



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul:
language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology**
Kerkhof, A.E.

Citation

Kerkhof, A. E. (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: Publisher's Version

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).

1 Language and the Early Medieval Past

1.1 The access to the past

Every historical science, whether it be history, archaeology or philology, strives to reconstruct a reality that is forever lost to us. It is important to realize from the outset that historical scientists do not have direct access to the past. Once a moment has happened, it is gone and cannot be repeated in an experiment. This means that, in order to establish whether something really happened and subsequently how it happened, the scholar is left to deal with historical evidence of a diverse nature.

The study and interpretation of material sources is the domain of the archaeologist. Physical evidence holds a privileged position among the different types of historical evidence, since it consists of tangible products of past human activity. Most of these products consist of settlement traces and refuse of everyday life; products which were made without an agenda towards their reflection amongst future generations. When interpreted correctly, archaeology can shed light on periods of human history from which no or little written record survives.

The study and interpretation of written sources is the discipline of the historian. In order to reconstruct the happening of a past event, the historian requires sources that ideally meet the following conditions:

1. There are multiple sources, all of which document the event under study, so that parallel documentation confirms the occurrence of the event and elucidates the causality involved.
2. The sources were produced in a place and time that are relatively close to the place and time in which the event supposedly happened.
3. The sources are disinterested in the event under study, so that the way in which the event is recorded does not reflect the bias of the writer.

It is clear that these conditions are seldom met, and that the historian is left to reconstruct the past with only a few misshapen pieces of the puzzle surviving. The main reason why this is the case lies in the fact that literacy in pre-modern times was often limited to a small class of literacy specialists. These professional scribes fulfilled the literary needs of a small intellectual and political elite. These circumstances severely impair the reliability of the source material. History as an academic discipline is therefore a hermeneutic science that studies the small window on past realities that the written sources offer (cf. Lorenz 1987).

Historical linguistics, on the other hand, is a completely different historical discipline. By studying the oldest attested stages of related languages and comparing these languages

by use of the well-established comparative method (Campbell 2004; Crowley & Bowern 2009), historical linguists are able to retrace past linguistic realities by reversing the regular sound changes which transformed the language through the ages. Thus the comparative method generates (pre-)historic data, whose reliability is confirmed by its adherence to the regularity of sound change. Naturally, this reliability is dependent on both a correct linguistic interpretation and the correct application of the method; the linguistic data, therefore, requires a thorough philological analysis before it can be used for comparative purposes. Nevertheless, if all philological bases are covered, the comparative method can give us access to the words of a (pre-)historical speech community, and through this, also to the concepts and categories of this community. It is worth noting that these concept and categories generally reflect a broader part of society than can be studied through the literary sources.

Here it should be stressed that the reconstruction of past linguistic realities supplies the scholar with a historical artifact that is comparable to the material evidence of the archaeologist. Just as pots and pans were made without an apparent agenda towards their reflection upon future generations, so also the concepts and categories conveyed in the lexicon of a historical language are largely the circumstantial heritage of past linguistic stages. Although the words in a specific historical period in part reflect the topical limitations of the historical documents in which those words are found, fortunately the cumulative evidence from philology, comparative linguistics, and historical dialectology often reveals to us a significant part of the historical lexicon and, by extension, the ancestral proto-language. In short: whereas historians mainly have access to the historical realities of the elites, historical linguists often gain access to the language of both kings and commoners, and therefore glimpse a different part of past human activity (Epps 2015: 579).

The study of historical words as a source to past historical realities has a long tradition in the field of historical linguistics. It was Jacob Grimm (1848), who first expressed the sentiment that words as the lexical building blocks of language give access to a historical reality, and that both language and culture should be studied alongside each other: “*Sprachforschung, der ich anhängen und von der ich ausgehe, hat mich noch nie in die Weise befriedigen können, das ich nicht immer gern von den Wörtern zu den Sachen gelangt wäre*” (Grimm 1848: IX). In the early twentieth century, the incipient discipline of linguistic dialectology, pioneered by Schuchardt and Gilliéron, internalized the ‘Wörter und Sachen’ *dictum* in its insistence that every word has its own history and that a history of language is basically a history of words (“*chaque mot a son histoire*”, see Malkiel 1967). A more literary interpretation of the principle was given by Cola Minis, who stated that “*Sprachgeschichte ist im Grunde die schwärzeste aller*

‘schwarzen’ Künste, das einzige Mittel die Geister verschwundener Jahrhunderte zu beschwören” (Minis 1952: 107).⁶

However, Grimm, Gilliéron and Minis were mainly considering the study of lexical material in attested languages. The connection between language and culture becomes more tenuous, if we apply it to reconstructed languages. Here it should be mentioned that many linguists view linguistic reconstructions as abstract formulae, formulae that are merely the phonological basis for linguistic phylogenetics. According to them, the sum of all possible reconstructions for a linguistic proto-stage should not be considered as a ‘real’ prehistoric language, set in a ‘real’ prehistoric time (see Mallory & Adams 2008: 86-87). In my opinion, however, the whole concept of a genetic proto-language presupposes a historically real community of speakers. It therefore seems only fair to assume that our historical reconstructions are at least abstract approximations of the language of a prehistoric speech community.

If we commit to the view that linguistic reconstruction is not just an abstract shorthand, but instead constitutes a fair approximation of a real language that was spoken by real people, we are reminded of the historicist principle formulated by Leopold von Ranke (1874: VII), who admonished historians to show how it really was (“*wie es eigentlich gewesen*”). It is my contention that historical linguistics shares the same obligation and constitutes a valuable instrument, with which to study a part of the historical past. I therefore believe that there is great potential for an interdisciplinary approach, that exploits the complementary evidence from the different historical disciplines (cf. Heggarty 2015: 598).

1.2 The transformation of the Roman world paradigm

This dissertation deals with a period for which the correct interpretation of the historical sources has been controversial for a long time. Since Edward Gibbon published ‘*The History of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*’ in 1789, the decline of Roman civilization has remained a topic of discussion for every scholar interested in the political and intellectual history of pre-modern Europe. Christianity, Roman decadence, economic recession, climate change, pestilence, corruption, all of these factors have been credited as the causes for Rome’s decline. Until recently, however, most scholars agreed on what force dismembered the Late Roman state. This was the Migration Age: the invasions of non-Roman, largely Germanic-speaking peoples who ravaged the Roman countryside, decimated the Roman field armies and eventually migrated into the former Roman provinces establishing their own kingdoms.

⁶ This quote (in English translation) has become popular thanks to its inclusion in Campbell’s *Historical Linguistics; an Introduction* as: “linguistic history is basically the darkest of the dark arts, the only means to conjure up the ghosts of vanished centuries” (Campbell 2004: 107).

Since the second half of the twentieth century, however, a new paradigm gained ground. The historian White suggested in 1960 that instead of focusing on the discontinuity that marked the transition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages, historians should rather study the way the Roman world was continued in the post-Roman successor states. This ‘transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm has become dominant in Anglophone medievalist circles since the 1980s. The popularity of the paradigm has posed a considerable challenge to some assumptions that are central to the enterprise of Old Germanic Studies, a discipline that focuses on the common linguistic and cultural heritage of the Germanic-speaking peoples. Because this dissertation is partly written from a the perspective of a Germanicist, I will shortly discuss the main assertions of the continuity paradigm followed by the critique that can be raised against it. The ‘transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm is marked by the following premises (for a similar analysis, see Heather 1997):

1. The military confrontation of barbarian peoples with the Late Roman state was a symptom and not the catalyst of the disintegration of the Late Roman state.
2. The Post-Roman successor states are marked by great continuity of Roman bureaucracy, ideology and religion.
3. The early twentieth-century conception that language and pre-state identity in Early Medieval Europe were linked is wrong, and all scholarship that in some way reflects this paradigm is outdated.

The first premise largely centers around the idea that the barbarian invasions were small-scale and did not dismember the political entity of the Late Roman state. The historians working in this paradigm share this view with most late twentieth-century archaeologists who discredit the idea of ethnic migrations and instead focus on continuity (see Härke 2006): these archaeologists employ a model, in which internal mechanisms of change are preferred above external mechanisms such as migration (cf. Anthony 2007: 108). Another side of the immobilism paradigm is the reassessment of earlier conceptions of ethnicity. Whereas pre-war scholarship viewed the Germanic peoples of Late Antiquity as well-defined entities with long histories dating back into the Proto-Germanic past (e.g. Kosinna 1911), from the 1960s onwards scholars have subscribed to the idea that identity is a dynamic and transient social construct. Disparate warrior bands are now supposed to have formed chameleon-like confederations in an opportunistic process that scholars call ‘ethnogenesis’. These relatively small groups were the barbarian armies that we encounter in the Late Roman sources, and no grand-scale migrations are involved. An extreme version of the ‘anti-migratory’ view was defended by the historians Goffart (1980) and Durliat (1988), who hold that no barbarian peoples whatsoever settled within the Roman empire. This view entails an alternative reading of many texts speaking about the settlement of barbarian groups on expropriated Roman estates. Instead, according to Goffart and Durliat, the late Roman state merely redirected tax revenues to small barbarian army regiments which were part of the Roman

policy of accommodating barbarian peoples as border defense forces.⁷ This led Goffart to assert that “the fall of the Western Empire was an imaginative experiment that got a little out of hand” (Goffart 1980: 35).

The second premise claims great continuity of Roman culture in the post-Roman successor states, and also leans closely on the post-war paradigm of immobilism. As a corollary to the continuity claim, many historians hold that there was no ‘Germanic’ contribution to Early Medieval Europe. This led medievalists to explore other venues of inquiry: the study of the uses of literacy in Early Medieval society is one area where the ‘transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm has greatly improved our understanding of the source material. The study of late Roman models of authority and religion became another focus point. Finally, the barbarian origin myths, which former generations of scholars have taken as an expression of barbarian cultural heritage, were also, albeit somewhat awkwardly, integrated into the non-Germanic paradigm.

Continuity of Roman bureaucracy is stressed by the historian Ian Wood, who claims that Merovingian Gaul, the barbarian kingdom that emerged from fifth-century Roman Gaul, was a bureaucratic society, namely “a society used to, needing and demanding documents” (Wood 2006: 258). The rejection of a Germanic contribution to the Early Middle Ages can be illustrated by the assertion of Mayke de Jong, who stated on the subject of Early Medieval religion, that “in spite of the occasional rearguard fight, the days of ‘pagan survivals’ and ubiquitous ‘Germanic roots’ may finally be over” (De Jong 1998: 269).

Walter Goffart (1988), in his book *‘the narrators of barbarian history’*, reassessed the barbarian origin myths, following a postmodernist strand of scholarship⁸ that is highly skeptical of the reliability of historical texts and rather sees them as reflections of the intentions of the author. According to Goffart, Early Medieval authors like Gregory of Tours, Jordanes and Paul the Deacon invented a history for the barbarian peoples. Therefore, in all likelihood, these ‘histories’ do not reflect oral traditions reaching back into the prehistoric past. Goffart’s interpretation is in line with the aforementioned reassessment of identity that is common in this strand of scholarship. Whereas Wenskus (1961), one of the first to reevaluate the concept of Early Medieval ethnicity, claimed at least some continuity with the Germanic past, Goffart and many scholars with him hold that the barbarian peoples of Late Antiquity were transient political communities of the historical moment, and therefore had no identity that reached back into Germanic Antiquity (Goffart 2006: 96-97).

⁷ According to Liebeschütz (2006), it is exactly this scarcity and relative vagueness of our sources that allowed Goffart to formulate his radically alternative interpretation of barbarian accommodation. In a precise and thorough study of the key passages in the relevant texts, Liebeschütz shows that the evidence for settlement is stronger than for merely a re-allotment of tax revenues.

⁸ For an overview of the postmodernist paradigm in contemporary historiography, see Bently (1999: 140-148).

While the last two premises merely indicate the divergence of the historical paradigm from the traditional perspective of Germanic philology, the third premise constitutes an outright rejection of most Germanicist scholarship on the Migration Age and Germanic culture. It therefore comes as no surprise that Germanicist studies on (continental) Germanic religious practices are commonly regarded by historians as clinging to outdated paradigms and being uncritical. As an example may serve the reception of Krutzler's (2011) recent monograph on the religion of the pagan Saxons and Frisians, whose philological approach has received substantial criticism from historians (e.g. Meens 2015).

In short: the scholarly conviction that we cannot say anything about Germanic ideological culture, is nowadays widely held among historians and archaeologists (cf. Amory 1997: xv).

Here we should recognize that part of the historians' and archaeologists' argument is undoubtedly true, and that the concept of 'Germanic culture' is an artificial construct which puts together facts and features under a single umbrella term, which the contemporaries might never have connected themselves. We may therefore sympathize with the more nuanced view of the historian Walther Pohl, who argued that the concept of a 'Germanic identity' must have played some role in Migration Age Europe, but that, from the historian's perspective, the term raises more questions than that it answers (2004: 30-31). Nevertheless, Germanic philologists still successfully use the traditional paradigm in their study of Early Medieval literature and culture. In my opinion, because almost all our written sources are written by the Latinate outsider, the evidence from linguistic archaeology, that is the linguistic reconstruction of inherited vocabulary and concepts, is all the more valuable.

The premise that there was no such thing as a 'Germanic heritage' or 'Germanic contribution to medieval culture' therefore severely impairs the dialogue between the disciplines. This rejection of Germanicist scholarship is a corollary to the post-war realization that language, material culture, and identity do not always come in 'neat ethnic packages' (Anthony 2007: 103). By inverting this argument, many historians and archaeologists now believe that language and identity are never connected, so that there were no ethnolinguistic tribal identities in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Julia Smith, in her 2005 book *Europe After Rome: A New Cultural History 500-1000*, gives voice to this sentiment in her statement that "we must dismiss the nineteenth-century misconception that there had ever existed a matching relationship of one people or polity to one language" (Smith 2005: 17).⁹

⁹ This statement ignores the sociolinguistic concept of the emblematic identity-giving code as opposed to the other secondary communication codes, concepts which have proven to be very useful in describing pre-state communities. This subject will be treated in more detail in chapter 4.

1.3 Language and Identity

For the past forty years, many historical linguists in Old Germanic studies have avoided engagement with the new paradigm, thereby resigning themselves to the theoretical separation of language and identity.¹⁰ In my opinion, historical linguists have failed to appreciate that the medievalist's rejection of language as an essential part of Early Medieval identity disregards an important sociolinguistic principle: namely that there is a close relationship between language, power and identity and that pre-state societies, where multilingualism is often the norm, commonly regard one language as their emblematic identity-giving code in relation to their 'heritage society' (Croft 2003: 50; Pakendorf 2007: 26). We should also consider that it is extremely difficult for an adult to lose an accent when speaking a second language that was not acquired during childhood. Consequently, belonging to a linguistic community and speaking a language without an accent is a powerful expression of social identity and being a part of existing power relations. Furthermore, linguistic proficiency limits or enhances the access to information and communication, and therefore strongly conditions the agency of the individual in its social interactions both within and without the community.

If we regard the individual as an intersection of a number of different identities (cf. Esmonde Cleary 2013: 15), we should realize that linguistic identity is expressed in both a conscious and an unconscious way; a Germanic-speaking newcomer, who settled in the Roman Empire, could manipulate his linguistic identity consciously by code-switching and avoiding the use of his ancestral language. However, there was also an important 'externally ascribed' (etic) part of his linguistic identity, a part that the average individual could not manipulate; this was his 'foreign accent', that is, the imposition of linguistic features of his native language on the secondarily acquired language of the Roman receiving population. So instead of language being mainly a tool one willfully uses to express social identity (as for example is the case with wearing a brooch or a weapon type), it rather represents a complex part of a particular group history that is interactively constructed and reconstructed in the confrontation of the individual with the group (Norris 2007; Hall 2011: 35). Suffice it to say that the sociolinguistic literature on the subject of language and identity is vast, and that the importance of language to identity is beyond doubt (cf. Labov 1963; Bourdieu 1991; Eckert 2000; Leonard 2012).

The problem, of course, when confronting this evidence from sociolinguistic theory and linguistic anthropology with the historical paradigm, is that the written Latin sources from Late Antiquity rarely mention that languages are a means of expressing identity.

¹⁰ A notable exception to this trend was the Cambridge Germanicist Dennis Green, who continued the dialogue with the historians for the entire length of his career. A good example of his commitment can be found in his contributions to the discussions, that are included in the proceedings of the fourth conference on 'Studies in Historical Archaeoethnology' (Wood ed. 1998).

Historians mainly encounter the Germanic-speaking peoples in texts that express their subjugation and settlement within the empire and their desire to become part of Roman power structures. It is therefore not surprising that historians regard the Germanic-speaking peoples mainly as ephemeral constellations that were only consolidated into political entities in their confrontation with the Roman Empire (Halsall 2007: 419). It was the Roman empire that gave them the opportunity to join the army, settle on the Roman countryside and opt in to a Roman identity that was cosmopolitan and vast, stretching from Ireland in the west to Persia in the east. Any strong indications that linguistic divides (other than that between Greek and Latin) ran through this Roman identity are missing from the Latin sources.

This does, however, not mean that these linguistic dividing lines did not exist. We may consider the parallel with the medieval Arabic world; in the Arabic literary sources, we also find a vast and multilingual territory described by learned contemporaries from the ideological viewpoint that only one language was culturally significant. We know from non-Arabic sources in Greek, Old French, and Latin that this was definitely not the case (cf. Aslanov 2013). This parallel gives a hint at how a literary discourse can differ dramatically from the sociocultural realities of everyday life. In my opinion, when we evaluate the concept of Early Medieval identity, our sociolinguistic evidence from pre-state societies and the sociolinguistic theory that contextualizes it should at least provide a methodological check on the preconceptions about language that come from the elite literary discourse of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.

1.4 Language and Archaeology

A powerful challenge to the premise of the historical and archaeological paradigm that language is a minor way of expressing identity has been provided by two archaeologists studying the prehistory of the Indo-European-speaking peoples. Since the concept of an Indo-European proto-language presupposes a community that spoke that language, it is understandable that precisely those archaeologists who advocate the combination of the disciplines would take up the gauntlet. The archaeologist James Mallory was the first to argue against a complete disjointing of archaeological and linguistic identity. In his book *'In search of the Indo-Europeans'* (1989), he stated that "while one may deny the necessity of assuming an invariable one-on-one correlation between an archaeological and linguistic identity, it is equally perverse to assume that there can be no correlation between the two" (Mallory 1989: 164). In support of this statement, he points to the archaeology of North America where a correlation between cultural traits and linguistic groups is often found. He rightly remarks that this is hardly surprising since cultural traits are more easily shared by people who speak the same language (Mallory 1989: 164; see also McMahon 2004: 6). This would also tie in with the fact that there seems to be a statistically significant positive correlation between genes and languages. A possible explanation for this would be that peoples speaking unrelated

languages tend not to intermarry as frequently as people that do speak related languages (cf. Barbujani 1991: 151; Pakendorf 2015: 628).

The archaeologist David Anthony followed the example set by Mallory in 1989 and also defended the combination of linguistic reconstruction and archaeology. In his book *'The Horse, the Wheel and Language'* (2007), he asserts that language is correlated with material culture at long-lasting distinct material-culture borders (Anthony 2007: 104). Anthony remarks that archaeologists have documented several of these long-lasting frontiers in prehistoric tribal settings. He also points to historical cases where linguistic boundary zones have remained stable for centuries. The Welsh-English, Breton-French and French-Swiss German language borders are referred to as well-known historical cases where we know that the language border hardly moved in more than a millennium. Anthony remarks that, in these cases, the linguistic boundary coincided with a cultural boundary that is defined by bundles of opposed customs and different socio-economic networks. Relatively few people migrated across these frontier zones, which led to a constant renewal of contrasting ethno-linguistic identities. In my opinion, Mallory and Anthony have made a convincing case for how the combination of historical linguistic evidence with archaeological evidence leads to a better understanding of prehistoric migrations and borderland dynamics.

In the past two decades, the paradigm in mainstream archaeology has also been shifting, and archaeologists such as Burmeister (2000) have tried to find a way forward in proving migration in archaeology. Burmeister did this by focusing on material culture from the private sphere, which lacked social significance and could not be used for prestige purposes. This model draws from Bourdieu's (1977) distinction between an external domain of social life, which would constitute a habitus of contact and innovation, and an internal domain, which would constitute a habitus of tradition. Since the internal domain of social life is inherently conservative, it is likely that migrating groups brought traces of their material culture from the private sphere along to their target destination. Identifying these traces may serve to establish new models of migration, an approach that has been adopted by archaeologists such as Theuus (2009), Van Thienen (2016) and Heeren (2017), who argued that small groups of 'barbarian' newcomers may have infiltrated Late Roman Gaul over the course of several generations.¹¹

Here it should be stressed that this model of protracted small-scale infiltration and settlement is not incompatible with the linguistic evidence of toponymy and loanword studies (see also Udolph 1995). In many regards, this would simply mean that the process of the 'Fränkische Landnahme', which earlier generations of scholars assumed had taken place within a few generations, now should be stretched out over the better part of two centuries

¹¹ We may note that this shift in the archaeological debate, i.e. the return of migration as an explanation for trans-cultural diffusion, does not necessarily entail a shift on how archaeologists view the relationship between ethnic groups and identity (see e.g. Hall 2012).

and envisioned as the outcome of successive waves of immigrants. Intimately tied up with the question of Germanic migration and Gallo-Roman continuity is the issue of language contact and identity, which will be revisited in chapter 4. In this regard, it is interesting to note that some historians and archaeologists are opening up to the idea that evidence for language shift and accelerated linguistic change might relate to questions of migration and societal continuity (e.g. Roymans & Heeren 2017: 4; Heather 2017: 33; Deckers 2017).

1.5 Roman transformation and Germanic infiltration

The view that the fifth-century Roman state collapsed under the momentum of invading barbarian armies who tore apart the political unity of the empire, is at least partly vindicated by the Late Antique sources, which indicate that the western Roman field armies suffered heavy losses and are unanimously vocal about the horrors of the fifth century (Heather 2017: 29). It cannot be denied that there is a wide range of fifth-century sources that recount the atrocities committed by the barbarian armies. This led some historians to voice the opinion that, whatever mechanisms of acculturation and integration may have been at play, the invasions of the Germanic peoples in the fifth century must have been “very unpleasant for the Roman population” (cf. Ward-Perkins 2003: 10). The historian Penny MacGeorge, in her study ‘Late Roman Warlords’, expressed the same opinion when she remarked that “scholars who envisage the process of ethnic and political change as consisting of peaceful interaction and acculturation hold the most optimistic and naïve notions of human behavior” (MacGeorge 2002: 164).

The geographical scope and density of Germanic settlement has been studied by Germanicists and Romanists for over a century (Gamillscheg 1970; Wartburg 1950b; Petri 1973). At first glance it might seem like Germanic place-names in France provide incontrovertible evidence in favor of the settlement of Germanic-speaking peoples. However, some historians working within the ‘transformation of the Roman world paradigm’ have sought to deemphasize the historical implications of this onomastic research by problematizing the link between identity and name-giving and being skeptical of the historicity of reconstructed linguistic forms (see for example Halsall 1995: 9-12). This has led to an uncomfortable stalemate that is aptly characterized by the following quote from philologist and toponymist Matthew Townend, who stated that students of Early Medieval migration history can be divided in two camps, namely “those who believe in linguistic evidence and those who do not” (Townend 2000: 89).

On the linguistic side of the argument, we may point to De Planhol, who, in his 1994 handbook on the historical geography of France, rightly remarks that “the renaming of many rural estates and the appearance of new forms of names composed according to the rules of Germanic syntax are only compatible with the presence and determining influence of new peoples” (De Planhol 1994: 61). One of the great achievements of the study of Germanic toponyms in the former Roman Empire has been its ability to sketch the geographic dimensions where Germanic settlement must have been relatively dense (see De Planhol 1994: 66-67; Pitz & Schorr 2003: 75; Besse 2000). Especially the expansion of settlement names in *-ingum* is relevant in this regard, since scholars have consistently argued that this naming fashion is connected to the settlement of Germanic-speaking peoples in post-Roman Gaul. This expansion is commonly dated to the early Merovingian period (Wartburg 1939; Gysseling 1960; Blok 1965) and represents a contiguous Germanic naming pattern that is densest to the north of the Somme – Aisne line. Here we should note that this scholarly position has stood the test of time and is still held by modern toponymists (cf. Rash 2002; Besse 2000; Pitz 2004).¹² In my opinion, it seems unwise to ignore this compelling evidence; especially since there are very few written sources that survive from this period, and those that do, remain frustratingly vague about the demographics involved in barbarian settlement.



Figure 2 the Somme - Aisne line

Several scholars in Old Germanic Studies have critiqued the new paradigm for rejecting any ‘Germanic’ contribution to the Early Middle Ages. Herwig Wolfram (2006) has provided multiple replies to Goffart’s insistence that the barbarian origin myths were contemporary ‘inventions of history’ that belong to the realm of fiction. He rightly remarks that the barbarian origin myths contain legendary material with analogues in North Germanic mythology, showing that genuine folk traditions must have played a role in their composition. He is joined by the Danish archaeologist Lotte Hedeager, who attempts to interpret ‘barbarian’ material culture by looking for leads in North Germanic mythology. In her 2011 book *Iron Age Myth and Materiality: an Archaeology of Scandinavia AD 400-1000*, she almost completely ignores the ‘transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm, and states that the writers of the barbarian histories “depicted their own past in a way that had meaning for

¹² For a modern view on the related question of the **-ingas* and **-ingahaim*-toponyms, see Deckers (2012).

them, using their own criteria of accuracy and concrete representation” (Hedeager 2011: 45). Hedeager holds that the material culture of the Germanic-speaking north provided an ideological code for a warrior identity that contrasted with the urban cultures of the Late Roman empire. This ideological code consisted of the cultivation of Germanic origin myths, the championing of Germanic customary law and the proliferation of Germanic bracteates and runic inscriptions. We may note that her theory sharply contrasts with the widely-held view among historians that the acceptance of a unifying Germanic identity is “an absurd idea” (cf. Halsall 2006: 283).

It must be said that there are also scholars within the ‘Transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm, who argue for a reappraisal of the barbarian side of the narrative. Michael Richter has been an important advocate for this revision. In his 1994 book *‘The Formation of the Medieval West’*, he shifted the focus back to the illiterate north. He rightly remarks that “since our sources come overwhelmingly from the Roman side, the barbarian dimensions tend to get obliterated” (Richter 1994: 26). Richter stresses the point that the barbarian identities of the Migration Age played an important part in the construction of Early Medieval statehood. Consequently, the barbarian perspective should at least be granted “as fair a hearing as possible” (cf. Richter 1994: 44).

Understandably, the view that there was no recognition of a common heritage among the Germanic-speaking peoples in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages has also been opposed by Germanic philologists. A notable example is Leonard Neidorf (2013), who criticized the new paradigm for failing to offer a substantial engagement with over a hundred years of philological scholarship. In an ingenious article defending the early dating of the Old English *Widsith* poem, Neidorf argued that the theory that Germanic epic poetry reflects a common Germanic heritage “has become unfashionable, but nothing has rendered it improbable” (Neidorf 2013: 178). According to Neidorf, the traditional paradigm of Old Germanic Studies offers a better model for explaining the idiosyncrasies of Germanic epic poetry than a paradigm which treats the idea of a shared Germanic heritage as a nineteenth-century delusion.

Likewise, the ‘Transformation of the Roman world’ paradigm fails to incorporate into its interpretative models the few vernacular text monuments from the Migration Age that do survive and fails to discuss how these text monuments relate to the use of vernacular languages as an expression of political power and sociocultural identity.

This is made painfully clear by how historians and archaeologists tend to ignore the runic inscriptions when discussing Late Antique and Early Medieval culture. Another area where the paradigm falls short, is the treatment of Gothic literacy. Whereas no other Germanic-speaking people has left behind a substantial corpus of vernacular text monuments dating back to the Migration Age, the Gothic language was put to writing in the fourth century when a part of the Gothic population was converted to Christianity by the bishop

Wulfila. The fourth-century Gothic Bible translation became a symbol of power and identity in the sixth-century Ostrogothic kingdom of Theoderic the Great (cf. Bigus 2011). Linguistic evidence which provides a non-Latinate window on Ostrogothic Italy is rarely cited by historians or gets dismissed as being unconvincing (cf. Wolfe 2014).

Although most historians treat the Gothic Bible translation as a circumstantial survival of one vernacular book,¹³ the surviving Gothic text monuments indicate that Ostrogothic chancelleries were producing a vast range of texts in the Gothic language. Papyrus slips with signature statements in Gothic, a Gothic homily on the gospel of John, and a recently found Gothic religious tractate (Falluomini 2014) all indicate that the range of Gothic literacy exceeded that of the mere copying of Bible manuscripts. Also intriguing is the Gothic Bible verse inscribed on the Hács-Bendékpusztá lead tablet found in a sixth-century Hungarian grave, to which no historian has yet provided a substantial commentary.

Finally, we may consider a compelling piece of historical linguistic evidence. In my opinion, it is striking that all the West Germanic languages possessed a concept that when referring to the inhabitants of the Roman Empire (regardless of whether they were Romance or Celtic speaking), clearly conflated the categories of foreigner and non-Germanic-speaking individual (cf. Schrijver 2014: 20). This concept would be tied to the Germanic term **walha-*, which is attested in all West Germanic languages and whose antiquity is therefore beyond question. In Old English, the reflexes of the West Germanic word function as an ethnonym, a glossonym and a social category for unfree and land-bound individuals (cf. OE *walas* ‘foreigners’, *wealh* ‘foreigner, slave’, *wīln* ‘female slave’). In the West Germanic languages it is mainly used as an ethnonym and a glossonym (cf. OHG *walah* ‘Roman, foreigner’, *welhisk* ‘Romance’), although also here connotations of inferiority might have been present, as is hinted at in the Old High German Kassel conversations (*tole sint uualha, luzic ist spahe in uualhum* ‘the Romance-speakers are stupid, there is little wisdom among the Romance-speakers’, Braune-Ebbinghaus 1994: 9). This evidence implies that the Germanic term **walha-* functioned as a marker of cultural and linguistic otherness and that the Germanic-speaking peoples conflated these categories in their confrontation with the inhabitants of the Roman empire.

I contend that all this evidence sharply contradicts the insistence of historians that the Germanic languages played no or little role in the identity and culture of the barbarian invaders.

¹³ We may note that Michael Richter in his treatment of Ostrogothic identity in sixth-century Italy, ignores the production of texts in the Gothic language as evidence for a contrasting ‘barbarian’ identity (cf. Richter 1994: 21-25). This is surprising since Richter, although often invoking the phrase ‘transformation of the Roman world’, generally tries to highlight the barbarian ‘contribution’ to the Migration Age, paying due notice to Germanicist scholarship on Germanic literature.

1.6 Language and the Roman border zone

The following outlines my view on the connection between the Germanic languages and barbarian identities in the transition from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. It is my contention that the northern border of the Roman Empire played a significant role in constructing and transforming the ethno-linguistic identities of the peoples on either side of the border. Following Anthony (2007), who argued for a strong correlation between language and persistent cultural frontiers, I contend that the Roman political border at the river Rhine constituted exactly such a persistent frontier. It was at the northern Roman border that contrasting material-cultures and socio-economic networks may have survived long enough to lead to an opposition of different ethno-linguistic identities.

Before the Romans established a border defense line at the river Rhine in the first century CE, Gaulish and Germanic peoples, irrespective of their linguistic identities, shared a subsistence economy of husbandry and open field agriculture (cf. Roymans 1990). Their material cultures were highly similar, and the evidence for language and culture contact between Gaulish and Germanic-speaking populations is substantial (see Green 1988). When the Roman army reached the banks of the river Rhine and established border garrisons in order to defend the Dutch river delta as part of the northern imperial border, a sharp cultural and socio-economic contrast arose. The encampment of thousands of Roman soldiers demanded a steady supply of provisions which could not be provided by traditional methods of agriculture. The need for surplus production prompted the establishment of large farming estates in the southern part of *Germania inferior* and the north of *Belgica Secunda* (Kooistra 1996: 9; Heeren 2017); these farming estates were managed by Roman colonists and supplied the provisions needed for the logistics of the Roman border troops (De Planhol 1994: 49). The range of this colonist settlement is marked by Roman place-names such as *villa* ‘estate’, *castellum* ‘fort’, *spicarium* ‘barn’, *vicus* ‘homestead’ and *māceria* ‘enclosure’, whose distribution closely follows the Roman roads and border fortresses (Schmitt 1996: 477). Also the presence of Romance toponyms in the Dutch river area, such as *Tricht*, *Wadenooijen* and *Kesteren*, may be ascribed to these Romance-speaking colonists of the first centuries CE (cf. Schrijver 2014: 153-54).¹⁴

These Roman colonists constituted a homogenous ethno-linguistic identity complex, whose *romanitas* was continually reinforced by the presence of the Roman army and the settlement of Roman traders and veterans in the frontier zone (cf. Adams 2007: 22; Schrijver 2014: 141-43). Their variety of the Latin language may have had some features of colonial

¹⁴ We should, however, note that the persistence of the toponyms into the Early Middle Ages does not necessarily imply continuity of habitation. It only implies a *traditio nominarum* from the Romance-speaking name-givers to the Germanic-speaking newcomers (see also Heeren 2017: 171).

dialects, as outlined by the sociolinguist Peter Trudgill (1983, 2010), and would have formed a strong ethno-linguistic counterpart to the non-Latin varieties on the other side of the border. Although the ethno-linguistic frontier which developed at this political boundary was at all times permeable, with traders and merchants travelling far and wide across it, the different socio-economic functional zones of the Roman empire on the one hand and the barbarian chiefdoms on the other would have fed and accentuated the contrasts of the ethno-linguistic boundary. The persistence of this robust ethno-linguistic frontier is illustrated by the fact that the present-day Romance–Germanic language border from the Belgian coast to Switzerland runs parallel to the Roman *limes* of the first century CE (see Van Durme 2002: 12).

It is my contention that, in the same way that Roman identity in the frontier zone was fed by a continuous stream of new soldiers and settlers, the barbarian chiefdoms at the frontier, depending on the opportunities of the moment, could look to their northern linguistic relatives in Germany and Denmark for cultural capital. When the Roman border defense faltered during the Crisis of the Third Century (235-284 CE), Germanic-speaking peoples at the *limes* increasingly adopted a discourse of otherness which drew strength from the linguistic and cultural heritage of the Germanic-speaking north. There seem to be two developments crossing each other: on the one hand, many Germanic tribesmen enlisted in the Roman army and became part of Late Roman society. On the other hand, Late Antique Germanic warrior culture, as argued by Hedeager (2011), was marked by non-Roman identity markers such as the use of the runic alphabet, Germanic style burial practices and the manufacturing of bracteates (MacGeorge 2002: 141). In the context of the Crisis of the Third Century, northern Gaul was at multiple occasions overrun by these raiding barbarian war bands. In order to improve the border defense, the Roman military exchanged the defense line at the Rhine for a new row of fortresses through northern Gaul (cf. Van Durme 1996: 168). These fortifications followed the Roman road from Boulogne-sur-Mer to Courtrai and Tongeren and were complemented by the fortification of hilltops and the restoration of town walls (Brulet 2017: 51-53). Together they constituted a more dynamic means of reacting to border incursions by Germanic raiding parties (Van Durme 2002: 11; Schrijver 2014: 142).

It is not unthinkable that the establishment of this new defense line in the third century brought along a major reinforcement of the Late Latin language in present-day Belgium. It seems reasonable to assume that the influx of new Romance speaking soldiers and the establishment of new supply lines for the army garrisons will have prompted any remaining communities that held on to Gaulish to make the switch to Gallo-Romance.¹⁵

¹⁵ In my opinion, this could be one of the main reasons why the Belgian language border runs along the fourth century defense line; we might here not be dealing with a Romance line of retreat, but rather with a reinforced line of Romance speaking communities in the middle of Belgium; along this line, the Early Medieval bilingualism of northern Gaul may have stabilized.

Now that the northern border was no longer a military defense line, but rather a military defense zone, the Gallo-Roman countryside was infiltrated by land-seeking immigrants and treaty-bound Germanic colonists (*dediticii* or *foederati*), who may have left traces in the form of the fourth century ‘Reihengräber’ (row-graves) burial practice (MacGeorge 2002: 140). When the Germanic colonists settled there, the Latin variety of Roman Gaul was still spoken. This is shown by the transmission of Gallo-Roman (both Gaulish and Romance) names for settlements and fields to the new Germanic-speaking populace, e.g. southern Dutch *kamp*, *kouter* and *bruul* < Gallo-Rom. **kamos* ‘field’, **koltura* ‘cultivated acre’, **brogilos* ‘enclosed area’ (cf. Kempeneers 1993; Van Durme 1996). Eventually however, the combined force of war and foreign occupation had far-reaching consequences: a contraction of the acreages under cultivation and a considerable drop in population (De Planhol 1994: 67). The archaeological record shows that, in the course of the fourth century, many Roman estates on the northern border were abandoned (Kooistra 1996: 10; Heeren 2017). From the historical records, we learn that emperor Julian, for the campaigning season of 358 CE, needed to bring grain from Britain in order to feed his troops, showing that the farmlands of the Rhine border no longer provided these provisions (cf. Heather 2017: 22). Recent research has shown that in some parts of the northern border zone there was continuity of human habitation (Cf. Van Thienen 2016). However, in many other parts of the Rhine frontier zone, the villas and fields, that once formed the lifelines for the Roman border troops, fell into disuse and forests sprawled in all directions (Tummers 1962: 8; De Planhol 1994: 68).

In the century that followed, Roman Gaul was transformed from a Roman province into an inward-looking society of Gallo-Roman warlords and estate-holders (Drinkwater & Elton 1992; Esmonde Cleary 2013: 42-96). As the northern border defense was completely abandoned in 410 CE, the political geography of the region changed drastically (Drinkwater 1992: 216). The sources indicate that many influential Gallo-Roman aristocrats fled south to Italy and Spain (Mathisen 1992: 228-230). The estate-holders that stayed tightened their grip on their land-bound peasants (Latin *coloni*). Some of the local aristocrats withdrew from Roman society altogether, and established independent communities defended by peasant militias (Drinkwater 1992: 214-215). In the contemporary sources, these independent Gallo-Roman rulers, who are likened to barbarians, are called *Bacaudae*.¹⁶ An intriguing insight into their barbarian society is offered by a fifth-century comedy known as the *Querolus sive Aulularia* (‘the complainer or the history of the pot’). In this text, life, north of the river Loire, from the perspective of a southern Gallo-Roman aristocrate, is described as follows.

“Go, live at the river Loire! Men live there under the law of barbarians. There is no trickery there. Capital sentences are performed on the oak tree and written on bones.

¹⁶ It should be noted that the name *bacaudai* is Gaulish in origin (Gaul. **bagatai* ‘warriors’, cf. OIr. *bág* ‘fight’), and this might be a significant fact in itself. It is possible this word belonged to the Gaulish language that was spoken by socially marginal Gallo-Roman countrymen (or at least a Romance basilect with a heavy Gaulish element). It seems likely that *bacaudai* originally referred to the Gallo-Roman war bands during the Crisis of the Third Century.

There even peasants perorate and common folk pronounce judgment. You can do anything you like there.” (Querolus I, 15: line 7-12¹⁷)

Although it is problematic to take this anecdote at face value (after all it comes from a comedy play in which exaggeration and hyperbole are to be expected), it is possible that the passage was considered humorous by the contemporaries exactly because it was recognizable.

It should come as no surprise that it is there, in northern Gaul, that discontinuity from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages is most evident. Even the northern Gallo-Roman cities, for which a continuity of habitation is borne out by the archaeological record, suffered dearly in this period. This is illustrated by the disruption of the bishop lists of the northern Gallo-Roman dioceses of Tournai, Noyon, Cambrai, Vermandois, and Arras in the fourth and fifth centuries, indicating that for a time the religious topography of the region was severely damaged. An early sixth-century hagiography recounts that the city of Arras was still in ruins when saint Vedastis visited it around the year 500 CE (*Vita Vedastis* c. 6). There is also archaeological evidence that Gallo-Roman settlements underwent a change in use with the abandonment of traditional Gallo-Roman building styles and the adoption of Germanic-type rectangular wooden halls (MacGeorge 2002: 140; see also Van Thienen 2016: 89).

Another interesting indication that Roman authority in Gaul was severely disrupted by the barbarian invasions, is the mention in the Early Medieval sources of a late fifth-century Gallo-Roman kingdom centered around the city of Soissons. This kingdom was ruled by autonomous Gallo-Roman warlords who had few to no ties to Italy or Byzantium (MacGeorge 2002: 80). Although some historians working in the continuity paradigm have doubted the existence of the kingdom of Soissons (cf. James 1988; Wijnendaele 2016), MacGeorge has convincingly defended the concept of at least an autonomous Gallo-Roman chiefdom (MacGeorge 2002: 135-36); its existence is corroborated by an early sixth-century text, featuring a list of Gallo-Roman kings (*de regibus romanorum*, see also MacGeorge 2002: 80), which starts with a certain Alanius in the early fifth century and ending with Syagrius, the Gallo-Roman warlord who was defeated by Hlodoweh (Latin *Chlothoveus*¹⁸), the king of the Salian Franks, in 486 CE. This evidence supports the view that, at some moment in the fifth century, northern Gaul had been politically separated from the rest of the Western Empire.¹⁹

The disjoining of northern Gaul from the Western Empire is best envisaged as a process that began with the abandonment of the Rhine defense in 410 CE, and was completed

¹⁷ “*vade, ad Ligerem vivito. Illic jure gentium vivunt homines. Ibi nullum est praestigium; ibi sententiae de robore capitales proferuntur et scribuntur in ossibus; illic rustici etiam perorant et privati judicant. Ibi totum licet: si dives fueris*” (cf. Havet 1880: 217-18). For a German translation, see Emrich (1965: 69).

¹⁸ The Latinized Frankish name *Chlothovechus* is here normalized as Hlodoweh; this normalization is chosen to reflect the Romance-influenced pronunciation that is implied by the Latinate spelling, i.e. Gm. **Hludawīg* > **Hlodoweh*.

¹⁹ Procopius’ remark that in the early sixth century, Roman soldiers were still serving as border troops in northern Gaul (Goth. 1.12.16-19) should therefore be treated with suspicion and may merely represent an outsider’s perspective on the Roman military styles that persisted in that area (*contra* Wijnendaele 2016: 193).

in the mid fifth century in the power vacuum left by the campaigns of Attila. There is convincing evidence that suggests that even southern Gaul came to feel separated from the Late Roman state in the second half of the fifth century. The Gallo-Roman prefect Arvandus was tried in Rome in 469 CE for treason since he had written to the Visigothic king Theoderic that Gaul should be divided between the Burgundians, the Goths and the Gallo-Romans.²⁰ In the same letter, he refers to the western emperor Anthemius (467-472 CE) as a 'Greek ruler' with whom no peace should be sought (Sidonius Apollinaris, letter to Vincentius, line 5; Anderson 1936: 371).

It seems tempting to connect the autonomy of Gaul in the late fifth century with the Anglo-Saxon habit of calling the Gallo-Romans *Galwalas* 'the Gaul foreigners', thereby distinguishing them from the *Rumwalas* 'the Rome foreigners', who may have belonged to an earlier epoch. We may also note the relatively minor role that the Romans played in Germanic epic poetry in general, whether it be Anglo-Saxon or Old Norse. Whereas many Germanic warlords of different barbarian nations feature in the poems about the Migration Age, no Roman generals are named. Indeed, Romans are seldom named at all, the exception being a list of kings in the Old English *Widsith* poem (*Widsith* 76-78) and the Old Norse 'Hunnenslachtlied' (*Saga Heiðreks konungs ins Vitra* c. 10). It could well be that this relative invisibility of the Late Roman state in Germanic epic poetry reflects the final stage of the fifth century, a period in which the Roman empire had already been dismembered.

1.7 Language in Migration Age Gaul

Now that I have expounded my view on the ethno-linguistic dynamics at play in Migration Age Europe, we may turn to fifth-century Gaul for a closer look at the linguistic situation. Here it should be mentioned that fifth century Gaul must have been a multilingual melting pot. We can reasonably assume that in the course of the fifth century the following languages were spoken in Gaul:

1. Late Latin or Gallo-Romance dialects were spoken by the Gallo-Roman population.
2. British Celtic was spoken by the British refugees on the Breton peninsula
3. North-Sea Germanic (Ingvaemonic) dialects were spoken by the Saxons and Frisians on the northwestern French coast, the *litus saxonicum*.
4. Continental West Germanic dialects were spoken by the Franks and Alamans in northern and eastern France.

²⁰ It is a distinct possibility that the Gallo-Roman prefect Arvandus (= Gm. **arhʷand*, cf. Goth. *arvazna* 'arrow') is to be identified with a certain Sagittarius, who is addressed in another letter of Sidonius (liber II, epistula IV, cf. Anderson 1936: 438-441).

5. East Germanic dialects were spoken by the Visigoths and Vandals during their trek to Spain, and by the Burgundians who settled in Central Gaul after their relocation from the Rhineland.
6. North-East Iranian languages were spoken by the Alans and Sarmatians during their trek to Spain.
7. A Semitic language was in all likelihood spoken by the Syrians who were active as merchants in the southern Gallo-Roman towns.
8. An East Germanic dialect was spoken by the Burgundians in eastern France.
9. Proto-Turkic and Proto-Mongolian were spoken by the Huns during their campaign through Gaul.
10. Old Aquitanian or Pre-Basque was spoken in southern Aquitaine and the Pyrenees.
11. Remaining pockets of continental Celtic (Gaulish) may have survived in isolated areas of Roman Gaul.

Unfortunately, we find little traces of this multilingualism in the historical texts. Although Early Medieval authors viewed language as a distinctive part of ethnicity,²¹ they rarely go into details when commenting on the foreign languages of the barbarians.

Sidonius Apollinaris (431-489 CE), an important witness to the political events of fifth-century Gaul, comments on several occasions on the language of the invaders. In one of his poems, he laments the fact that he has to suffer the Germanic words of Burgundian poetry (carmen 12). In another poem (carmen 8), he pokes fun of the Gallo-Roman aristocrat Syagrius (a popular Gallo-Roman name) for knowing better Burgundian than the Burgundians themselves. Only once, Sidonius comments on the use of a specific Germanic word. It may not be a coincidence that the word in question is the term *vargus** (Epistula 6.4), referring to a brigand or bandit. This word is well-known from Old English and Old Norse (cf. OE *wearg*, ON *vargr* ‘wolf, criminal’), and also occurs in the Merovingian redactions of the Salic Law.

Another contemporary author who mentions the language of one of the barbarian peoples that marched through Gaul is Procopius, a sixth-century Byzantine author. In his *History of the Wars* (book III, c. 2, 1-8), he states that the Vandals use the same language as the Goths and that this language is also known as Gothic. He presumes that, because of this shared language, the Vandals and Goths must originally have sprung from one tribe. The similarities between the Old Germanic languages were also noted by Paul the Deacon who, in reference to the epic poems about the Langobardic hero Alboin, mentions that the Bavarians, Saxons and Langobards are people of the same language who sing the same songs (*History of the Langobards* 1, 27). From the Carolingian period onwards, more comments on the vernaculars

²¹ For example, Saint Augustine remarks that there are more *gentes* than languages, because from one language more *gentes* sprang forth (*De Civitate Dei* 16, 6). This view is followed by Isidore of Sevilla (*Etymologiae* 9, 1, 1).

of the Germanic-speaking peoples have survived.²² Most of these use the Latinate term *teudiscus* to refer to the complex of Germanic vernaculars (see Weisgerber 1953); this *teudiscus* was a Latinized form of a Gallo-Romance word (cf. OFr. *tiedeis* ‘Germanic vernacular’), that was in turn borrowed from the Germanic word **þiudiska-* ‘of the people’ (see section 2.5).

1.8 The Franks

At the end of the fifth century CE, the language of the Franks quickly became the most important foreign language in the Gallo-Roman provinces. The Franks are first encountered in a third-century panegyric (*Panegyrici Latini* VIII (V) 9.3) for the Roman emperor Constantius Chlorus (Roman emperor from 293-306 CE, see Boone 1954). In all likelihood, they were a confederation of Germanic-speaking border groups (in Latin sources referred to as *Chauki*, *Chamavi*, *Chatti*, *Warni*) living along the lower reaches of the river Rhine, who in the course of the third century adopted the name **frank-* as a new self-designation, whose etymology remains obscure (cf. Seebold 2003: 32). In the panegyric for Constantius Chlorus, it is recounted that the Franks were settled as Roman dependents (Latin *deditici*) on the Betuwe island in the year 293 CE. Another piece of evidence comes from the historian Zosimus who tells us that the Franks were driven from the Betuwe by a band of marauding Saxons (*Historia Nova* III 6). Around 340 CE, emperor Constantius would have settled them under treaty in Toxandria, the sandy grounds of the present-day provinces of Brabant in the southern Netherlands and northern Belgium. The fourth-century author Ammianus Marcellinus provides us with some valuable additional information, when he discusses the border wars of the Roman emperor Julian the Apostate around the year 357 CE (*Rerum Gestarum*, book 17, c. 8). Ammianus Marcellinus tells us that the Franks in this region call themselves *Salii*, a name also encountered in a Greek letter of Julian himself who speaks of *Salioi* (*Letter to the Athenians* 8). The Germanicist Matthias Springer has convincingly argued that the name *Salii* derives from the Germanic word **saljan-* ‘companion, fellow’ (cf. OHG *gisellio* ‘companion’), and refers to the military organization of this Germanic-speaking confederation (Springer 1997: 66). Even though many scholars use the designation Salian Franks as a way of distinguishing them from the Ripuarian Franks, Springer (1997: 69-70) made it clear that the contemporary sources do not justify this use of the term. The term ‘*Salius*’ strictly belongs to the fourth and fifth century; in the Merovingian period, it is no longer used as an ethnic designation, and only occurs in the context of the Salic Law. We should note that this does not incapacitate the distinction between western Franks and eastern Franks in Migration Age Gaul. This distinction clearly plays a role in the sixth-century writings of Gregory of Tours. It also seems to have foreshadowed the seventh-century division of the Merovingian kingdom into a

²² Interestingly enough, Carolingian writers were fascinated by the traces of Gothic literacy that they encountered in northern Italy. Smaragd of Saint Mihiel, Frechulf of Lisieux and Walahfrid Strabo all considered the Old High German of the Franks to be the same language as the Gothic manuscripts of the Migration Age.

western realm (Neustria < Gm. **niujist*- ‘newest realm’ or **nehstrija*- ‘nearest realm’²³) and an eastern realm (Austria < **austra*- ‘east realm’, see De Planhol 1994: 81).

In the course of the fifth century, the Salian Franks entered the Flemish coastal plains and the Ardennes, and one group established a kingdom around the Gallo-Roman city of Tournai. Gregory of Tours recounts that similar Frankish kingdoms existed in Cambrai and Cologne.²⁴ The first Frankish king to come clearly into the light of history is named Hilderic (Latin *Childericus*), a Frankish warlord who competed with the Gallo-Roman kingdom of Soissons for overlordship over northern Gaul. The hagiography of saint Genovefa makes it clear that Hilderic was able to raid as far south as the city of Paris. Hilderic’s grave, discovered in 1653 CE, gives us an idea of how the cultural outlook of these fifth-century Franks was caught between two worlds (cf. Esmonde Cleary 2013: 383); the royal grave of Hilderic included elements (e.g. horse depositions) that can be linked to Germanic pre-Christian burials between the Elbe and Rhine river, but also elements (e.g. a Roman signet ring and Roman coinage) that link it to the urban and military culture of Late Roman Gaul. Childeric’s son, king Hlodoweh, eventually deposed the last Gallo-Roman king in northern Gaul (ca. 486 CE) and expanded the Frankish realm up to the river Loire.

1.9 The Germanic linguistic identity of the Franks

When the Franks settled on the northern Gallo-Roman countryside, they brought along their Continental West Germanic dialect. The possible influence that the Frankish language may have had on Gallo-Romance through the mechanisms of language contact constitutes a long debate in Romance and Germanic linguistics, which will be explored more fully in chapter 4. Here I will give an overview of the remarks by the historical contemporaries and explore some new data that may contain clues as to the fate of spoken Frankish.

As stated above, Latin sources rarely comment on the language of the Germanic-speaking foreigners; the Franks, unfortunately, are no exception. Venantius Fortunatus, a sixth-century Italian aristocrat who settled in the city of Poitiers, is one of the few contemporary writers who speaks about the Frankish language in Gaul. Among the many panegyrics to the Frankish kings that Venantius composed, several comment on the use of the Frankish language.

²³ Gysseling (1960:737) argues for an etymology Gm. **nebastrija*- to a purported Gm. **nebas*- ‘mist’, so that the Frankish realm was divided into a “mist-land” and a “dawn-land” but this hardly seems credible.

²⁴ It should be mentioned that almost all our information on this part of Frankish history is dependent on the sixth-century texts of Gregory of Tours, who wrote more than 150 years later after these events occurred. He himself seems to have been dependent on several Late Roman histories by Sulpicius Alexander and Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus that have not survived.

1. In a panegyric on King Haribert (Latin *Charibertus*), the king's fluency in the language of the Gallo-Romans is praised, and Fortunatus wonders how much greater the king's eloquence must be in his own language (*carmen* 6.2, George 1995: 95-101).
2. In a panegyric on King Hilperic (Latin *Chilpericus*), the king's aptitude in understanding many languages is praised. It is noted that he does not use an interpreter (*carmen* 9.1, George 1995: 27-30).
3. In the same panegyric, Venantius Fortunatus comments on the meaning of Hilperic's name, translating it as '*adiutor fortis*' ('strong helper', George 1995: 77-78).

In several other contexts, Venantius Fortunatus refers to the foreign habits of the Germanic-speaking Franks. His assertion that Germanic runes on ash wood are just as well able to convey a written message as a letter on papyrus (*Carmen* 7, 18), is a valuable witness to the Frankish knowledge of the runic alphabet (see Düwel 2001: 203). The anecdote on King Hilperic adding Greek letters to the Latin alphabet, as recounted by Gregory of Tours (*History of the Franks*, book V, c. 44), probably indicates that the Franks were uncomfortable with writing their Frankish names in Latin orthography (Sims-Williams 1992: 30; *contra* Riché 1962: 268-269). Venantius Fortunatus also comments on the Frankish practice of singing songs called *leudos* (cf. OHG *liot* 'song'), distinguishing them from the Latin *versiculos* that he composes (*Epistula* 7.8, to Duke Lupus; George 1995: 69). In sum, the writings of Fortunatus Venantius clearly show that in the late sixth century, almost a century after their settlement in northern Gaul, the Franks were still speaking their Germanic language.

How long the Frankish language was used in Gaul after the sixth century is a moot point in Germanic and Romance linguistics (De Grauwe 2003: 96; Flobert 2002). It seems likely that a Frankish gloss is present in a seventh-century Irish glossary (cf. Herren 2013: 102): "*blinn auga .i. dallsuilech in lingua galleorum*" (*blinn auga* this is 'blind' in the language of the Galloromans). Another reference to the fate of West Frankish may be found in an anecdote recounted by Bede in his 'Ecclesiastical History' (*Eccl.Hist.* XXV). There it is recounted that the Frankish bishop Agilbert, who originally came from northwestern France, let the Anglo-Saxon priest Wilfrid speak for him at the synod of Whitby in 664, because he felt that an Anglo-Saxon could explain things better than he could do through an interpreter (see also Fjaldall 2005: 18-19). Here we could assume that the mutual incomprehensibility between Anglo-Saxon and Frankish was the linguistic hurdle, which Agilbert struggled with. However, it is also possible that Agilbert was hindered by Gallo-Romance as his native language and not so much by Frankish. Since Bede does not explicitly state Agilbert's native language, there is no way to be certain whether the anecdote really refers to West Frankish.

It is my contention that a late testimony to the use of West Frankish in northern Gaul may be present in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, where we find several remarkable Old English forms of French toponyms. Whereas the first compilation of the chronicle was undertaken in the ninth century (ca. 891 CE), the Easter tables on which the compilation was based may

have been considerably older, the practice of adding historical information to Easter tables dating back as far as the seventh century CE (cf. Bately 2003: 16). The entry for the year 659 offers a peculiar linguistic form for the French city of Paris:

“*se Ægelbryght onfeng Persa biscopdomes on Galwalum bi Signe*”

“this Ægelbryght received the see of Paris in France on the river Seine.”

In all other Anglo-Saxon texts, the name for the city of Paris reads *Paris* in Old English which must reflect an Early Old French **Parisās* (Dietz 1993: 504-505). If we take the form *Persa* as a genitive plural in *-a*, it might reflect a genuine Old English ethnonym *Perse** ‘Parisians’. In order to make this scenario work, we have to assume that the Anglo-Saxons adopted the Gallo-Roman name *Parisi* before the Migration Age, early enough to undergo umlaut (see also Wollmann 1990b: 516); they then must have kept the name in this indigenous form until it was recorded in a document that was integrated into the chronicle. We must also assume that at no point was this Anglo-Saxon form replaced by a younger Frankish form. This scenario is doubtful at best, especially since the form *Persa* displays a non-Old English syncope of /i/ after short root syllable (Campbell 1959: 144). Attributing these idiosyncrasies of the Anglo-Saxon name to a West Frankish donor form **Persa* [nom.pl.] < Gallo-Rom. **parisi* < Latin *parisii* (contra Dietz 1993: 505) should at least be considered as a viable alternative.²⁵ We should note that for the more northerly place-names *Gend* ‘Ghent’ (cf. MidDu. *Gent*) and *Bunan* ‘Bologne-sur-Mer’ (cf. MidDu. *Beunen*), which also occur in the chronicle, a Frankish donor form is not in doubt.

This is not the only French place-name in the Anglo-Saxon chronicle that shows an umlauted vowel, which is difficult to understand from an Old English perspective. Under the year 884, the northern French city of Amiens (Latin *Ambianense*) is rendered in Old English with *Embenum* [dat.pl.], presupposing an Old English ethnonym *Embene** ‘inhabitants of Amiens’. As noted by Dietz (1993: 496), the place-name must have been borrowed from Gallo-Romance before the **mbj* > **ndʒ* sound change (cf. Gallo-Rom. **kambjāre* > OFr. *changer* ‘to change’, see section 3.38).²⁶

In my opinion, it is a plausible scenario that also this place-name was borrowed by Old English from West Frankish, rather than being pre-migration Anglo-Saxon heritage. The umlaut of these place-names should then be attributed to West Frankish, which, in the case of Paris, finds support in the continental *Perisii* and *Perisiaca* spellings of the Merovingian period (e.g. *Epitoma Chronicon*, *Vita S. Martini*). Although umlaut in the continental Germanic dialects only phonemicized in the eighth century (Braune-Mitzka 1967: 26), the onset of the

²⁵ The view that the Old English form *Persa* reflects West Frankish was also propounded without further argumentation by George van Driem in his *Languages of the Himalayas* (2001: 183).

²⁶ There is however a distinct possibility that the place-name *Embenum* does not refer to Amiens, but rather to Angiens, a place close to the Norman coast. This possibility is neglected by Nègre (1996: 827) in his *Toponymie générale de la France* in favour of a derivation from a romanized Germanic personal name **Anginus*.

phonetic mutation may already have been there in the seventh century (Buccini 2003: 193-94). Historians and archaeologists have noted that there were close ties between the West Frankish realm of Neustria and the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent in the seventh century (Lohaus 1974). The historian Ian Wood even claimed that the Frankish king Hlothar II (OE *Hlothere*, 584-630 CE) held overlordship by marriage over seventh-century Kent (Wood 1992). In this context, it is very well conceivable that West Frankish place-names were adopted in Anglo-Saxon England. Also, if inherited Anglo-Saxon forms for these Gallo-Roman towns still existed, they surely would have run the risk of being replaced in this context of intensive Kentish – Frankish political relations.

1.10 The Germanic cultural identity of the Franks

The settlement of the Franks in northern Gaul was accompanied by an intrusion of new styles of material culture that have been interpreted by archaeologists in different ways. Whereas early twentieth-century scholarship identified the intrusive styles as ‘Germanic’ and attributed their proliferation to the settlement of Germanic-speaking peoples, scholars working in the ‘immobilism’ paradigm have opted for an internal explanation.

This way, burial practices such as the row-grave cemeteries have been reinterpreted as a mere change of fashion, reflecting the more militarized nature of Gallo-Roman society (MacGeorge 2002: 140-141). However, the fourth-century appearance of grave mounds (*tumuli*) with burial chambers and lavish grave goods is hardly explicable as an internal Gallo-Roman development. Its distinctive non-Christian background is best connected to the intrusion of non-Christian Frankish warrior elites (MacGeorge 2002: 140; Soulat 2007). It is interesting to note that in the last decade, archaeologists have become more confident in linking fifth-century pottery through the chemical analysis of clay types to areas beyond the borders of the Roman Empire, thereby substantiating the hypothesis that ‘Germanic’ immigrants brought parts of their material culture from their home destination to their target destination (cf. Van Thienen 2016).

That being said, it is beyond doubt that the culture of the fifth-century Merovingian Franks contained aspects of a *Mischzivilization* (cf. Böhme 1974) in which ‘Gallo-Roman’ and ‘Germanic’ elements were part of a single but heterogeneous military frontier culture (Esmonde Cleary 2013: 376-86). This much was also clear from the grave of Childeric, that showed a dual orientation, containing elements tying it to the Roman military and to the Germanic cultures of northern Germany.

The most convincing example of an intrusive cultural practice that can reliably be connected to the linguistic identity of Germanic-speaking colonists, is the appearance of runic inscriptions in Merovingian Gaul. Although markings of a runic character are commonly found on Merovingian brooches and sword pommels, there are only six

inscriptions in southern Belgium, Luxembourg and France that can at present be read as Old Futhark runic text monuments. The readings are adopted from Findell (2012), but, as is common in the field of runology, the interpretations are disputed.

1. Arlon silver capsule (ca. 600 CE, prov. Luxembourg, Belgium):
godun : ?ulo : þes : rasuwa mudwoþro??? (see Nedoma 1992: Findell 2012: 368)
2. Chéhéry gold disc fibula (ca. 500 CE, dep. Ardennes, France):
DEOS : DE / E : ditan / sum?? (see Looijenga 2003: 264; Findell 2012: 386)
3. Charnay silver bow fibula (ca. 500 CE, row-gravefield, dep. Saône-et-Loire, France²⁷):
fuparkwhnijþzstbem / upfnþai : id / dan : ?iano / ðia / k rca. (Findell 2021: 383-385)
4. Fréthun sword pommel (ca. 560 CE, dep. Pas-de-Calais, France)
h ? e (see Findell 2012: 397).
5. Ichtratzheim silver spoon (ca. 600 CE, , dep. Bas-Rhin, France):
Matteus lapela abuda (see Fischer e.a. 2013)
6. Saint-Dizier ring sword pommel²⁸ (ca. 525 CE, , dep. Haute-Marne, France):
alu (see Findell 2012: 454)

The Swedish archaeologist Svante Fischer interprets the sixth-century Merovingian revival of runic literacy as an ideological dialogue with the cultures of northern Europe facilitated by the encounter with Latinate types of literacy (Fischer 2005: 161-162). If this is the case, the Merovingian runic monuments may constitute a Merovingian identity marker, which purposefully created a contrast with Christian Gallo-Roman culture. It was this contrast that was eloquently accentuated in Venantius Fortunatus' poem, in which he juxtaposed runic literacy along Latin literacy.

Another area where Frankish customs differed significantly from those of the population of northern Gaul, is the cultivation of a pre-Christian religion. The Frankish King Hlodoweh, after subjugating northern Gaul, abandoned this religion in the early sixth century. The former importance of this religion to the royal house is implied by the Merovingian origin myth that claims supernatural ancestry for Meroweh (Latin *Merovechus*), the eponymous ancestor of the royal dynasty (Chronicle of Pseudo-Fredegar,²⁹ book 3, c. 9). Although the historian Yitzhak Hen (1995) has attempted to deny the intrusion of non-

²⁷ The runic inscription of the Arguel pebble, is of disputed authenticity. Looijenga (2003: 223) considers it a falsification; the sole scholar defending its authenticity is Bizet (1964).

²⁸ The Saint-Dizier sword pommel is part of a seventh-century archaeological complex of runic ring swords which are found all over northern Gaul and in the neighboring Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent (Fischer & Soulat 2010). This distribution lines up with the theory that Merovingian and Kentish elites were intimately connected.

²⁹ It is often overlooked that the name of the supernatural being that sired Meroweh, given as *quinotauri* by the author of Pseudo-Fredegar's chronicle, can be understood as a Merovingian Latin spelling for Greek *Κένταυρος*, e.g. *quinomento* < *cognomento* 'name, designation' in Pseudo-Fredegar's chronicle (cf. Devillers & Meyers 2001: 45). The dominant view among historians (cf. Richter 1994: 20) which regards this *quinotauri* as a bull-shaped entity, a *minotaurus*, is therefore unfounded.

Christian religions in northern Gaul, the contemporary sources are unanimous in their reports of non-Christian customs (see Dumézil 2005: 221). Gregory of Tours greatly elaborates on the conversion of King Hlodoweh in the late fifth century (History of the Franks II, c. 30), and gives several anecdotes in which sixth-century ‘pagans’ play a role, several of which feature the unwillingness of the Merovingian kings to directly intervene in favor of Christianity (Dumézil 2005: 222). This is in line with an anecdote of Procopius, who states that the Franks had only become Christian in name and that the Frankish army of Theodebert that invaded Italy in the year 539 CE sacrificed prisoners of war to their ancestral gods (History of the Wars IV, 35). Also hard to ignore are the Merovingian hagiographies that speak of a seventh-century Christianization of northern Gaul in the wake of the Columban monastic movement (Wood 1994: 312-14). The southern Gallo-Roman bishops Eligius and Amandus are received with much hostility when they start preaching around the Gallo-Roman cities of Noyon, Tournai, and Ghent. Noteworthy is the fact that Eligius is called “*romane*” by a Frankish magnate when he tried to break up a non-Christian festival (Vita Eligii, c. 20). This designation implies that in the seventh century the term ‘*Romanus*’ could be used to make a cultural distinction between a northern Frank and a southern Gallo-Roman.³⁰ Finally, we may consider the recent dissertation by the Dutch archaeologist Martine van Haperen (2017), who has shown that Merovingian Frankish communities in the Low Countries were carefully reopening graves in order to take or add grave goods, which may hint at an observance of ancestor worship.

Some direct but unfortunately very fragmentary information about Frankish pre-Christian religion comes to us in a text, whose linguistic and historical value cannot be overstated. The text in question is the early sixth-century Latin codification of Frankish customary law known as the ‘*Pactus Legis Salicae*’.

1.11 Salic Law in northern Gaul

The ‘*Pactus Legis Salicae*’ or Salic Law is a text from sixth-century Gaul, and contains the earliest codification of Frankish customary law. The Salic Law is preserved in hundreds of manuscript, with only a fraction of these belonging to the Pre-Carolingian period and reflecting Merovingian redactions. In this dissertation, the Salic Law is often used as a source for ancient Germanic lexis or as a referent to Early Romance sound change. Therefore I will offer a short overview of Salic Law in its capacity to provide a window on the language and culture of Migration Age Gaul.

³⁰ It should be stressed here that most of the preceding anecdotes are found within the framework of Christian-Latin discourse that is marked by the imitation of earlier literary examples and avoids giving direct information about non-Christian deities. This means that historians who want to deny the reliability of these reports may easily do so (e.g. Hen 1995).

Frankish customary law was in principle an oral body of law, safeguarded by the wise men (Latin *ragimburgii* < Gm. **ragin-* ‘council’, cf. Kroonen 2013: 401) of the community, who held court on a place that in the sources is called *Malloberg* (WGM. **maþlaberg* ~ **mahlaberg*, cf. MidDu. *maelberg*, *madelstede*, *heimael* ‘law court’, cf. Quak 2008b: 142). As many other law codes in pre-state societies, the focus of Frankish oral law is on arbitration and not on punishment. In the law code, compensation tariffs are provided for conflicts that by custom demand reparation in either wealth or blood.

We may assume that the law text was drafted in the wake of the Frankish infiltration of the Gallo-Roman countryside, which is in line with several provisions that the text contains; these law articles address the protection of migrants (c. 14 *de supervenientes* ‘on hold-ups’) and the procedure on settling in a new community (c. 45 *de migrantibus* ‘on migrants’, see also Seebold 2018: 6-7). In this way, the codification of Frankish customary law may have eased the resolution of legal conflicts with the Gallo-Roman populace, who under the principle of the personality of law, were not bound to the legal customs of the Frankish newcomers³¹ (Drew 1991: 8). Leonard (2012), in his study on identity formation in Early Iceland, has shown that law can become an important basis for social organization in colonial societies (Leonard 2012: 96; see also Tomasson 1980: 12-13), since it both unifies migrants from diverse origins and provides an important feature of self-definition. It seems plausible that this was also the case for Salic Law in the Early Frankish society of northern Gaul.

An obscure reference to the compilation of the law code is given in the short prologue of the Merovingian redactions. There it is recounted that four wise men, Wisogast, Arogast, Salegast and Windogast, living across the Rhine (*ultra Rhenum*), met at three law assemblies in order to discuss the proper judgments for each transgression. The information in this prologue is in all likelihood legendary (cf. Rivers 1986: 5) and has the characteristics of a folk tale, with the names of the law-givers reflecting different characteristics of Frankish life (cf. OHG *wisa* ‘meadow’, OHG *aren* ‘harvest’, OHG *sal* ‘hall’, OHG *wind* ‘wind’). The fact that the origin of the law code is placed ‘*ultra Rhenum*’ implies that the ancient customs of the Franks were associated with territory in the Germanic-speaking north.

When the ‘*Pactus Legis Salicae*’ was exactly issued is unclear but its compilation is usually placed in the late reign of king Hlodoweh, between 507 and 511 CE (Drew 1991: 29; see also Charles-Edwards 2000). There are several reasons for this dating. The epilogue of the earliest redaction (A-redaction) of the ‘*Pactus Legis Salicae*’ ascribes the first 65 law articles to the first king of the Franks. A specific king is not named, but a following list of kings names Theuderic, Hlodoweh’s son, as the first king of the Merovingian realm. Since we know that this was not the case, we may assume that the ascription to the first king is correct, but the

³¹ This principle is explicated in the late sixth-century law code of the Ripuarian Franks, where we find the injunction (c. 35) ‘*ubi natus fuerit, sic respondeat*’, which means “wherever someone is born, he will be judged in the corresponding manner”.

name of the first king is wrong. The law code itself also provides a hint to the relative moment of the first compilation. The ordering suggests a chronological organization with the 65 articles of the *Pactus Legis Salicae* as the earliest text base which is followed by royal decrees issued by Hildebert I and Hlothar I (548-558 CE), by Hilperic I (after 561 CE) and by Hildebert II (594-96 CE). Since all these royal decrees providing additions to the Salic Law belong to the second half of the sixth century, we may assume that the original compilation was issued earlier; the early sixth century, during the reign of king Hlodoweh, would therefore fit nicely.

Another reason to date the compilation of the Salic Law to the reign of King Hlodoweh is found in the contents of the law code, where the Frankish realm is implied to be one continuous region which lies between the *Silva Carbonaria* (the Charbonnière forest in eastern Belgium) and the river Loire (Drew 1991: 242). This means that the first compilation of the *Pactus* must postdate the extension of Frankish rule to the river Loire in 481 CE and predate the division of the realm in 511 after the death of king Hlodoweh. At the same time, the law code also provides legal delays for Franks that were settled beyond the river Loire. Since settlement across the Loire was only possible with the Frankish conquest of Aquitaine after the battle of Vouillé (507 CE), the time window seems to lie between 507 and 511 CE.³²

Another clue to the age of the Salic Law is found in the law articles that describe pre-Christian customs. As was mentioned above, the informative value of these stipulations is unfortunately very limited. Nevertheless, they do provide convincing evidence that the society for which the first compilation of Salic Law was drafted, had not yet abandoned its ancestral religion (Schmidt-Wiegand 1994). In the law code, several law articles hint to the observance of pre-Christian or sub-Christian religious practices. Compensation tariffs are provided for the following cases:

- Engaging in cannibalistic witchcraft (c. 64)
- Destroying devotional buildings on grave monuments³³ (c. 55)
- Stealing sacrificial pigs (c. 2)

The sacrificing of pigs is especially noteworthy because it has a striking parallel in Scandinavian mythology³⁴ (Schmidt-Wiegand 1994: 256-258). Other customs may contain traces of a pre-Christian origin, but can also be interpreted as rituals that were

³² Patrick Wormald dates the drafting of the Salic Law to the year 508 CE, and connects it to the Byzantine recognition of Merovingian rule (Wormald 1973: 129). The theory of Bruno Krusch (1934) that the law code was composed in Aquitaine in the year 507 CE has not found acceptance. Krusch's view was founded on a poorly argued identification of the scribe of the Salic Law as the scribe who drafted Hlodoweh's letter to the bishops of Aquitaine in 507 CE.

³³ The Early Medieval church denounced the belief in witchcraft as superstition, and the Salic Law is the only Early Medieval law code where witchcraft itself features as a legal offense. This strongly argues for a pre-Christian cosmology. The devotional grave monuments are connected in the later redactions of the law code to pre-Christian practice. It should be noted that for these grave monuments no Christian terminology is used (See Seebold 2018: 17-22).

³⁴ In pre-Christian Scandinavia, the Old Norse *sonarblót* was one of the main feasts of the year devoted to the Old Norse god *Freyr* (see North 2015).

accommodated to Christianity and whose former religious meaning was ill-understood. This may be the case for the Frankish wealth rejection ritual called the *chrenecruda* (c. 58, cf. Gm. **hraini grūta* ‘pure sand’) and the oath swearing on weapons instead of on relics (c. 69). It is also noteworthy that law articles providing tariffs for the protection of churches and clergy are absent in the earliest 65-article redaction. These are only provided by the later addition to the law code by Hildebert and Hlothar. All things considered, this seems to indicate that the earliest compilation of Salic Law reflects a society wherein the non-Christian religion of the Franks still played a role, whereas Christianity was not yet pervasive enough to be featured (Charles-Edwards 2000: 272). This is also in line with a dating to the Early Merovingian period in the late fifth, early sixth century.

However, not all evidence points to the early sixth century. Numismatist scholars have argued that the monetary tariffs listed in the law code reflect gold to silver ratios (1 golden solidus is worth 40 silver denarii) of the early fifth century, and are best connected to the unofficial coinage of northern Gaul (Gierson & Blackburn 1986: 105-106). This would mean that the tariffs recorded in the law code predate the compilation by several generations. For this reason, Charles-Edwards (2000: 274) has attributed the first compilation of Salic Law to the reign of king Hilderic (ca. 457 – 481 CE) which is more in line with the numismatist findings.

An alternative theory on the origin of the Salic Law has been formulated by several historians who argue that the Salic Law was originally a penal code for fourth-century Franks living under Roman military authority (Poly 1993; Magnou-Nortier 1997; Dierkens & Perin 2003). This seems highly unlikely, as the law code champions the Franks as the legitimate rulers of Gaul and treats Romans as second-rate citizens.

We may therefore regard a dating of the first compilation of Salic Law to the early sixth century as a well-informed estimate. That the law code existed as written code in the middle of the sixth century is clear from the Merovingian formularies and one piece of evidence from Anglo-Saxon England; it is probable that in the late sixth century the Salic Law functioned as an example for the law code of the Kentish king Æthelberht (reigned from 589 – 616 CE). This is clear from stylistic similarities and the inclusion in the law code of the Frankish word *leode* ‘vassals of the king’, a word that is not used in this sense elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon text monuments (cf. Lohaus 1964: 18).

On a final note, I want to stress that the law text offers a broad outlook on Frankish society, covering issues as diverse as plowing a neighbor’s field, the application of abortive drugs, and the legal liability of warriors in the royal retinue. It should therefore be clear that the Salic Law is a unique source for sixth-century social history.

1.12 Germanic lexis in the Salic Law

Besides being an invaluable source to historians, the Salic Law has long been an object of study for linguists as well. The linguistic value of the *Pactus Legis Salicae* resides in the Early Romance features of the Latin and in the non-Latin glosses that are placed within the Latin text. The non-Latin glosses are known in the scholarly literature as the Malberg glosses, since in the text they are introduced by the word *Mallobergo* ‘on the Malberg’. Among historical linguists, the Malberg glosses have generated great interest since they may very well reflect the vernacular of the early sixth-century Franks. The glosses are found in the following pre-Carolingian manuscript redactions (Eckhardt 1962: XL; see also Seebold 2007: 3-4):

- A-redaction
 - Early Merovingian redaction, issued in the time of King Hlodoweh
- B-redaction
 - only reconstructed on the basis of excerpts in other manuscripts
- C-redaction
 - Merovingian, late sixth century redaction
- D-redaction
 - mid eighth-century compilation of seventh-century example texts
 - This redaction was probably issued by Pippin the Short
- H-manuscript
 - sixteenth-century print edition, whose Merovingian example texts are unclear³⁵

It has been argued that the Malberg glosses go back to lost Merovingian manuscript prototypes in which the words were entered in the margin (cf. Eckhardt 1954: 179; Schmidt-Wiegand 1957: 226). This may explain why some manuscripts (A1, A2) have entered specific glosses in the wrong part of the text, whereas other manuscripts (A3, A4) seem to have them in the correct place.

The inclusion of the glosses in the law code is a unique testament to the oral character of Early Medieval legal culture. This is why the Salic Law states that a request for the administration of justice should be phrased as ‘tell us the Salic custom’ (*dicite nobis legem salicam*, c. 57). Nevertheless, somewhere in the tradition of the earliest manuscripts, the meaning of the glosses became obscure. The continued copying of the manuscripts by Romance speaking scribes who did not understand the legal jargon of the Franks corrupted the glosses further. It is telling that the scribe of the A3 manuscript, while copying a Merovingian redaction, thinks that the glosses are Greek and chooses to omit them at certain places (MGH LL Rer.Nat.Germ. IV 1: 15).

³⁵ Eckhardt assumes that H is dependent on lost C manuscripts and K manuscripts but also incorporated elements from the B-redaction (Eckhardt 1962: XXVIII).

In the early nineteenth century, the linguistic identity of the glosses was still unsure, with Jacob Grimm (Merkel 1850) defending a Germanic background and Heinrich Leo (1842) arguing for an Old Celtic legal language. From the 1880s onwards, it has become clear that a significant part of the glosses is indeed understandable from a Germanic perspective (Kern 1880; Van Helten 1900). Since then, scholarship has gravitated to an almost exclusively Germanic interpretation. In the mid-twentieth century, however, the romanist Jungandreas (1954) made a convincing case that Early Romance played a larger role in the language of the glosses than had thus far been assumed. He argued that some glosses were Germanic loanwords in Gallo-Romance, instead of directly representing sixth-century West Frankish with a Latinate ending. These findings have been noted by later scholars, but generated little following: the legal historian Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand (1967, 1969, 1989), who dedicated numerous studies to the glosses of the Salic Law, mainly focuses on the Germanic side of the interpretation, and leaves issues of Romance historical phonology largely out of consideration. The studies of Arend Quak (e.g. Quak 1983) and Elmar Seebold (e.g. Seebold 2017) represent the same line of approach and rarely venture outside the realm of Old Germanic linguistics.

One of the views of Schmidt-Wiegand that has been widely accepted (cf. Modzelewski 2006: 86) is her insistence that different Germanic dialects are represented in the glosses. In this way, Schmidt-Wiegand explains the two alternate spellings of the Malberg gloss *reipus* ‘ring-money’ (cf. OHG *reif* ‘ring, band’):

- Gm. **raip-* > Low Frankish **rēp-* → Malberg *repus*
- Gm. **raip-* > Rhine Frankish **reip-* → Malberg *reipus*

Also the different reflexes of Germanic **wr-* are adduced as evidence for dialect mixture in the glosses, with *waranio* ‘stallion’ < Gm. **wrain-* (cf. MidDu. *wrene* ‘id.’) as the Low Frankish reflex and *redunia* ‘lead sow’ < **wreþu-* (cf. Goth. *wreþus* ‘herd’) as the Rhine Frankish reflex. It should be noted, though, that every linguistic analysis of the glosses is in the first place dependent on a correct etymology; these supposed dialectal differences are rarely found in the same word, Malberg *repus* being the sole exception. This makes the case for dialectal differences in the gloss material perhaps a bit more tenuous than most scholars would admit. More convincing is Schmidt-Wiegand’s argument that the language of the Salic Law is tied to the Frankish Rhineland. This supposition is supported by the Malberg gloss *galtia* ‘female piglet’ and the Latinate word *duropellus*. These lexical items correspond to Germanic words that are only preserved in the Frankish dialects of the Lower and Middle Rhine region:

- Rhine Frankish *Gelte, Gelze*, MidDu. *gelte* ‘castrated sow’
- Rhine Frankish *Dürpel*, MidDu. *dorpel* ‘threshold’

The presence of a Low Frankish element in the Salic Law is defended by Quak’s (2008), who argued that the Malberg glosses contain North Sea Germanic traits such as the use of the

Germanic prefix **ā-* in <afrio> and <atomeo>. Another North Sea Germanic trait would be the /*ǣ*/ vowel that might be present in the gloss <leto>/<lito> for Old Frankish **lǣt-* ‘freed-man’ (see ONW s.v. *lāt*). Also the occurrence of the Malberg gloss <leudardi>, which can only be connected to Old Frisian *liodwerdene* ‘personal injury’, seems to point in the direction of the North Sea coast (see Von Olberg 1981: 102).

That the Malberg glosses preserve Germanic lexical material of considerable antiquity is beyond doubt. As an example may serve the Malberg gloss *scimada*, found in a law article on the theft of goats, which has a convincing counterpart in Old Norse *skimuðr* ‘goat’. This word is only found in Old Norse, and even there it is an archaic word. It occurs only once in Finnur Jónsson’s *Lexicon Poeticum* and is never found in prose texts (see Quak 2008a: 474). The archaic nature of the Old Frankish language of the Salic Law need not surprise us, since the Malberg glosses predate the production of most text monuments in Old English and Old High German by almost 250 years.

1.13 The survival of Gaulish

Another piece of the linguistic puzzle of Migration Age Gaul that is hard to fit in place, is the role that Gaulish may have played. The death of the continental Celtic language known as Gaulish has been the subject of speculation for Romanists and Celtologists alike. Romanist scholars were especially occupied by the amount of Gaulish loanwords that survived in the French dialects, estimates going from 200 on the lower end up to 600 at the higher end (cf. Flobert 2002). Also the Gaulish layer in Late Latin has received renewed attention (cf. Adams 2007: 276-368). In the end, however, the scholarly narrative has stayed consistent: a Gaulish substratum, especially evident from the loanwords,³⁶ will have colored the regional Latin of Roman Gaul, but Gaulish speaking Gallo-Romans will have shifted quickly to Late Latin in the wake of the cultural Romanization of the first and second century CE. According to Blom, we should therefore be skeptical of historical commentaries that speak of a *lingua gallica* or *lingua celtica* in the Late Roman Empire (cf. Blom 2009).

It may be clear that this sociolinguistic narrative is strongly biased by the general historical narrative of the swift and thorough Romanization of Roman Gaul. I contend that this has led scholars to ignore some convincing pieces of evidence that argue for a late yet marginal survival of Gaulish in the fifth and sixth centuries. This late survival would make Gaulish a relevant factor for this dissertation, and therefore deserves some comments. Below,

³⁶ I would like to express my gratitude to my former student Veerle Verhagen, who did a case-study on non-Romance lexis in a sixth-century treaty on health and nutrition written by the physician Anthimus, a text that was intended for the Frankish king Theuderic (*De Observatione Ciborum*). She found that almost all fish, that were mentioned as native in Theuderic’s regions, had Gaulish names.

I will give a concise overview of the evidence that makes a sixth-century survival of Gaulish plausible.

We may start with the epigraphic record where we find four Gaulish inscriptions that belong to the late third and early fourth century CE.

1. the lead tablet inscription of Rom Deux-Sèvres
2. the vase inscription of Bourges
3. the lead tablet inscription of Châteaubleau
4. the gold tablet inscription of Baudecet

The inscription of Rom (Deux-Sèvres) is the most controversial of these, since the Gaulish nature of the text is disputed. A Celtic interpretation has been given by Haas (1959), but it has failed to find support among scholars. In order to arrive at his interpretation, Haas reconstructs a Gaulish that differs greatly from the actually attested text. A Vulgar Latin interpretation has been given by Egger (1962), who argued that words like *oraumo* and *priiaumo* are best understood as Vulgar Latin verbal forms corresponding to Latin *orāvimus* and *precāvimus*. Despite the apparent similarity between the Latin words and the forms found on the Rom tablet, this interpretation is also problematic. In Gallo-Romance, the final /s/ of the 1st pl. desinence is preserved as is clear from Old French *priiens* ‘we have requested’ < Latin *precāvimus*, and loss of /k/ between front vowels is generally attributed to a later period than the late third century (see section 3.31). Blom (2009) has recently argued that the phonotactics of the letter combinations suggests that there is a sizeable Gaulish element in the inscription. Although this does not prove that the entire text is in Gaulish, Blom shows that the recurrence of certain function words which have plausible Celtic etymologies, makes a Gaulish template very likely.

The vase inscription of Bourges is dated to the early fourth century, and its Gaulish character is undisputed. Because of the formulaic nature of the text, its interpretation has been relatively secure since the 1920 reading by Dottin: *buscilla sosio legasit in Alixie magalu* is easily understood as ‘Buscilla placed this for Magalos in Alisia’. The Bourges inscription would thus be the youngest text monument documenting the use of the Gaulish vernacular in Late Antique Gaul.

The following two inscriptions were discovered relatively recently and constituted the first evidence that Gaulish epigraphy was not limited to central and southern Gaul. The Baudecet gold tablet was excavated in 1993 near the city of Namurs (Piso 1993; Schrijver 2004), and contains a text dated on paleographic grounds to the late second or early third century. The text on the tablet is interpreted by Schrijver (2004) as a medical enchantment. The Châteaubleau inscription was excavated in 1998 in the vicinity of Paris and consists of a lead tablet inscribed with a long and obscure text. The tablet in all likelihood belongs to the late third to early fourth century (Schrijver 1998-2000: 135). Whereas the Gaulish character

of the first text has been disputed (see Plumier-Torfs e.a. 1993), the Châteaubleau inscription is without a doubt written in a form of continental Celtic (Mees 2011). Both texts are important testimonies to the survival of a continental Celtic variety in the north of Gaul up to at least the third century CE.

1.14 Fifth-century Gaulish

The evidence for the survival of Gaulish in the later fourth and fifth century is less direct and its interpretation is fraught with difficulties. The references in Latin texts to a *lingua Gallica* and *lingua Celtica* are problematic, since this seemingly straightforward designation is also used for rural varieties of Late Latin (see Schmidt 1983; Blom 2009). More useful are a couple of fourth- and fifth-century texts that contain quotations of Gaulish sentences and lexical material. Unfortunately, their informative value as to the survival of Gaulish is not straightforward:

1. the Gaulish incantations of Marcellus of Bordeaux's fifth-century *De Medicamentis*
2. the possibly fifth-century prototype of *De nominibus Gallicis* (Endlicher's Glossary)
3. the Gaulish sentence of the fifth-century *Vita Symphoriani*

The first example is the fifth-century medical handbook '*De Medicamentis*' by Marcellus of Bordeaux, which contains two Gaulish incantations. Of the two incantations, the remedy against an eye ailment is the best understood: *in mon derco marcos axat ison* "may Marcos take away that which is in my eye" (Lambert 1994: 178). This sentence does not convincingly prove that Gaulish was still spoken and understood. It only shows that in fifth-century Gallo-Roman folk belief, incantations in Gaulish were used.

The second example is the ninth-century glossary *De nominibus Gallicis*, which is better known as Endlicher's Glossary. The glossary correctly translates multiple Gaulish lexical items; some toponymic elements of Gallo-Roman localities (e.g. *Trinante* [i.e.] *tres valles*), but also some independent words (e.g. *prenne* [i.e.] *arborem grandem*). It is generally assumed that the surviving copy of Endlicher's Glossary goes back to a fifth-century original. Blom (2011) has shown that since we are dealing with a list of collected glosses (*glossae collecta*) that were taken from Late Latin texts, younger redactors may have added material.³⁷ This implies that if the prototype for Endlicher's Glossary dates back to the fifth century, it does also not automatically prove the survival of Gaulish.

The final testimony is in my opinion the most convincing one, and is found in a fifth-century hagiography (*Vita Symphoriani*) about the second-century Gallo-Roman saint

³⁷ Several glosses show traces of being interpreted by a Germanic-speaking scribe. In this way, the place-name Lugdunum is interpreted as '*montem desideratum*' which probably reflects Germanic **luf-dun* 'love fort' and the Gaulish word *caio* is translated with the Germanic word *bigardio* 'enclosure' (see Blom 2011).

Symphorianus (see Meyer 1901). In the Latin text, we find a non-Latin sentence introduced by the phrase *'in voce Gallica'*. This sentence is followed by a translation into Latin: *nate, nate, mentobe to diuo, hoc est, memorare di tui* 'son, son, remember your god'. The interpretation of the language of the quotation is ambiguous, with *natus* and *divus* also occurring in Latin, but a strong case can be made that the entire sentence is in Gaulish (cf. Thurneysen 1923; *contra* Adams 2007: 202-03). Since the textual prototype of the saint's life is dated to the fifth century, the quotation and correct translation of the sentence would show that Gaulish was still understood in fifth-century Gaul.

Moreover, the case for a fifth-century survival of Gaulish is convincingly defended by Meissner in a 2009 article. He argues that two important sources that have bearing on the linguistic situation around fourth- and fifth-century Trier strengthen the case for a survival of Gaulish there. The first source is the well-known and heavily disputed comment of the Bible translator Hieronymus, who stated that the Galatians speak the same language as the inhabitants of Trier (*Comment. in. Gall. Migne* 36, 382). It has been doubted whether this statement really belongs to the fourth century (see Schmidt 1983); some scholars say that Hieronymus may just have repeated information from a lost work of the second-century author Poseidonios. Meissner (2009: 108-109) argues that this skepticism is unfounded and prejudiced.³⁸ He proposes to combine the Hieronymus comment with the linguistic implications of the combination of two personal names on a fifth-, possibly sixth-century epitaph that was excavated in the vicinity of Trier (CIL XIII, 3909, see also Krämer 1974). In this inscription, a mother named *Artula* commemorates her deceased daughter, who is called *Ursula*. It was noted by Weisgerber (1935) already, that the Latin name of the daughter is a translation of the name of the mother (Gaul. **artola* cf. Gaul. **artos*, OIr. *art* 'bear', MW *arth* 'id.'). Meissner argues that this cannot be coincidence. He states that we may take the 'she-bear' naming motive as evidence that Gaulish was understood in the fifth century. If Meissner is correct, it would lend greater credibility to the fourth-century comment of Hieronymus and makes the case for a late survival of Gaulish around Trier that much more solid.

As we enter the sixth century, we find several references to Gaulish as a spoken language in the works of Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus. Gregory of Tours refers to a temple in the Auvergne known *'in lingua Gallica'* as *Vasso Calate* (History of the Franks, book I, c. 31). The name *Vasso galate* is a genuine Gaulish epithet for the god Mercury, as is clear from the Bitburg inscription *deo mercu Vasso Caleti* from the German Rhineland. However, Gregory of Tours could be using the designation *lingua gallica* as a characterization for 'local speech'. He provided the same designation for the non-Gaulish word *cimiterium*

³⁸ Hieronymus is known to have lived in Trier around the year 367 CE and he was greatly interested in linguistic matters. It is unlikely that he would have repeated information about the linguistic situation in Trier that he knew to be untrue. Furthermore, Poseidonios lived in the south of Gaul, and there is no reason why he would not compare the language of the Galatians to the Gaulish of his own regions, instead of the Gaulish of far-away Trier.

‘cemetery’ (*Liber in Gloria Confessorum*, c. 72), whereas the Gaulish word *olca* ‘untilled land’ (PCelt. **φolka*, cf. Matasović 2009: 136) is not marked with this phrase.³⁹ This means that the linguistic implications of the designation *lingua Gallica* in Gregory of Tours are insecure. Venantius Fortunatus used the designation *lingua Gallica* in a poem on the basilica of St. Vincent. There he translates the Gaulish word *vernemetis* (PCelt. **uφer nemete* ‘great sanctuary’) as *fanum ingens*. We should however realize that knowledge of the meaning of Gaulish place-names does not prove the survival of spoken Gaulish. Venantius Fortunatus may just have well learned the meaning of the Gaulish place-name from a written source or local legends. Regrettably, the conclusion must be that all the sixth-century written references to the survival of Gaulish are insecure.

1.15 Gaulish in the Swiss Alps and Brittany

Whereas the textual evidence regarding the late survival of Gaulish is at many points inconclusive, the linguistic evidence sheds a different light on the matter. Not many historians know that linguists have argued for a relatively long persistence of Gaulish in Late Antique and Early Medieval Gaul. In 1938, Johannes Hubschmied argued that in the Swiss Alps, Gaulish may have survived for quite some time. One of his main arguments concerned the toponymic evidence that the Alamans who settled in the Swiss Alps in the fifth century encountered meaningful Gaulish designations for cities, forests, rivers and mountains. This way, a Gaulish place-name *Pennelocos* (**penne-lok*^w*os* ‘head of the lake’) recorded in the third-century *‘Itinerarium Antonii’* was known in Medieval Latin as *Caput lacu* and in Medieval German as *Hauptsee*. Another intriguing clue to Gaulish – Germanic language contact is found in the Swiss German word *Tobwelde* < **duba-waldi*, which is glossed in a thirteenth-century diploma as *silvas nigras* ‘black forests’. Since the first element must be identified as Gaulish **dubo* ‘black’ (see Delamarre 2003: 152-153) and the word underwent the Old High German sound shift, the borrowing must date back to the fifth or sixth century. Also the triple designation of a valley with the names *Inderlappen* (Gaulish **inder lok*^w*as*), *Inter Lacos* and *Untersewen* (Modern *Interlaken*) can be interpreted as a double Romance-Germanic translation of a Gaulish place-name. Hubschmied took the High Medieval attestations of Celtic toponyms in the Swiss Alps as evidence that the Gaulish language survived until the twelfth century. Other romanists have rightly argued that this severely exaggerates the bearing of the evidence (Weisgerber 1969: 167; Zinsli 1982: 25; see also Grezga 2007: 20). It therefore seems prudent to stay with the limited conclusion that Hubschmied’s data allows: the transfer of Gaulish lexis and toponyms into Alamannic German, suggest that, during the Alamannic settlement of the fifth and sixth-century, Gaulish may still have been alive (Sofer 1941; Fleuriot 1978: 77; Schmitt 1997: 816).

³⁹ This might be because Gregory considers it to be a common Gallo-Roman word (cf. OFr. *ouche* ‘arable land’, FEW VII: 339).

Geostatistic analyses of Gaulish substratum words in Gallo-Romance, made possible by the data collected in the FEW (*Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*), support the scenario of a relatively protracted survival of Gaulish in the Swiss Alps. These substratum words are mainly found in the semantic domains of agricultural terminology and local flora and fauna (cf. Schmitt 1997). Müller (1982) mapped the occurrence of Gaulish substratum words in the Gallo-Romance dialects and found the densest concentration of Gaulish lexis in the Jura and the Swiss Alps. The same study shows that in the regions of the Central Massif (Auvergne, Rouergue, northern Languedoc), similar concentrations of Gaulish substratum words are found. This lends credibility to the idea that Gregory of Tours could still have encountered Gaulish speakers in the sixth-century Auvergne.

A complex question is the fate of Gaulish in the western extremity of Gaul. It has been argued by Fleuriot (1982: 77), that the British colonists, who settled on the Armorican peninsula in the fifth century, may still have encountered Gaulish speakers. Falc'hun (1951, 1962, 1963) even argued that there is a Gaulish-Breton mixed idiom reflected in the Breton Vannetais dialect.⁴⁰ Fleuriot's argument was repeated by Gvozdanović (2009: 157-61), who argues that the fifth-century speakers of continental Celtic with whom the Britons came into contact were Veneti.

Although, in my opinion, it is plausible that in remote and inaccessible areas of Gaul the Gaulish language may have survived until the Migration Age, it should be noted that there is very little uncontroversial evidence corroborating its survival in Brittany (cf. Weisgerber 1969: 38). It is exactly this kind of evidence that the mapping of substratum words from the FEW does provide for the cases of central Gaul and the Swiss Alps.

Naturally, we should realize that concentrations of surviving substratum words only inform us about the areas where Gaulish may have survived the longest. They do not give us any clue as to when Gaulish as a substratum language ceased to be spoken. All things considered, we may tentatively argue that, at least into the sixth century CE, pockets of Gaulish-speaking communities survived in the mountainous regions of the Central Massif, the Jura and the Swiss Alps. This means that in some regions there may not only have been contact between Late Latin and West Frankish, but also between Late Latin and Late Gaulish, and possibly even between Gaulish and West Frankish.

⁴⁰ Falc'hun's argument (1963: 431-32) that the nineteenth-century Breton-French language border is better explained as a withdrawal line of continental Celtic rather than as the furthest expansion line of Breton, is intriguing yet unconvincing. The fact that Nantes and Rennes and their surrounding countryside were French-speaking in the nineteenth century does not necessarily reflect the inherited situation from Roman times. I am grateful to my former student Adriaan van Doorn for exploring the literature on this subject.

1.16 Late Gaulish sound changes

Now that the Romanist case for a late survival of Gaulish has been defended, we should take note of the linguistic features that have been attributed to the Late Gaulish language. Whereas several idiosyncrasies of Gaulish lexical material have been interpreted as dialectal developments (see Billy 2007), several others have been interpreted as reflecting a difference in chronology. The following developments are relatively certain sound changes that would have occurred in a late stage of Gaulish:

1. Gaulish **sr-* > Late Gaulish **fr-* (cf. Meid 1960; Fleuriot 1974; Schrijver 1995: 441)
2. Gaulish **m* > Late Gaulish **μ* (cf. Fleuriot 1974: 82-83; Schrijver 1995: 463; Billy 2007: 133)
3. Gaulish **wr-* > Late Gaulish **br-* (cf. Fleuriot 1978: 81;)
4. Gaulish **nn* > Late Gaulish **nd* (cf. Fleuriot 1964: 82)

The first development is the sound change of earlier Celtic /*sr/* to later Gaulish /*fr/* which runs parallel to the /*sr/* > /*fr/* development in British Celtic. This development is implied by the following Romance words (see Fleuriot 1978: 81).

- Old French *frogne* ‘nose’ < Gaulish **frogna* < PCelt. **srogna*
- Old French *fringue* ‘jump’ < Gaulish **fringa* < PCelt. **springa*⁴¹
- Arabeto *fruda* ‘brook’ < Gaulish **frota* < PCelt. **sruta*
- Lombardo *froda* ‘brook’

Although the parallel between Gaulish and Brittonic is striking, it is unclear whether this sound change can be regarded as a common innovation.

The second development is the sound change of earlier Celtic /*m/* to later Gaulish /*μ/*. This sound change is also found in British Celtic, where PCelt. /*m/* is lenited to /*μ/* in all voiced environments.⁴²

- PCelt. **samo-* > MW *haf* ‘summer’
- PCelt. **anman-* > MW *enw* ‘name’.

The first to argue that Late Gaulish underwent the same sound shift was Dottin in his 1920 monograph ‘*La langue gauloise*’, soon followed by Hubschmied in his 1938 article on Late Gaulish in the Swiss Alps. They point to the alternation of <*m*> and <*u*> in the Gaulish theonym *Bormo* and *Borvo* (cf. ModFr. *Bourbon*) and the Gaulish words *curmi* ‘beer’ and *cervisia* ‘id.’

⁴¹ See Fleuriot (1978: 81) and FEW (III: 804-05). The example of OFr. *fringue* is controversial because generally no Celtic etymon **spring-* going back to PIE **spreng^h-* is reconstructed (see Kroonen 2013: 470). Fleuriot regards Breton *springal* ‘to jump’ as an inherited lexeme from Proto-Celtic, although a borrowing from French is just as likely.

⁴² Schrijver argues that the Brittonic sound change must have happened at a late stage (ca. 6th c. CE), since Lat. *monumenta* is affected (cf. British Latin *monimenta* > MW *mynwent*, Schrijver 1995: 463).

(Dottin 1920: 62; Delamarre 2003: 133). Nevertheless, only a few cases of a Gaulish /m/ > /μ/ shift are generally accepted (cf. Koch 1992; Schrijver 1995: 463):

- Larzac Tablet *anuana* < Gaul. **an̥uana* 'names'
- Latin (Plinius) *acaunamargus*⁴³ < Gaul. **ak̥ano-* 'marl'

Also the identification of the Gaulish personal name *Riouarus* with *Riomarus* may be adduced as evidence in favor of the shift (Gray 1944: 223-230). Billy (2007: 133-34) argued that a Gaulish /m/ > /μ/ shift is reflected in French dialect words that show /b/ for etymological /m/ (e.g. OFr. *mesgue* 'whey' ~ Central France *begot*, *begaud* 'id.' < Gaul. **mezgo-*, FEW 6/2; 43). Still, most scholars have explained these cases differently and consider the development of the /b/ reflex as a young phenomenon.⁴⁴ Despite the skeptical position of many Celtologists, the evidence in favor of a Late Gaulish /m/ > /μ/ shift seems to be increasing (cf. Ellis-Evans 1967: 409; Fleuriot 1974: 82-83). The romanist Kramer, who studied the Gallo-Roman words *mascauda* and *bascauda*⁴⁵ 'luxurious kitchenware' in Late Antique papyri, concluded that the initial alternation between /m/ and /b/ can only be sensibly explained by lenition induced allophony in the Gaulish donor language (Kramer 2011: 193).⁴⁶ Summing up, it may be stated that the evidence for a Late Gaulish /m/ > /μ/ shift is solid enough to warrant a place in this list.

Related to the question of Gaulish lenition is the /wr/ > /br/ change in initial position, found in several Gaulish words attested in Gallo-Latin context and a Gallo-Roman place-name. A Gaulish lenition of /br/ to /βr/ would make the merger with /wr/ easier to understand.

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Gallo-Latin <i>brigantes</i> (gloss) | < Gaulish * <i>wrigantes</i> | 'worms' |
| Gallo-Latin <i>brucus</i> (gloss) | < Gaulish * <i>wroikos</i> | 'heather' |
| Gallo-Latin <i>branca</i> (loanword) | < Gaulish * <i>wranka</i> | 'branch' |
| Old French <i>Brumad</i> (place-name) | < Gaulish * <i>wrocomagatos</i> | 'Brumath' |

The change must be placed at a late date, as acknowledged by Fleuriot (1978), Lambert (1997), and Delamarre (2003). Whereas Fleuriot regards it as a genuine Late Gaulish sound change (Fleuriot 1978: 81; cf. Loth 1920: 121), Lambert (1997: 401-02) argues that it represents a Vulgar Latin sound substitution of Gaulish *wr- by Vulgar Latin br- = West Romance /βr/. According

⁴³ This etymon is also reflected in place-names like *Acaunum*.

⁴⁴ Many examples concern Romance etyma where the /b/ for /m/ reflex can be explained as a dissimilation process triggered by an /m/ further on in the word (cf. Lat. *minimare* > Cahors *bermé* 'to lessen'). A similar irregular interchange between /m/ and /b/ is found in West Flemish Dutch, where it is also regarded as a young phenomenon (Beele 1984: 24).

⁴⁵ We should note that the Gaulish word is continued in Old French as *bascho(u)e* 'wooden pot' and in Moselland German as *Bäschoff* 'Gefäß in dem die Trauben zur Fahrbrütte tragen werden' (cf. Kleiber 1975).

⁴⁶ Since Kramer seems to be unaware of the controversy regarding the Gaulish participation in the sound shift, we may assume that his judgment is relatively unbiased.

to Lambert, the continued occurrence of the sequence <vr> and <vl> in Late Gallo-Latin epigraphy would show that Late Gaulish retained the value /wr/ ~ /wl/. This, however, is open to question, since it is very well conceivable that the epigraphic tradition held on to an older spelling tradition (see chapter 2).

The last development is the sound change of earlier Celtic **nm* to later Gaulish **nd* (cf. Wartburg FEW 25: 181). This sound shift is reflected in three Old French words and two place-names (see also Weisgerber 1931: 186).

- OFr. *arpent* < Gaulish *arepennis* ‘land measure’ (cf. FEW 25: 180)
- OFr. *talevande* < Gaulish **talupennis* ‘land measure’ (cf. FEW 13: 67)
- OFr. *auvent* < Gaulish *andebanno-* ‘scaffolding’ (cf. FEW 24: 545)
- ModFr. *Gironde* < Gaulish *Garunna*
- ModFr. *Ingrande* < Gaulish *Icoranna*

Wartburg argues that the Old French final sequence /nt/ is only explicable as a reflection of an older /nd/, an ancestral form reflected in Medieval Latin forms such as *arripendum* (9th c.). Perhaps the same sound change is reflected in the case of Gaulish *mannus* ‘Gaulish horse’ (5th c. Consentius, cf. OCast. *mañero* ‘barren animal’, Bearnais *mano* ‘id.’) that is reflected in Basque with /nd/ (e.g. Basque *mando* ‘barren animal’, cf. Weisgerber 1931: 186).

Difficult to judge are some of the idiosyncrasies in the lexical items of Endlicher’s Glossary. Lambert (1994: 204) has argued that the forms *breialo* (glossing *caio*) and *treide* (glossing *pedem*) from earlier Celtic **brogilos* and **trogetos* might imply a sound shift /oi/ > /ei/. In the case of *breialo* (cf. OFr. *brueil* ‘enclosure of woodland’ < **brogilo-*), a vowel shift in the first syllable is possible. In the case of *treide* however, it is unclear whether the word exhibits a sound shift from earlier **oi*. It seems more likely that the form *treide* is connected to Proto-Celtic **treget*, a reconstruction which is supported by the comparison to Old Irish *traig* < PCelt. **treget* (cf. Matasović 2009: 389). It should be noted that further evidence in favor of a Late Gaulish /oi/ > /ei/ sound shift is lacking.

Another theory that concerns Late Gaulish vowels has been proposed by Schrijver (2004, 2014), who argued on the basis of the late Gaulish tablet inscriptions (Châteaubateau, Baudecet) for a Gaulish diphthongization of /ō/ > /uo/ and /ē/ > /ei/. The empirical basis for this intriguing theory is of course dependent on the correct etymologies of the words in the relevant inscriptions. Since the interpretation of the inscriptions is as of yet far from certain, the basis for the theory remains insecure. According to Schrijver, this Gaulish diphthongization, by way of language shift, may have triggered the onset of Romance primary diphthongization. For this reason, we will revisit the theory later on in the discussion of the relative chronology of Gallo-Romance sound laws (see section 3.8, 3.40).

The question whether Late Gaulish underwent lenition of the stops has interested scholars for a long time. As we have seen, phonetic lenition did affect the Gaulish /m/ in

voiced environments and a similar weakening happened in the case of intervocalic /s/.⁴⁷ Of course these phenomena do not prove that the Gaulish stop system underwent lenition as well. Scholars like Gray (1944) and Tovar (1948) have sought evidence for Gaulish lenition in the onomastic material from the epigraphic record. In Gallo-Roman epigraphy, Gaulish names with etymological voiceless stops are often written with a voiced stop in Latin alphabet, e.g. PN *Veriucus* ~ *Veriugus*. Ellis-Evans (1967: 403), following studies by Watkins (1955) and Whatmough (1963), has interpreted this phenomenon differently, and argued that the voiced spellings for Gaulish voiceless stops may have been caused by a different phonological contrast in Gaulish and Latin. Since Latin had a voicing contrast and Gaulish may have had a tenseness contrast, speakers of Latin may have interpreted Gaulish lax /p/ as Latin voiced /b/. If this theory is correct, the voiced spellings for Gaulish voiceless stops would not reflect lenition but Latin sound substitution. Moreover, in the Late Roman period, the onset of Romance lenition caused orthographic confusion in the spelling of the Latin stop series; this may also explain some of the voiced spellings for Gaulish voiceless stops. Suffice it to say that the question of whether Gaulish stops underwent lenition remains disputed.

Most of the above listed features of Late Gaulish cannot be attributed to a specific chronological time window. There is however one linguistic feature that unambiguously provides evidence for a late survival of Gaulish. This evidence consists of a stratum of Gaulish etyma starting with *w- that are continued in the modern Gallo-Romance dialects with /g^w/ (cf. Fleuriot 1978: 80). This substitution contrasts with an earlier stratum where Gaulish *w- joins Latin /w/ = <v>, cf. Gaulish **wassos* > Latin *vassus* [wassus] → OFr. *vassal* ‘servant’.

1. Gaul. **wabero-* (OProv. *waur* ‘ravine’, cf. *silva wavera* 9th c. Belgium, cf. FEW 14: 92-93)
2. Gaul. **worra-* (Occitan *goura*, Bonneville *vouré* ‘meadow’, cf. FEW 14: 632)
3. Gaul. **werna-* (ODauph. *verne*, Grenoble *garne* ‘elder tree’, cf. FEW 14: 299-302)
4. Gaul. **wadana-* (cf. MFr. *gasne* ‘pond’, cf. FEW 14: 111-112)

It is clear that these Gaulish words, instead of joining the Latin *w- > Gallo-Romance *v- sound shift, show the same sound substitution /w/ → /g^w/ as the Germanic loanwords in *w- (cf. Gm. **wardojan-* > OFr. *garder* ‘to watch’, see section 4.11). The sound substitution of the Germanic loanwords shows us that at the time the Germanic words entered Romance, the Latin /w/ had already shifted, first to Romance /β/ (ca. 300 CE, cf. Richter 1934: 47), then to Gallo-Romance /v/ (ca. 500 CE, cf. Richter 1934: 60-61, 117). This implies that the Gaulish language survived the Romance sound shift, so that Gaulish words with initial *w- were adopted into Gallo-Romance at roughly the same time as the Germanic loanwords. According to Richter’s relative chronology, the borrowing must have happened after 300 CE because before that time Latin still possessed a /w/ (l.c.).

⁴⁷ This development is implied by the Gaulish lexis in the late inscriptions, where intervocalic /s/ seems to have been lost, e.g. *suirebe* < PCelt. **suesorebe*, *regenia* < **regenesa*, *sioxti* < **sesogti* and *siaxsiou* < **sesaqsiū* (Schrijver 1998, 2000: 137).

1.17 The Franks and the Gallo-Romans

As has been made clear in the discussions above, our source material does not allow concrete judgments on the use of Gaulish in the Migration Age. Much of the language contact of the period is clouded in the mists of history, with only the encounter between Frankish and Gallo-Romance featuring in the comments of the contemporaries. From the perspective of the Franks, the linguistic diversity amongst the Gallo-Roman populace will probably not have mattered anyway. In the Salic Law there is only one word for the Gallo-Romans, which is *Romani*. In the Malberg glosses of the *Pactus Legis Salicae* these *Romani* are called *Walaleodi* (*De homicidiis ingenuorum*, cf. 41), which reflects a vernacular Gm. **walha liodi* ‘foreign people’ (cf. OHG *walah* ‘foreign’). We may assume that this term referred to all Gallo-Romans, irrespective of the language they spoke.

Nevertheless, Gallo-Roman culture with its Gaulish and Roman heritage was quickly adopted by the Frankish newcomers. One of the most conspicuous traces of this phenomenon is the occurrence of hybrid name-giving, where Gaulish and Germanic onomastic elements were combined. This way, the Frankish royal name *Dagoberht* (Latin *Dagobertus*) combines the Gaulish element **dago-* ‘good’ (cf. OIr. *dag*, MW *da* ‘id.’, see Ellis-Evans 1967: 188) with the Germanic **berht-* ‘shining’. This trend of name-giving is more widely reflected in the Romance–Germanic hybrid names, e.g. *Bellichildis* < Romance **bella-* ‘pretty’ + Germanic **hildi* ‘female warrior’ (see Haubrichs 2004; Kremer 2008; Jochum-Godglück 2014). It seems likely that this kind of name-giving could only arise when Frankish elites integrated into the local communities of the Gallo-Roman countryside. In this regard, we may note that the name *Dagobert* is only found from the seventh century onwards, more than a hundred years after the settlement of the Franks in northern Gaul.

Another trace of the Frankish adoption of Gallo-Romance culture is found in the Frankish origin myth. This myth is recounted in the seventh-century chronicle of Pseudo-Fredegar, and features the classical story of the diaspora following the fall of Troy. Many historians have interpreted this story as a learned invention that was inserted by writers that were well-versed in classical texts, in order to provide the Franks with a classical past (cf. Ewig 1998; Wood 2006; Kearns 2002).⁴⁸ The philologists Panzer (1954) and Hommel (1956) have shown that this interpretation is incomplete, since the Trojan origin story may very well consist of a genuine folk tale that shows a complex interplay of Frankish and Gallo-Roman mythical material. The Frankish elements in the myth are found in the two kings with alliterating names, *Franko* ‘Frank’ (Latin *francio*) and *Frija* ‘Free’ (Latin *Friga*), one of which led the Frankish people to their new homes on the river Rhine. Upon their arrival, they built a city there called *Troja*. This city can be identified as the Roman town of Xanten, first known

⁴⁸ The anecdote partly reflects information from the sixth-century story *De excidio Trojae Historia* ascribed to Dares Frigius, which should not be confused with the eighth-century story *De origine Francorum* which goes back to Pseudo-Fredegar and is also ascribed to Dares Frigius.

as Ulpia Colonia Trajana but later called Troja in Late Antiquity (Ravenna Geography, 5th c. CE) and the Middle Ages (MHG *klein Trojen*). If this identification is correct,⁴⁹ the Trojan origin myth reflects the political situation of the fourth century, when the Franks were occupying the Gallo-Roman cities of Cologne, Trier and Xanten (cf. Boone 1954: 18).

Panzer and Hommel have argued that the Frankish memory of a homeland on the river Rhine was combined with a complex of Gallo-Roman myths. According to classical sources, the Gaulish peoples of the Haedui in Lyon, the Arverni in the Auvergne and the Veneti in Brittany all claimed Trojan descent. This enabled them to express their close affiliation with the Roman people and state. It therefore seems likely that Pseudo-Fredegar's Troy myth is much more than a learned invention for the purpose of providing the Franks with a classical past, but rather reflects the complicated synthesis between Frankish and Gallo-Roman cultural heritage.

1.18 The Franks and the fate of Late Gaulish

An important indication that even in an earlier period the Franks had been in contact with the culture and languages of Gaul, is found in the Salic Law. The Latin of the law code features several Gallo-Roman words of Gaulish origin:⁵⁰

- *segusium* 'sleuth hound' < PCelt. **segūsios*, cf. OFr. *seuz* 'id.'
- *sutis* 'sty' < PCelt. **su-teges*, cf. OFr. *seu* 'id.'
- *arepennis* 'land measure' < PCelt. **arek^wenni-*, cf. OFr. *arpent* 'id.'⁵¹
- *vassus* 'servant' < PCelt. **wassos*, cf. OFr. *vassal* 'liegeman'⁵²

These Gaulish words are continued in the modern Gallo-Romance dialects, and may therefore simply represent the Gallo-Roman variety of the scribe (cf. Adams 2007: 313).

Nevertheless, I will argue that at least some Gaulish lexical material is represented in the non-Latin lexis of the Malberg glosses, that is, the words and phrases introduced by the word *mallobergo*.⁵³ Although it cannot be excluded that these Gaulish words entered Frankish via

⁴⁹ Fabian Zuk (2017: 367-389) argues that also a phonetic reason might be invoked to explain the identification of Colonia Traiana with Troy. He argues that Gallo-Romance basilect form [ˈtrɔjana] next to more learned [traˈjana] might have been interpreted by Germanic speakers as [trɔjana].

⁵⁰ The suggested Gaulish origin for the word *litus* / *laetus* 'half-free man' (i.e. Gaulish **lidos* < PCelt. **ϕlidos*, cf. Scovazzi 1952; see also Szemérenyi 1977: 304) must be rejected, because the comparison to Old Alamannic *frilāz* 'freed man' is more straightforward than an Indo-European connection to Latin *plēbs* and Greek *πληθὺς*.⁵⁰

⁵¹ Reflected in Old Irish *airchenn* 'the short side of a rectangular field'. The Old French word *arpent* denoted a 'land measure of 20 to 70 acres depending on the region'.

⁵² This word and its Romance and Germanic continuations is discussed in Kerkhof (2015).

⁵³ It is interesting to note that the word <mallobergo> is not the expected Gallo-Romance adaptation of a Germanic etymon **mahla-* ~ **maþla-*; in Merovingian Latin, at no point do we find <mathaloberg>, <machaloberg> or <mafloberg> written. In my opinion, it is possible that the Germanic word entered Merovingian Latin/Romance through a Gaulish intermediary,

an early Romance intermediary, it is possible that they were borrowed at an earlier stage directly from the Gaulish dialects of Belgium and northern France. Since the survival of Gaulish in Belgium is at least secure for the third century CE, there must have been a significant time window for the Franks to be in direct contact with Gaulish speaking communities. In my opinion, the following lexical items from the Salic Law stand a good chance of representing Gaulish loanwords in the Frankish language.

1. Gaulish *kranni ‘pig’ (cf. OIr. *crain* ‘pig’, MW *cranan*)
2. Gaulish *wanio ‘dog’ (cf. OFr. *guaignun* ‘id.’)
3. Gaulish *dewa ‘arson’ (cf. MW *deifyaw* ‘to burn’)

The first Gaulish word may be found in the law articles regarding the theft of pigs (*De furtis porcorum*, c. 2). The Malberg gloss *chrane caltio* (A2) has generally been connected to a Low Frankish *hramni- ‘animal pen’ (cf. ModDu. *ren* ‘id.’, OFr. *franc* ‘pig sty’, see FEW 16: 237), in combination with the Germanic word *galtjan- ‘gelded animal’ (cf. Rhine Frankish *gelze* ‘gelded sow’, see Kroonen 2013: 165-166). However, Hyllested (2014: 79), following a suggestion by Kroonen, has argued that the first element should instead be identified as Gaulish *kranni-, a Celtic etymon that can be found in the Insular Celtic languages (OIr. *crain* ‘pig’, MW *cranan* ‘id.’).⁵⁴ In this regard it should be noted that the provisions concerning the sties (Latin *chranne*) are only found from the C-redaction of the Pactus onwards. The older A-redaction just provides the Malberg gloss *chrane caltio*. It is possible that the Malberg gloss of the A-redaction consists of a tautological phrase where both the word *chrane* and the word *caltio* render the meaning ‘pig’. The prototype for the C-redaction may have interpreted the *chranne* gloss as corresponding to the Frankish word *hramne ‘animal pen’ which would have motivated the addition of provisions regarding different pigsties (*contra* Höfinghoff 1987: 63-64).

The second Gaulish word may be found in the law articles concerning the theft of farm dogs (*De furtis canum*, c. 6, see Höfinghoff 1987: 210-15). Here the Malberg glosses *repo uano*, *trouitho uano*, *chunno uano* and *theo uano* occur where the second word *uano* seems to reflect the meaning ‘dog’. The similarity of the Malberg gloss *uano* to the Old French word *guaignun* ‘dog’ < Pre-French *wanjone has first been noted by Schweisthal in 1889. It is remarkable that his suggestion has gone unnoticed by later generations of scholars. A Germanic etymology for the Malberg gloss has been attempted by Gysseling (1976: 84) who reconstructed a non-attested Germanic etymon *h^wana-, a full-grade formation to Gm. *hun- and *hwin- (cf. OHG *hunt*, OFr. *hwynd*, see Kroonen 2013: 256). This etymology is incapacitated by the lack of

i.e. Gm. *mapla- > Gaul. *mallo-. If this scenario is correct, we might also have an alternative explanation for the Gaulish anthroponymic element *mallo- (see Schmidt 1957: 236).

⁵⁴ This word is cited by Hyllested (2014: 79) who took it over from Hamp (1987). Hamp states that the word is found in the White book of Rhydderch and then attested once later. Further references are missing and I have not managed to track these attestations down.

another Germanic language reflecting this full-grade. Van Helten (1900: 300), followed by Schmidt-Wiegand and Quak, opted for a connection to Germanic **wanjan-* ‘to grow accustomed’, leading to an interpretation of the Malberg gloss *repo uano* as ‘guard dog that is accustomed to a rope collar’. The second etymology is problematic because no Germanic noun in the daughter languages that reflects the root **wan-* is associated with dogs. Therefore both etymologies fail to convince and, more importantly, do not take the cognate form in Old French into account. A Germanic origin for Malberg *uano* can be saved, if we follow Baldinger (1998: 150-151) in his theory that OFr. *gaignun* represents a derivation to the Germanic verb **wainōn* ‘to howl’. The Malberg gloss *uano* might then reflect the same Germanic etymon, a Germanic *n*-stem **waino* ~ **wainan* meaning ‘howler’.

Although this is a distinct possibility, a Gaulish etymology should not be discarded in advance. A Gaulish interpretation for the word *uano* is strengthened by a connection to the Gaulish personal name *Cunuanos*, whose first element is generally accepted to mean ‘dog’ (cf. PCelt. **k^won-* ‘dog’, cf. Matasović 2009: 372). Traditionally, the Gaulish personal name *cunouanos* is interpreted as meaning ‘hound-slayer’ because of the interpretation of Gaulish **wan-* as PCelt. **g^wan-* ‘to slay’ and the connection to another Gaulish personal name *Tazcouanos* which is interpreted as ‘badger-slayer’ (cf. MW *teuchwant*, see Delamarre 2003: 306). I contend that in both personal names, the second element could also be interpreted as ‘hound’. The personal name *Cunuanos* could then denote a ‘wolf-hound’ and the personal name *Tazcouanos* could denote a hound that was used for hunting badgers (cf. German *Dachshund*).⁵⁵ If this explanation of Gaulish **wanos* as ‘hound’ is correct, we may note that the personal name *Cunuanos* closely resembles the Malberg gloss *chunno uano*. In my opinion, it is possible that in the case of the Malberg gloss *chunno uano* we are dealing with a Gaulish hound name **kunwanos* ‘wolf-hound’, which by Germanic-speakers was reanalyzed and deformed by contamination with the Germanic word **hund-* ‘hound’.⁵⁶ This would mean that *chunno uano*, just like *chranni caltio*, may represent a tautological phrase or sequence, in which Gaulish lexical material was first subjected to Germanic folk etymology, and later written down by Romance-speaking Merovingian scribes.

The last Gaulish word may be found in the law articles concerning arson (*De incendiis*, c. 16) where the Malberg glosses *andeba*, *sal deba* and *leo deba* occur (see Höfinghof 1987: 101-02). It should be noted that the gloss *andeba* is only featured in the eighth-century D-redaction of the Salic Law, which means that the gloss was not taken over from an A or C-manuscript.⁵⁷ The A and C manuscripts have the glosses *sal deba* and *leo deba*, which are found in law articles treating the burning of agricultural buildings. In the case of *saldeba* it is likely that the first

⁵⁵ Alternatively, we could also interpret the personal name *Cunuanos* as a Gaulish tautological compound in which both element had the meaning ‘dog’. This seems less likely to me.

⁵⁶ The spelling <nn> for Germanic /nd/ could be a sign of a transfer into Romance, cf. Wall. *hounine* ‘caterpillar’ < Gm. **hundina* ‘little dog’.

⁵⁷ This might indicate that, at a relatively late moment in the Merovingian period, the word <andeba> was still meaningful.

element denotes the building (i.e. Gm. *sal- ‘farm house’) and the second element *deba* denotes the burning.⁵⁸ In the case of *leo deba*, we should consider the possibility that we are dealing with a misplaced *leo(d)* from *iudicetur de leode*, which occurs several times in manuscript A2. If we would be dealing with a Germanic word *hlewa- ‘shelter’, we would surely expect a spelling <chleo> for the Early Merovingian A-redaction (*contra* Höfinghof 1987: 101). Gysseling (1976: 70) has argued that the gloss *deba* must continue an unattested Germanic verb *diwan ‘to burn’. Once again, Gysseling’s reconstruction is not supported by corroborating data from the other Germanic languages. Grimm (in Merkel 1850: XLVII), followed by later scholars (Lloyd e.a. EWA 2: 547; Quak 2008a: 480-81), has proposed a connection to Gm. *befan- ‘to warm’ which is only reflected in the Old Norse verb *befa* ‘to reek, to stink’. This etymology is problematic because of the initial consonant in the gloss (<d> for Old Frankish /b/), and leaves us with a significant semantic distance to the Germanic verb. A Gaulish etymology, on the other hand, provides us with a perfect formal and semantic match: PCelt. *dewyo- is reflected in all the Insular Celtic languages (MW *deifyaw* ‘to burn’, OCorn. *dewy* ‘id.’, OBret. *dev* ‘burned’) in the meaning ‘to burn’.⁵⁹

Since the compilation of Salic Law, as has been discussed in detail above, must have taken place in the late fifth or early sixth century, this Gaulish lexis must have entered Frankish before the migration into northern Gaul. The Malberg glosses also contain several examples of Romance lexis that was integrated into the legal language of the pre-migration Franks. Several cases of Romance –Germanic hybrid compounds are featured (see also Quak 2017).

- *ort(o)focla* ‘garden bird’ ← WRom. *orto- + WGm. *fogal
- *vialagina* ‘way laying’ ← WRom. *vea- + WGm. *lagīn
- *minoflidis* ‘freemen of lesser rank’ ← WRom. *mino- + WGm. *flæd-⁶⁰
- *olechardis* ‘beehive garden’ ← WRom. *aula- + WGm. *gardi

A single case where the entire Malberg gloss is a Frankish word of Romance origin can be found in the word *podero* that features in the law articles regarding the theft of young animals (*De furtis animalium*, c. 3). Arend Quak (2007) has shown that the same word is reflected in the Dutch place-names *Poederooijen* (Gelderland, Netherlands), *Poederlee* (Antwerp, Belgium) and *Puurs* (Mechelen, Belgium). A Romance origin of the word is already implied by the Latinate *poledrus* (< WRom. *polédro* < Lat. *pullítrus, cf. ModIt. *poledro* ‘foal’) that accompanies *podero* in the stipulation regarding the theft of a foal. It seems likely that this Romance form **poledro* was combined with a Romance variant form that had the accent on the initial syllable (cf. Lat.

⁵⁸ The gloss *sal* occurs in an article treating the burning of a *spicarium* (Old Walloon *spier* ‘granary’, FEW 12: 175) or *machalum* (< Gm. *māhal, cf. Walloon *mafe* ‘place where grain is stored’, FEW 16: 499). The same conclusion can be drawn regarding the gloss *leo deba* that is featured in an article treating the burning of a *sutis* ‘sty’ or *scuria* ‘barn’.

⁵⁹ A Celtic etymology also accounts for the occurrence of the etymon in Italo-Romance (OTusc. *debbio* ‘deforestation’, Sardin. *debbyu* ‘id.’, see REW 2627: 206; EWA 2: 547) which is hard to reconcile with a borrowing from West Frankish.

⁶⁰ Cf. OE *-flæd* ‘glory, beauty’ in OE *Eadflæd*, Old Frankisch *audofleda* and MHG *vlât* ‘beauty’ (see Schönfeld 1911: 37).

púlliter > OFr. *poultre* 'foal'). The same inner-Romance variation is found in Old Spanish where *poltro* and *podro* are found alongside regular *poldro* (see Corominas 1954: 863-64). The loss of the pre-consonantal /l/ remains as of yet unexplained.

The borrowing of Late Latin or Early Romance words in the Old Germanic languages is of course nothing new. It is a well-known fact that the Old Germanic languages contain a large amount of Late Latin / Early Romance loanwords (cf. Schmidt 1993: 59-60). However, the occurrence of Romance lexis in the Malberg glosses does teach us something that cannot be learned from the loanwords in the other Old Germanic languages, namely that already in the fifth century CE, some Romance loanwords were so well integrated into the receiving Germanic languages that they could feature as native legal idiom in an otherwise Latinate law text. In this dissertation several more intriguing cases of non-Germanic lexis in the glosses of the Early Medieval barbarian law codes will be presented. It will be argued that the phonological and semantic intricacies of these to-and-fro borrowings across the Romance – Germanic language border provide a unique window on Early Medieval society. What kind of Late Latin or Early Romance was the donor language in these early lexical transfers will be the topic of the following chapter.