *sokół* ‘falcon’

Czech/Slov. *sokol* ‘falcon’

S/Cr. *sókō*, *sokōla* ‘falcon’

We may note that in Lithuanian we also find the word *sākalas* ‘falcon, sparrow hawk, vulture’, but this form is commonly regarded as a borrowing from Slavic (cf. Fraenkel 1965: 757; Vasmer 1957 vol II: 689).

On the basis of the Slavic cognates, we may reconstruct a Common Slavic form *\*sōkolъ* ‘falcon’ that goes back to a Proto-Slavic form *\*sākalъ*.<sup>158</sup> This form later underwent the Proto-Slavic /a/ > Common Slavic /o/ shift. The Proto-Slavic word is connected by Vasmer (1957 vol II: 688–89) to Skt. *śakunā-*, *śakūni*, *śakūnta-* ‘a rather large bird’, a connection that is deemed possible but ultimately unconvincing by Mayrhofer (1996 EWIA II: 603). Chernykh (1999: 185) however connects PSl. *\*sōkolъ* to the verb *\*sočiti* ‘to pursue’ (cf. PIE *\*sokʷ-*, see also Vasmer 1957 vol II: 704–05), which is unlikely because a presumed Proto-Indo-European formation *\*sokʷ-* + *\*-olos* is not found in any other language, nor was *\*-olъ* a productive suffix in the prehistory of Slavic. The origin of the Slavic falcon word is therefore still unclear.

The connection between the Germanic and the Slavic bird name seems evident to me as the formal similarity between Slavic *\*sōkolъ* and the Malberg gloss <socelino> cannot be denied. It is however clear that the words are not related via the IE ancestral language since an inherited Germanic /k/ does not correspond to an inherited Slavic /k/. We may therefore assume that the words are connected through a borrowing process. If the words were transmitted from one language to the other, it should be noted that it is more likely that the word was transmitted from Germanic to Slavic than the other way around (cf. Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 69). If that is also the directionality that is involved in this connection, we should take

<sup>157</sup> This semantic difference between a falcon and a sparrow-hawk is trivial since both birds are relatively small raptors that may easily have been referred to by the same name (compare Latin *accipiter* ‘sparrow hawk, falcon’).

<sup>158</sup> The nature of the accentuation is unclear since Serbo-Croatian points to a neo-circumflex accent whereas the rest of the Slavic languages confirm an acute accentuation. The latter accentuation is provided in my reconstruction.

the following sound correspondences that are relevant in Germanic – Slavic lexical transfers in account (Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 221).

1. Germanic words in /ō/ are reflected in Proto-Slavic with /au/ > CSL. /ū/
2. Germanic words in /u/ are reflected in Proto-Slavic with /ъ/ > CSL. /ъ/
3. Germanic words in /a/ are reflected in Proto-Slavic with /a/ > CSL. /o/

These sound correspondences show that we have a phonological mismatch between the Germanic root and the Slavic root when we want to explain the connection between the two through a borrowing from Germanic to Slavic.

- Germanic \*sōk- > CSL. \*\*suk-
- Germanic \*suk- > CSL. \*\*sŏk-

Here we should take a step back and take a closer look at the Malberg gloss and the philological basis for its interpretation as Germanic \*sōkil-; It is important to realize that the gloss <socelino> is only found in the C6 manuscript, a single manuscript in the late Merovingian C-tradition. The C6 gloss is supported by the Herold manuscript that gives us <sucelin>, but we should take into consideration that the Herold manuscript is a sixteenth century printed edition combining manuscripts from the C-tradition and B-tradition and other lost manuscripts whose redaction cannot be established (Eckhardt 1969: XL). This crucially affects the reliability of the <o> vowel in <socelino> since the Late Merovingian C-tradition regularly confuses the <u> and <a> vowel of the Merovingian minuscule script (cf. also Seebold 2018). This confusion happened because both the Merovingian <a> grapheme and the Merovingian <u> grapheme were open at the top. The same <a>/<u> corruption can be found in the Salic Law in the cases of <mardo> for <murdo> and <flamen> for <flumen> (Van Helten 1900: 2037).

Since it is therefore possible that the original gloss was <sacelino> instead of <socelino>, we may envision the following scenario which constitutes in my opinion a plausible way in which an original gloss <sacelino> could have been corrupted to <sucelin> and <socelino>:

1. The Malberg gloss was entered as <sacelino> into one of the prototypes of the Late Merovingian manuscript traditions.
2. Somewhere in the Late Merovingian period the gloss <sacelino> was read as <sucelino>
3. The form <sucelino> was alternated with <socelino> according to the Merovingian <u>/<o> variation (see section 3.10). This would give us the spelling of the C6 manuscript.
4. The form <sucelino> was shortened to <sucelin> in the manuscript that Herold took as the example text for his edition.

An interpretation of the Malberg gloss <socelino> as <sacelino> would allow us to distill a Germanic form *\*sakil-* ‘sparrow hawk, falcon’. As to the suffix of the Germanic word which the Malberg gloss gives as <el> plus the Romanizing extension <ino>, we may follow Quak (1983: 54-55) in his analysis that we can interpret it as an agent noun suffix in PGm. *\*-ila*.<sup>159</sup> In this regard, we should note that we find another bird name in the Salic Law that shows a suffix form <el> (cf. Pactus Legis Salicae c. 7 § 6)

- Malb. <sundelino> = PGm. *\*sundil* ‘water bird’

A Frankish word *\*sakil* would give us a viable donor form for a lexical transfer between Germanic and Slavic. Although the directionality is now ambiguous, it seems safe to start from the assumption that the transfer followed the general directionality trend of Germanic lexical material entering Slavic. The discrepancy between the Germanic and the Slavic suffix may be attributed to Germanic, where a suffix alternation between *\*-il-/\*-al-/\*-ul-/\*-l-* is well established (Krahe-Meid 1967: 85).

- Gm. *\*sakil-/\*sakal-* → PSl. *\*sǎkalъ* > Csl. *\*sōkolъ*

The only question that remains is where this Germanic falcon/hawk word originally came from. The Germanic form *\*sakil-* also allows a connection to Gothic *sakuls* ‘quarrelsome’, a derivation from the verb *sakan* ‘to quarrel, to dispute’ and related to the above mentioned *\*sōkjan-* ‘to seek’. This would make Germanic *\*sakil-* a ‘fight bird’ or a ‘quarrel bird’. In my opinion however, this etymology is unconvincing since the Old Germanic languages all show a semantic narrowing of the root PGm. *\*sak-* to the verbal domain of ‘to quarrel’ and ‘to argue’ (see Kroonen 2013: 423).

Since we have assumed that the birds were included in the Salic Law because of their use in hawking and falconry, we should note that the practice of hunting with birds only entered Europe at a relatively late date. It is therefore likely that we are dealing with a ‘wanderwort’, and when we want to understand its etymology, we should take the spread and origin of the cultural practice into account. In the next section we will therefore sketch how falconry came to Roman Gaul in the first place.

## Spread of falconry

The origin of hawking is commonly placed in the Middle East, since the earliest depiction of it is found in a palace relief in Mosul dating back to the eighth century BCE (Allsen 2006: 135). The Greek physician Ctesias, writing at the Achaemenid court in the fifth century BCE,

<sup>159</sup> In the Old Dutch dictionary, a slight emendation to Quak’s (1983) analysis is made by interpreting the sequence <elin> as the Germic suffix *\*-ilōn ~\*-ilan*. This however problematizes the etymology since *\*-ilan-* is a denominal suffix and not a deverbal suffix (Krahe-Meid 1967: 87). Website consulted at 17-02-2018 at URL:

<http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=ONW&id=ID5670&lemmodern=zoekel>



situates the hawking sport in Persia and India and several centuries later we first encounter hawking in the Far East. In Chinese sources the practice of hunting with birds from horseback is connected to the nomads of Central Asia and the Japanese recount that they adopted it from Korea (Allsen 2006: 136). It seems therefore reasonable to assume that hawking spread from the Middle East to the steppes of Central Asia and from central Asia to the Far East.

Greek and Roman writers occasionally refer to hawking but no mention is made of it being a common past time in their own regions. It seems therefore likely that in Antiquity it never became popular in the Greco-Roman world (cf. Allsen 2006: 136). This changed in the fifth century, when we suddenly encounter hawking as a sport for young aristocratic men in the writings of Paulinus of Pella and Sidonius Apollinaris (Lindner 1973: 119; Allsen 2006: 136). This coming into vogue of hawking in the Late Roman Empire is commonly connected with the integration of Germanic-speaking peoples in the Roman aristocracy. This is supported by the fact that the Germanic word *\*falkōn/\*falkan-* all but completely replaced the Latin word *accipiter* in the Romance languages.<sup>160</sup> The Germanic word for ‘hawk’ i.e. Gm. *\*habuk-*, which was also a ‘wanderwort’, likewise spread to neighboring languages (cf. Kroonen 2013: 197):

- Gm. *\*habuk-* > Fin. *havukka*
- Gm. *\*habuk-* > MidW *hebawc*

It seems therefore likely that in the Germanic successor kingdoms of the Early Middle Ages hawking was a popular sport, practiced by farmers, noblemen and clergymen alike, as is clear from the Germanic law codes and the Church council reports (cf. River 1977: 101, 170; Allsen 2006: 136).

In order to understand the prehistoric transmission of hawking and hawking terminology, we should take note of its socio-cultural context, i.e. the role hawking played in pre-modern societies. It may be noted that hunting with birds is one of the most affordable types of hunting which could be practiced without expensive equipment or a retinue.<sup>161</sup> This means that the practice of hawking was easily transmitted since no special technology was needed and the trained hawks themselves could easily be sold or traded across cultural and linguistic borders. This connects well with the fact that in many European and Middle-Eastern languages names for hunting birds are loanwords, showing that in the exchange of hawking technology, the terminology was very likely to be transferred as well.

<sup>160</sup> Latin *accipiter* had a Late Latin variant *acceptor* ‘hawk’ which does have a Romance afterlife in OSpan. *aztor* ‘id.’. From this Old Spanish form the word spread again over the southern *Romania*, i.e. ModIt. *astore*, Campid. *stori*, Prov. *austor*, ModFr. *autour* ‘id.’ (see Meyer-Lübke REW 68: 6). We may note that also the Germanic word *\*sparwari* (cf. ModDu. *sperwer*, ModG *Sperber*) was widely diffused in the Romance dialect continuum (e.g. ModFr. *épervier*, cf. FEW XVII: 172)

<sup>161</sup> This can be illustrated by taking a look at hawking practices among present-day nomads in Inner Asia where hawking is still an egalitarian affair (Allsen 2006: 136). This

### French borrowings

- OFr. *faucon* ‘falcon’ < Gm. \**falkōn*/*\*falkan-*
- OFr. *épervier* ‘sparrow hawk’ < OFrnk. \**sparwari*
- OFr. *girfauc* ‘gyrfalcon’ < OFrnk. \**gērfaik*
- OFr. *gabiez* ‘falcon hunt’ < OFrnk. \**gabaiti*

### Arabic borrowings

- MArab. *al-bāz* ‘falcon’ < MPers. \**bāz*
- MArab. *al-sunqur* ‘falcon’ < OTurk. \**suŋkor*
- MArab. *al-ṣaqr/al-saqr* ‘sacer falcon’ < OTurk. \**čakrı*

Hawking and falconry remained a popular sport for most of the Middle Ages, with the exchange and trade of finely bred hawks connecting aristocratic families all over Europe. In the Early Middle Ages, falcons were commonly used as gifts to accommodate diplomacy, which may be illustrated by the example of the Anglo-Saxon bishop Boniface sending a hawk and two falcons to the king of Mercia (Tangl 1916: 142). In the centuries that followed,<sup>162</sup> hawking terminology also travelled from the Romance speaking south back to the Germanic-speaking north as can be illustrated by the following examples:

- MHG *derzel* ‘male sparrow hawk’ < OFr. *terciel*
- MHG *sakers* ‘sacer falcon’ < MArab. *al-ṣaqr*

As the Middle Ages drew to a close, the trade in the gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*) spanned the Eurasian continent. This way, the thirteenth century German emperor Frederick II could list traits and qualities of birds bred in far-away Mongolia. In that time, falconry was primarily envisioned as the past-time of kings and royalty as is clear from the Hungarian writer Simon of Kéza imagining that Attila the Hun rode into Europe with an Altai Turul falcon crested in his banner (*Gesta Hungarorum* c. 10).

Here we should note that the networks involving the spread of falconry did not only run from east to west, but also from north to south. Although many goods in the Eurasian trade travelled along an east-west axis, luxury goods, of which falcons are a prime example, were an exception (cf. Allsen 2006: 147). This is how hawking was transmitted around the start of the Islamic era to the Arabs in Iraq via the Persian speaking peoples of Iran and Central Asia. In the centuries that followed, the nomads of Central Asia engaged in a long-

---

<sup>162</sup> The Old English form *wealh-hafoc* ‘Welsh/French hawk’, found in the OE version of ‘Alexander’s letter to Aristotle’, shows that the influx of southern hawk/falcon breeds back to the Germanic-speaking north already started in the ninth century. It is interesting to note that this falcon/hawk word made it all the way to Scandinavia, cf. ON *valr* ‘falcon’ (see De Vries 1962: 642)

lasting transfer with the Arab world in which they supplied the finer bred birds in exchange for tribute and trade privileges (Allsen 2006: 144-47).

## Wanderwort

The rough chronology of the cultural transmission of hawking is therefore clear: 1) hawking originated in the Middle East and spread to the nomadic peoples of Central Asia. 2) Germanic and Slavic speaking peoples adopted hawking from the nomads on the eastern European steppes. 3) hawking entered the Roman empire in the wake of the infiltration of Germanic-speaking warrior elites. 4) hawking spread to the Arab world when the Arabs came into contact with Persia and its Inner Asian trade networks.

It is therefore reasonable to assume that the languages of the nomadic peoples of Central Asia are a good place to start looking for the origin of our Germanic-Slavic hawk-word. Two language families should then be taken into consideration, namely Turkic and Iranian. Here I want to propose an etymology that ties both language families to our Germanic –Slavic falcon/sparrow hawk word, although, as is common in the case of *wanderwörter*, I will not pretend to be able to solve all phonological problems. I therefore want to stress that the following scenario of lexical transfers merely represents a hypothesis that I deem plausible.

In Turkish we find two lexical items (Clauson 1972: 410), referring to hunting birds, that show a reasonable phonological similarity to our Germanic – Slavic hawk word.

- OTurk. *čayrı* < Proto-Turk. *\*čakrı* ‘Falco sacer’
- OTurk. *čavlı* < Proto-Turk. *\*čawlı* ‘merlin, stone falcon’

Despite the Turkish words being very similar, the forms cannot be etymologically reconciled and if they are connected to each other it must be via an unknown linguistic intermediary. It is the first term, i.e. Proto-Turk. *\*čakrı*, that offers us a connection to Iranian. This connection was proposed by Volker Rybatzki (2011: 373), but on the wrong assumption that Iranian *\*čarka/čakra* (cf. ModPers. *čarḡ/čarg*<sup>163</sup> ‘hunting falcon’) would have been the donor form for Turkic *\*čakrı*. The reconstructed form cannot be correct since already in Proto-Iranian times all instances of /kr/ shifted to /χr/. Alternatively, we may take an Iranian form *\*čaxra* as the donor word and assume a phoneme substitution *\*χ* → *\*k* in the transmission to Turkic. A lexical transfer from Iranian to Turkic is not unusual since in the first millennium CE many Iranian words entered the Turkic languages (see Golden 2006). It is also possible that the

---

<sup>163</sup> For the Iranian falcon words, see also Le Coq (1914: 11) and Schapka (1972: 63). An interesting complication is offered by the possible interference from a possible Proto-Iranian form *\*čarkasa/\*karkāsa*, cf. Av. *kahrkāsa*, but also here the phonological correspondences are irregular (cf. Abaev 1958 :1303; Cheung 2002: 175).

directionality of the borrowing should be inverted and we are dealing with a borrowing from Turkic to Iranian.

- Proto-Turkic \*čakrı ← Middle Iranian \*čaxra
- Middle Iranian \*čaxra ← Proto-Turkic \*čakrı

We may note that it was in all likelihood the same Iranian/Turkish word complex that supplied the Arabic term for falcon, i.e. Arabic *al-saqr/al-šaqr*.<sup>164</sup>

Furthermore, we should remark that the etymology of neither the Old Turkic word nor the Middle Iranian word can be retrieved. It seems likely that in neither language it was an inherited word and it remains therefore unclear what the original donor language was.

Whatever the case, we can take the Proto-Turkic form \*čakrı as our starting point for a scenario that connects the Iranian/Turkish word complex to the Germanic and Slavic languages of the Early Middle Ages. In Late Antiquity, several nomadic confederations speaking Turkic and Iranian languages roamed the steppes of western Eurasia. In this socio-cultural context of transhumance, long distance trade and inter-clan warfare, Turkic-speakers may have been in regular contact with speakers of Alanic, a north-east Iranian language. A historical development which may have facilitated Turkic-Alanic language contact is the westward expansion of the Pre-Hunnic Xiongnu confederation in the third century CE (Kim 2016: 38). During this expansion, the Xiongnu confederation absorbed the Turkic-speaking Dingling peoples between the Altai mountains and the Caucasus and later moved into Alanic territory. We may therefore assume that in this period Turkic-speaking elements of the Xiongnu confederation were in direct contact with the Alans (cf. Kim 2016: 66-67).

If we accept the scenario that the Proto-Turkic word entered Alanic in the early centuries CE, the Alanic/Proto-Ossetic sound law /ri/ to /l/ brings us very close to a possible donor word for the Germanic- Slavic falcon/hawk-word.<sup>165</sup> We may then assume that the following developments took place:

- Proto-Turkic \*čakrı → Alanic \*čakl
  1. Regular Proto-Ossetic development from /ri/ > /l/
- Alanic \*čakl → Germanic \*sakl > WGM. \*sakal
  2. Substitution of Alanic /č/ by Germanic /s/<sup>166</sup>

<sup>164</sup> An inner-Arabic derivation of Arab. *al-saqr* 'falcon' from Arab. *al-šaqr* 'brown' does not provide a satisfying etymology. That Arab. *al-saqr* is a loanword might also be suspected based on the vacillation of the initial consonant between /s/ and /š/ and a loan from Turkish would account for the initial consonant, since in the Pre-Islamic period the *šad* was still pronounced as /tsʔ/, i.e. Turk. \*čakrı → Arab. \*tsʔaqr (see Al-Jallad 2014).

<sup>165</sup> for the sound change, see Bieliemeier (1989: 241) and Cheung (2002: 40, 100).

<sup>166</sup> We may wonder whether it is possible that Proto-Iranian /č/ had in the Alanic period already developed into the /ts/ sound that we can reconstruct for Pre-Ossetic. An Alanic /ts/ would reduce the phonetic distance to the Germanic /s/ with

### 3. West Germanic anaptyxis of /kl/ to /kal/

The transfer from Alanic to Germanic could then be dated to the late fourth century CE, when barbarian confederations consisting of both Germanic speakers and Alanic speakers moved into the Roman Empire.

The only objection that could be raised against it, is that at some point Pre-Ossetian clusters of the /CL/ type were metathesized to /LC/, cf. PIIR. *\*tigra-* > Oss. *cyrğ* ‘sharp’ (cf. Cheung 2002: 34). Since the date of this metathesis is unclear, it is possible that the borrowing of OTurk. *\*čakrı* as Alan. *\*čakl* predates its operation.

On the Germanic side, everything seems to be in order; both the sound substitution and the anaptyxis are unproblematic developments that are supported by the following facts:

- 1) The sound substitution is also found in the Late Antique name of the Alanic warlord Sangibanus < Alanic *\*čangi-ban* ‘he who commands the flank’ (see Vernadsky 1963: 408-9).
- 2) the anaptyxis in *\*-CL#* is regular for West Germanic after the loss of the nominative ending (see Boutkan 1995: 161).

The Slavic word *\*sākalъ* would then be an adaptation of the Germanic word *\*sakl* ~ *\*sakal*, a lexical transfer which corresponds to the general directionality of Germanic – Slavic lexical copies (cf. Pronk-Tiethoff 2013). A transmission from Germanic to Slavic and not the other way around is also more likely because Slavic did have a /č/ with which they could have rendered Alanic /č/ (cf. CSL. *črbtoga* ‘bedroom’ ← Alan. *\*čartāga*, see Gołąb 1992: 320).

To summarize the historic scenario implied by the above sketched lexical transfers: We may envision the transmission of the word for ‘falcon, hawk’ to have started in Late Antiquity when the practice of hawking was common across the Eurasian steppes. There, an Old Turkic word for falcon could have been transmitted to Alanic, a language spoken to the north of the Black Sea and the Caucasus mountains. This may have happened in the early centuries CE through the trade networks of the Late Antique steppes or in the context of the pre-Hunnic Xiongnu westward expansion which brought Turkic-speaking peoples in direct contact with the Alans to the north of the Caucasus mountain range. When the Huns moved into the Black sea region, the Alans attached themselves to the Gothic confederation consisting of mainly Germanic-speaking peoples who dwelled on the eastern European steppes. This engendered a close cultural and linguistic contact with Germanic-speakers (see also Hyllested 2017: 27-33) and thus the Asiatic word may have entered Germanic as a specialized hunting term. From Germanic, the word spread to Slavic where it became the general word for ‘falcon’. Finally, the Germanic word was replaced by newer terminology

---

which it was replaced. However, this seems unlikely since Proto-Iranian post-consonantal /č/ developed into Ossetian /č̣/ (See also Cheung 2002: 22-23)

which is very likely for a term that was associated with specific breeds of animals (Maslo 2015: 181). In this way, the word disappeared in the other Germanic languages, while surviving as a single Merovingian Frankish hunting term in the Merovingian legal register of the Salic Law.

## Conclusion

To conclude, in this chapter I have argued that the Malberg gloss <socelino> ‘sparrow hawk’ should be read as <sacelino> which can be connected to Common Slavic \*sǫkolъ ‘falcon’. Both languages borrowed the words as falconry and hawking terminology when they adopted the practice of hawking from the Central Asiatic cultures to their east. The Germanic and the Slavic words may be connected with Turkish *çayrı* and Iranian \*čaxra- which also provided the word for hawk in Arabic. The intermediate language that transmitted the word from Turkic to Western Europe would have been Alanic where Proto-Turkic \*čakri would have yielded Alanic \*čakl before the Pre-Ossetic metathesis of /CL/ > /LC/. The Alans are without a doubt the most logical intermediary between the cultures of Central Asia and Europe, since they were the linguistic and cultural neighbors of the Germanic peoples from the second century to the fifth century CE. This Alanic form \*čakl would have been adopted into Germanic as \*sakl ~ \*sakal and, probably via Germanic, into Slavic as \*sǫkalъ. As falconry spread over the Eurasian continent in the course of the first millennium CE, Central Asiatic terminology likewise spread its wings over neighboring languages.