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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Purpose and Approach

It is the purpose of this research to assemble as completely as possible the Gothic\(^1\) lexicon to be found in Spanish\(^2\) -- exclusive of person and place names, which constitute a separate and badly needed study in themselves -- and to explore systematically the phonological changes which these lexical items have undergone in their assimilation into Spanish from Gothic. A structural description of these changes has been provided insofar as possible. Because the study includes historical phonological developments as well as structural analysis, an approach is favored which is both diachronic and synchronic.

Since Visigothic loans into Spanish (as well as into Portuguese and Provençal) constitute one of the chief sources of our knowledge to date of this now extinct East Germanic dialect,\(^3\) and, since valuable phonological information

\(^{\text{1}}\) The term "Gothic" is subsequently used in this paper equivalent to Visigothic.

\(^{\text{2}}\) The term "Spanish", unless otherwise specified, refers always to Castilian.

concerning Gothic may be deduced from Gothic reflexes in Spanish, this study is an attempt to fulfill the current need for such an investigation.

The task of assembling a lexicon anywhere nearly complete is rendered extremely difficult because of the scattered and varied sources of information, and by virtue of the fact that many valuable sources, i.e., manuscripts⁴ and historical relics⁵ have been lost or destroyed over the years. Also, the fact that not all words used in any given period have ever appeared in writing, especially since the only written language throughout the Visigothic occupation of the Iberian Peninsula was Latin, differentiates and renders more complex one aspect of research in Gothic from similar research in still extant, living languages. While such a lexical collection can therefore never be truly complete or one-hundred per cent accurate perhaps, the lexicon in chapter three upon which the subsequent study is based is drawn from comprehensive historical and etymological studies of several well-established Germanists and Romanists and many isolated smaller articles, and, I believe, may be considered as complete as one can postulate on the basis of existing evidence.

⁵Cf. R. Menéndez Pidal, Historia de España, Tomo III, Madrid, 1940, pp. 357-606.
Despite the fact that a number of the Gothic forms cited in chapter four are undocumentable, the attempt has been made to provide a structural description of whatever changes have taken place wherever given patterns seem to emerge definitively, e.g., those reflected in the adaptation of clusters and other phonetic arrangements unfamiliar to the structure of Spanish as the borrowing language.

In addition to the problem of postulated versus documented forms, we must also be aware of the fact that writing is after all not language itself, rather only a way of recording language by way of visible marks, so that we must therefore be extremely careful in interpreting the written symbols into terms of phonetic realization. Written records give us only an imperfect and sometimes even a distorted picture of past speech, which has to be deciphered and interpreted. Frequently the logographic or phonographic values are unknown, except where bilingual inscriptions are available, and one of the languages is a known quantity.\(^6\) Such is assuredly the situation with the Gothic language. Therefore it is hoped that an analysis of Gothic forms -- attested or postulated -- as they appear in Spanish adaptations may only not further define the still debated extent of Gothic influence upon Spanish, but also may provide the key

to several still unanswered questions concerning the phonological system of Gothic.

1.1 Previous Scholarship

Despite the many excellent and detailed treatments of Germanic influences on Romance, none seems to provide conclusive evidence of specific Gothic influences upon Spanish nor of Gothic reflexes in Spanish. Among previous studies Corominas' monumental work provides by far the most comprehensive historical and etymological treatment of the Spanish language available at present. However, since even Corominas does not treat all those items which other scholarship attributes to Gothic origin, nor does he concur in his opinions regarding many a lexical item with one or

---


8It must be borne in mind that only the Gothic lexicon in Spanish, not the Germanic lexicon in Romance, is under treatment in this study.

9J. Corominas, Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana, 4 vols., Bern, 1954, which constitutes a first-hand investigation over a period of some 20 years of original Hispanic documents and literary sources as well as dictionaries and studies in several languages and treats with minor omissions all the words contained in the most recent complete edition of the Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana of the Real Academia Española.
another Romanist or Germanist, it was necessary to discuss and to evaluate obvious discrepancies. All other sources used in assembling and discussing the lexicon and in formulating my phonological observations and conclusions are documented as consulted in chapters three and four below.

1.2 **The Concept of Linguistic Interference**

As Martinet points out, each individual among us is a permanent source of linguistic interference, i.e., even those of us who speak only one language reflect nevertheless more than one social or regional dialect in our speech.\(^{10}\) We may then logically conclude that the same is especially true of two entire peoples who come into extended mutual contact. Since language interference results from what ethnologists call cultural diffusion or acculturation, a brief orientation to the socio-cultural factors as well as the linguistic features involved in lexical and phonic interference has been given.

The concept of linguistic contacts, the mechanism and the structural causes and co-determinants in the process of language interference are probed comprehensively by Weinreich in an attempt to show the promise of exploring the variety of factors on which the effects of language contact depend and

"to show to what extent interference is determined by the structure of two languages in contact as against non-linguistic factors in the socio-cultural context of the language contact."¹¹ Not all of Weinreich's study is pertinent to the present one, since it is oriented toward living languages in contact and because we are concerned here primarily with the linguistic features involved in the changes which the Gothic (source) language has sustained in its adaptations to the Spanish (recipient) language and only secondarily with the extralinguistic factors.

It should be obvious that a "language boundary" can exist only as a relative concept, since such a boundary constitutes at once both a line of demarcation and a point of contact, within which or beyond which communication possibilities between two "speech-communities"¹² may range from zero to infinite. Some languages are of course more capable of internal expansion in word-building and in the development of new terms without "cultural borrowing" than are others; where such internal expansion is not easily possible, however, a language may attempt to compensate for its lexical inadequacies by external expansion in terms of "loans" and semantic extensions.¹³

¹¹Cf. Weinreich, p. 4.
¹²Cf. Bloomfield, p. 29; cf. also pp. 52 ff.
The need for lexical change is frequently precisely due to a contact situation and the areas of vocabulary in which it may take place, whether on a lexical or a phonic level, may range from military and legal to religious and domestic. The relative positions of cultural and social superiority or inferiority of the two languages determines whether or not the transfer of a foreign form is a purposefully perpetrated one; the linguistic features involved are most often responsible for the unconscious adaptations made.

The homogeneity or difference between the historical and ethnic backgrounds, the religious, political and social customs of the two peoples in contact, and the status of the languages as indigenous or immigrant constitute the socio-cultural factors. The status of the two languages in turn often introduces also a psychological factor, which greatly influences the manner, extent and pace of the borrowing of foreign elements, i.e., the factor of resistance or of acceptance in the recipient language.

The linguistic feature changes in a word being taken over from another language vary according to the degree of bilingualism of the speaker or the speech-community into which it is absorbed.\textsuperscript{14} If the borrower is somewhat familiar with the lending language, he may tend to preserve the foreign sounds more or less accurately, even if they violate his native

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Weinreich, pp. 14-70; also Bloomfield, pp. 444-460.
phonetic system, provided the social factor permits. If, on
the other hand, the borrower has no familiarity with the
foreign language, he may replace the foreign sounds with the
phonemes and the phonemic arrangement of his native language;
similarly, he may interpret the written notation of a
foreign form in terms of the orthography which represents
his own phonemic system, with a wide variety of allophonic
variations.

The degree of substitution made in transferring or
adapting a foreign form to the fundamental phonetic habits
of another language may thus vary from almost no substitution
to such complete substitution that the foreign origin of the
word is ultimately obscured completely, beyond the ability
of linguistic description to distinguish it from a native
form, except by means of older forms or derivatives retaining
older characteristics, for which reason the diachronic
aspect of this study is of particular importance.

In describing the contact situation between the Goths
and the Iberians over a period of three centuries (cf. below
in chapter two), I would with Bloomfield distinguish between
an ordinarily mutual "cultural borrowing" and a one-sided
"intimate borrowing," which occurs when two languages are
spoken in what is topographically and politically a single
community, a situation engendered in most cases by conquest,
not by peaceful migration. Bloomfield further states that
the language of the subject people in most such instances of
intimate contact is indigenous while the language of the dominating people is usually introduced by a body of conquerors and asserts that, in all cases of intimate borrowing, it is the former language which borrows predominantly from the latter, not vice-versa, while the latter -- if it survives at all\textsuperscript{15} -- will show little interference phenomena.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15}Since Gothic, the language of the conquerors of the Iberian Peninsula, did not survive, we must rely solely upon scant written transmission of the forms of the past from the few Gothic documents we have and on the isolated (actual or postulated) forms which appear in modified form in other languages as "loans."

\textsuperscript{16}Cf. Bloomfield, Chapters 25 and 26.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL CONTACT OF THE VISIGOTHS

WITH THE IBERIAN PENINSULANS

While it would be of no immediate relevance to the present study to attempt to trace in detail the ultimate origins of either the Goths or the Spaniards or of their languages back to their earliest beginnings, insofar as these are known or debated, we should consider briefly the historical contact between the two peoples, as well as the stage of development which each of their languages had reached by the time they came into extended mutual contact. We are thus concerned with how, where, why, when and for how long the Goths sustained contact with the particular inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula and with what happened between the two languages during that period.

At some point still unknown to us, a prehistoric language termed by historical linguists "Proto-Germanic" produced divergent forms of the Germanic family of languages, among which Gothic belongs to the now extinct East Germanic group; the Romance family of languages which we know today began to develop from Latin in the Middle Ages. While the genetic relationship of Gothic to Spanish is not superficially apparent, it is well established that both languages
developed from a common source and are but divergent forms of a single prehistoric language which is generally known as Proto-Indo-European.

The Proto-Romance language, as it is called by linguists, from which the various Romance languages later developed, was the spoken Latin, or so-called Vulgar Latin\textsuperscript{17} of the Roman Empire. From the collapse of the western Roman Empire at the end of the fifth century to the ninth century, one distinguished only generally the various Romance groups as Gallo-, Italo-, Hispano-, Rhalto- and Balkan-Romance. From the middle of the ninth century, Classical Latin, long maintained as the official and written language, began to be replaced by writing in the vernacular. During this formative period of some four centuries, because of "local phonetic change and varied lexical and semantic choice rather than of any far-reaching modification of accidence and syntax,"\textsuperscript{18} these groups had become increasingly mutually unintelligible. Of particular concern to this study is the Iberian Vulgar Latin spoken by the Hispano-Romance group on the Iberian Peninsula, which later developed into Spanish, Portuguese and Catalan.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{19}For detailed studies of the development of Hispano-Romance, cf. R. Lapesa, \textit{Historia de la lengua española}, Madrid, 1959, pp. 51-94; also R. Menéndez Pidal,
Proto-Germanic, as it is termed by linguists, from which the various Germanic languages later developed, is "the postulated form of a relatively uniform ancestral Germanic language once spoken over an area small enough to preclude important regional differences and is thus assumed to be that stage of Germanic, which precedes the division into North, East and West Germanic." The branch of particular concern to this study is the East Germanic branch, which includes Gothic, Burgundian, Vandalic, Gepidic and Rugic.

These divisions and developments may perhaps be represented most expeditiously for our purposes here in diagram form, as follows:

---


During the first century of the Christian era the Goths had occupied the region of the Lower Vistula, from where they migrated during the next three centuries southeastward. By the time they reached the Black Sea, they had split into Ostrogoths (East Goths) and Visigoths (West Goths). The fourth century Visigothic translation of the Bible by the Arian bishop, Wulfila, who died in 383, is the earliest literary monument in any Germanic tongue; this has, however, come down to us only in fragments of various manuscripts written chiefly by Ostrogothic scribes during the
5th and 6th centuries in Northern Italy, after the Visigoths had moved on to conquer Spain.

The Visigoths had entered Italy in A.D. 401 under their king, Alaric. Seven years later under Alaric they invaded Italy a second time for two years. In A.D. 410 Alaric marched a third time on Rome, then moved on to southern Italy. Alaric, called "the Moses of the Visigoths", was always seeking for them a promised land; although he died before he led them to it, he assuredly prepared the way for the future Visigothic kingdoms in Gaul and Spain. His successor was the very pro-Roman Athaulf, who led the Goths northward into Gaul, where they remained but briefly before moving in A.D. 415 into Spain.

Following Athaulf's assassination, Wallia, also pro-Roman, became king and in A.D. 416 proceeded to attack the more primitive Germanic tribes from Spain who were harassing the Ibero-Roman population of the Peninsula. The Roman Emperor, Honorius, then offered the Goths a permanent home in southwest Gaul in A.D. 419, which they accepted. Six years later they established an independent kingdom with Toulouse as capital.

---

22 Elcock, pp. 212ff.
In A. D. 451, the Gothic king Theodoric joined forces with a Roman general to defeat the Hunnish invasion of Gaul. Scarcely fifty years later, however, the Visigothic rule in Gaul ended in A. D. 507, when their kingdom was overthrown by the Franks. The remaining Visigoths crossed the Pyrenees and established thereafter an even greater Visigothic kingdom in Spain, with Barcelona as their first capital and Toledo as their second, which was to last for some two-hundred years until it was overthrown by the Moors in A. D. 711. One by one, the Visigoths subdued their territorial rivals (Swabians, Romans and Byzantines) under King Leo-vigild, who reigned A. D. 568-586 and King Sisebut, who reigned A. D. 612-621, until the last of the Byzantine resistance was overcome in A. D. 629.

Spain was rapidly politically unified under the Visigoths, but social unification was slow because the Goths remained an aloof military caste, devoutly Arian in religion and perpetuated a ban on intermarriage with the Romans, which had been imposed originally by the Romans.

---

24 Cf. Elcock, pp.: 219f..
25 Arianism taught that Jesus could not logically be co-existent with God, but must be of a lesser nature.
The Visigothic landowners were feared and shunned by the Spaniards of the towns, whose civilization was nevertheless superior. Finally, the first effective Romanization of the Goths began with King Recared, son of Leovigild, who in A.D. 589, abandoned the Arianism embraced by the Goths since the time of Wulfila and declared Catholicism the official religion, in consequence of which the Gothic monarchy received the favor and support of the Roman Church. Thereafter King Receswinth, who reigned A.D. 649-672, issued a code of mingled Gothic and Roman law and, in A.D. 655, the ban on intermarriage was lifted, which further contributed to the Germanization of the Visigoths. The attempt to achieve unification and integration among Goths and Spaniards had, however, begun too late to have been more than partially successful or complete by A.D. 711, when a force of Arabic invaders effectively destroyed the Visigothic kingdom in Spain.

Briefly summarized, the Visigoths sustained relatively brief contact with the inhabitants of Italy and of Gaul, and more extensive contact with the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula from early 5th - 8th centuries during most of the still formative period of the Romance languages.

In the subsequent chapters of this paper, we have undertaken to observe the results of the chronological and geographic distribution of the Visigoths in terms of linguistic
interference through an etymological study (cf. Chapter three below) and a phonological analysis (cf. Chapter four below) of the Gothic lexicon in Spanish as it still manifests itself in present Castilian.
CHAPTER THREE

THE VISIGOTHIC LEXICON IN SPANISH

3.0 Preliminary Remarks

The positive (cf. 3.1 below), probable (cf. 3.2) and possible (cf. 3.3) lexical items subjected to analysis in this study have all been assumed by one or another scholar, as documented, to be of Gothic origin. The prevailing disagreement among Germanists and Romanists, however, concerning the precise source, original form and date of entry of many Germanic forms into Romance -- in particular of forms of Gothic origin into Spanish -- automatically renders the classification made in this chapter subject to challenge by any one of these scholars with whom it disagrees. However, since this classification into categories of positive, probable and possible was not merely arbitrarily established, but was rather self-evident from the historical and etymological evidence accumulated -- or the lack of evidence available -- in our opinion it must be accorded a certain natural validity.

As E. Syrop\(^{27}\) has pointed out, any attempt to show what routes individual lexical forms took in passing from

Germanic into Romance and what their phonetic and semantic developments were, involves a study of the historical background of the Roman Empire, the Germanic tribes and the linguistic developments of the western Romance languages. The same holds true in isolating and tracing by means of etymological and phonological study the specific Gothic lexical forms which passed into Spanish.

The difficulty lies in the fact that earlier Germanic influences upon Spanish, as well as Romance in general, preceded Gothic influence. Because there were for centuries peaceful as well as hostile contacts between the Romance and Germanic peoples in military as well as commercial capacities, Germanic words in Latinized forms seeped into the Vulgar Latin vernacular, perhaps even as early as the 3rd century, and vice-versa. Since these words did not appear in written form, however, during the incipient stages of Latin's development into Romance, it is difficult to ascertain just when they did enter and just which Germanic language was the exact source.

Although a number of Gothic lexical forms entered Sp. directly, a considerable additional number came in indirectly via Cat. and Prov. The reason for the latter phenomenon is

---

28 Cf. Lapesa, p. 80; cf. also Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 301.
29 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 38; cf. also E. Syrop, "Introduction."
30 Provençal refers in this study not only to the language of the Provence, but also to the Langue d'Oc and various related dialects of Southern France, referred to as "occitano" by Corominas and "Okzitanisch" by von Wartburg.
clearly due to the fact that the Visigoths had maintained a kingdom in southern Gaul for almost a century from A. D. 418-507, a period when, although some were no doubt partially or perhaps even fully bilingual, they were still in full possession of their Germanic tongue. During this time, Gothic exerted a direct and extensive influence on Cat. and Prov., which in turn became the chief vehicles for Gothic linguistic interference in Spanish, and it is precisely by means of the somewhat different linguistic development of Cat. and Prov. from Sp. and Fr. that so many Germanic -- and Gothic in particular -- origins can be traced.

Thus, despite the number of old cultural loanwords from Germanic, the new loans of the Migration Period can often be distinguished either by their geographic distribution or by formal characteristics which point to the dialect of the conquerors.

The Gothic forms are in all cases given first in alphabetical order in each section of their classification into positive, probable or possible etymologies, together with their English equivalents. These are followed by the cor-

33 Cf. W. von Wartburg, Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker, Tübingen, 1951, p. 10; cf. also Bloomfield, p. 466.
responding Modern Spanish forms and their current English meanings. Where discrepantly postulated Gothic or Spanish forms, variant older Spanish forms, archaic meanings and derivatives are known, these are also given. Since in most cases the sources consulted were written in French, German or Spanish, the information derived from these has been incorporated into this study in English translation or paraphrase. 34

3.1 Positive Etymologies

1) Goth. aleina 'ell measure, cubit' > Sp. ana 'ell measure'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. aln, alen, qln, ONorw. alun, OE eln, OFris. elne, MDu. elne, OS, OHG elina, MHG elle, elne, NHG Elle 'ell' (cf. Holthausen, GEW p. 5).

Aleina is documented only in the accusative singular (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 35) form, although the form alina has also been postulated (cf. below).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 17) disagrees with Grimm's earlier derivation of aleina from Lat. ulna, stating that Ital. anna, alla, Prov. Cat. alna are assuredly from Goth. aleina of corresponding feminine gender. He also (Wb. IIb, p. 84)...

34 Due to the repetitious nature of the extensive documentation therefore necessary in treating each item of the lexicon, all documentation quoted is given parenthetically in as abbreviated form as possible immediately within the text of the etymological discussion.
gives parallels to the development of OSp. alna > Sp. ana, e.g. jaine > jalde, alnus > almo, alamo, in which the -in- cluster is avoided and which point to the fact that this cluster cannot be tolerated in Sp.

ML (REW 341) derives Fr. aune, Ital. anna, Prov. Cat. alna OSp. OPort. alna Sp. ana 'ell' from Goth. alina 'ell', noting that the scarcity of this form in Italy and perhaps also on the Iberian Peninsula renders a subsidiary Lat. *alna corresponding to ulna improbable as the source of the Romance forms and speaks rather for the Goth. origin.

Corominas (I, p. 197) likewise proposes the form Goth. alina (with the initial vowel accented as in the Sp. forms) as the direct origin of OSp. alna (Val.) > Sp. ana. Deriv.: Sp. anear, aneaje. Noting that the long middle vowel of the documented Goth. aleina does not correspond to that of other IE forms, he supposes therefore that aleina is erroneous for alina.

Contradictorily, however, Kluge gives aleina as the correct Gothic etymon and asserts (KZ XXVI, p. 101), that the ei is not written in error for i (cf. Goth. akeit, OE aced, etc.). While it is true that some of the other IE forms have a short middle vowel, there are also others which evidence a long middle vowel as does aleina (cf. Kluge, EWDS, p. 5).

2) Goth. *alisa 'alder tree' > Sp. aliso 'alder tree'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. elri(r), q1r, alri, alr-, OE alor, MLG aller, aire, elre, else, Du. ele, OHG elira,
erila 'alder' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, pp. 5f.).

Several forms have been postulated for this etymon: *alisa, *aliza, *alisi (cf. below).

Diez (WB. IIb, p. 89) merely lists Sp. aliso 'alder tree' and suggests further reference to the NHG dialect form Else 'alder'.

ML (REW 350) gives Gmc. aliza 'alder tree' > OFr. alis, Fr. alise, Oc. alio, Sp. aliso, but he also (Index p. 1062) lists alisa as a Gothic word.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 381) gives Goth. *alisi 'alder tree' corresponding to Du. els (cf. Kluge EWDS under 'Erle') and says it becomes Sp. aliso (masc.) due to the fact that all tree names in VLat. have masc. gender. Deriv.: Sp. alisar, aliseda. Previously (RFE XIX, p. 234) Gamillscheg postulated Goth. *aliza 'alder tree' > Sp. aliso id, which is documented exclusively on the Iberian Peninsula.

Kluge (EWDS, p. 172) holds that Goth. *alisa corresponding to Gmc. *alisō can be derived from or postulated on the basis of Sp. aliso 'alder tree'.


Cor. (I, p. 134) says that Sp. aliso is of unknown but probably of pre-Rom. origin, in contrast to Kluge and Gamillscheg (cf. above) who believe that it comes from the Gothic word which corresponds to NHG Erle 'alder' and other Gmc. cognates. So far as the form of the Gothic word is concerned, Corominas, having confirmed on the basis of literary
rhymes that it had a voiced -s- in OSp., doubts that it would be *aliza or *alisi. With Jud (cf. ASNSL CXXI, 92) he notes that this would be the only Spanish tree of Gmc. origin; and moreover that it does not seem admissible to transfer the accent of *alisa to aliso. Still another cause for scruple is the fact that the Goth. ȓ is not represented by Sp. e, rather by Sp. i, as well as that other Romance forms present grave discrepancies: Fr. alisier, Prov. aliguier 'white-beam tree', Fr. alise NHG Elabeere (foreign to OHG) 'fruit of the whitebeam tree'. He finds it difficult to doubt the relationship between these forms and Sp. aliso despite the semantic discrepancy.

Despite the phonological difficulties presented by the etymology, which will be dealt with in the following chapter, we agree with that scholarship which supports a Gothic origin. The decision as to the precise form of the etymon must remain open for the present.

3) Goth. bandwa 'banner, standard, sign signal' > Sp. banda 'armed band, group or hoard'

Gmc. cognate: OIcel. benda 'to give a sign'.

Bandwa is documented only in the dative singular bandwai 'sign', with the following derivatives: bandwo 'sign', bandwjan and ga-bandwjan 'to give a signal, to indicate' (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 79).

The etymologies which Diez (Wb. I, p. 49f) gives for Ital. Prov. Sp. banda 'band, ribbon', likewise Ital. bandiera, Sp. bandera, etc. 'flag' < Goth. bandi, OHG band and (Wb. I,
p. 50f.) for Ital. Prov. Port. Sp. bando 'public announce-
ment, ban' and the corresponding verb Ital. bandire, Sp.
Prov. bandir, Port. bandir, banir, Fr. bannir, 'to announce
publicly' ≲ Goth. bandwjan 'to designate' seem in the
light of more recent scholarship (cf. especially Corominas
I, 384ff.) as erroneous as the rest of his discussion is
confusing.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 366) and Feist (VWGS, p. 79) agree
that Goth. bandwa, bandwō 'sign' were Latinized to bandum
'flag' and entered Romance as the collective form banda
'a group of soldiers gathered under a common flag',
division', 'group'. At this point, however, their
opinions diverge.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 366) gives not only Prov. Ital.
banda 'swarm, group, crowd', but also Cat. banda 'military
mark of distinction' 'insignia', Sp. banda 'sash (as a
military mark of distinction)', 'distinguishing mark of
certain assemblies of the nobility' ≲ Goth. bandwō. He
further (cf. EWFR 75 a-b and RFE XI, p. 145) gives Sp.
Port. banda 'swarm, group, crowd' ≲ Fr. bande id, Prov.
banda id.

Feist (VWGS, p. 79) seems inadvertently to have merged
the divergent etymologies given by ML (REW 929) for 1) Goth.
bandwja 'sign' ≷ Ital. banda ≷ Fr. bande 'group, division';
Goth.*bando ≷ Sp. Port. bando 'summons, appeal', 'proclama-
tion'; 2) Franc. *banna ≷ Fr. banniere to Ital. bandiera,
Sp. bandera, Port. bandeira 'flag', also Ital. banderiola
Fr. banderole, penderole 'flag' and by ML (REW 930) 1)
Goth. bandwjan 'to give a sign' > Ital. bandire 'to announce publicly or solemnly', 'to ban (a person)', Prov. bandir id, Sp. Port. bandir 'to ban (a person)', also the derivative Ital. bandito 'banned person', 'criminal'; 2) Franc. banjan > Ofr. banir 'to announce publicly or solemnly', 'to ban (a person)'.

Most convincing of all the discussions encountered was that of Corominas (I, p. 384 ff.), in which he clearly distinguishes between the Goth. and Franc. forms and their separate reflexes in Sp., as follows:

1) Goth. bandwō 'sign, banner, 'tandard' > Sp. banda II 'armed band or group or hoard', with the indication that it was borrowed directly into Sp., rather than indirectly via Fr. as Gamillscheg suggests (cf. above), since in Fr. the form was of Prov., origin, and did not appear until the 14th c. In addition, its meaning in Fr. tended toward that of 'flock, herd, drove, multitude (of animals)' as in Sp..

Deriv.: Sp. bandada, bandear, desbandar (with OSp. variant debandar possible taken from Fr. debander, although equally possibly from Ital. sbandare or an autochthonous foundation), desbandado, sobanda; further, Sp. bandeja 'tray', 'tray for fanning out wheat chaff' from Port. bandeja and this from Sp. banda II 'side (in the sense of shaking something from one side to another)'; further Sp. bandera from Sp. banda II in its etymological sense of 'sign, banner, standard' (common
also to Ital. bandiera, Fr. bannière, Prov. bandiera Cat. bandera); from bandera come abanderado, derived from the verb (a)banderar 'to provide with a banner', banderado, banderilla; banderola from Cat. banderola, dimin. of bandera (as a nautical term), embanderar.

2) Goth. bandwō 'sign, banner, standard' > Sp. bando II 'faction, party', it then passed into Cat. where it later developed a final parasitic consonant (bândol), as is common in the Castilianisms and Italianisms of this language. Deriv: abandear, bandearse, bandería, bandero, banderizo, abanderizar. Sp. bandolero 'highwayman', OSp. 'partisan, factious' from Cat. bandoler from bândol.

1) Franc. binda 'sash, ribbon' > Sp. banda I id, indicating in contrast to Diez (cf. above) the improbability of Sp. banda I from Goth. bandi 'fetter, cord', which we would expect in any case to be Romanized into *bandia as *milti to *miltia, andbahti to *andbahtia. (cf. Gamillscheg RG II, 377, 379).
Deriv.: bandeado, OSp. bandado, Ast. bandón.

2) Franc. bannjan 'to outlaw, forbid' (confused with Goth. bandwjan 'to give a signal') > Sp. bandir 'to outlaw, to forbid' (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, pp. 160f.); OProv. OCat. bandir, Fr. bannir and the OFr. variant banir.

4) Goth. *bramon 'to roar' > Sp. bramar 'to roar'

Gmc. cognates: OHG breman, MHG brinnen, brummen, MDu. brommen, OE bremman 'to desire', Swed. brama 'to make noise'. 
There are two postulated variants for this etymology:

*bramon, *brammon (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 17; cf. also below):

Diez (Wb. I, p. 8) says that Ital. **bramare** 'to desire ardently', Sp. Port. **bramar**, Fr. **bramer** 'to roar, yell' corresponding to OHG **breman** 'to roar', but makes no mention of a Goth. form.

ML (REW 1270) gives Gmc. **brammon** 'to roar' > Ital. **bramare** 'to desire', OFr. **bramer** 'to yell', Fr. **bramer** 'to roar (oxen)', Prov. **bramar** 'to roar', 'to desire', Cat. Port. Sp. **bramar** 'to roar' and says that Diez's OHG **breman** and Thurneysen's Gall. **bremm** (cf. Keltorom., p. 92) are not compatible with the Rom. -a-.

Gamillscheg discrepantly postulates Goth. *brammon (RFE XIX, p. 143) and Goth. *bramon (RG I, pp. 366f.) 'to cry, wail, howl', both corresponding to OHG **breman** 'to desire' and surviving in OFr. **bramer**, Prov. **bramar**, Cat. **bramar** and **bram** 'bellow, cry, roar', Sp. **bramar**, Port. **bramar** and **brama** 'state of zeal or ardor', Ital. **bramare** 'to desire with vehemence' and **bramire** 'to yell, cry out, bellow (wild animals)'. He notes that it was probably among the early Gmc. words used by the soldiers in VLat.

Corominas (I, p. 508) favors a direct Goth origin: Goth. *bramon* 'to roar' > Sp. **bramar** id, Port. Cat. Prov. **bramar** id, Ital. **bramare** 'to roar', 'to desire ardently', which corresponds to Sp. **brama** 'desire, mating instinct (of wild animals)', Deriv.: **bramadera**, **bramadero**, **bramido**,
brama, bramo, bramura, rebramar, rebramo.

5) Goth. *brid, 'slab, plank, board' => Sp. brete 'fence, schackle, fetter'

Gmc. cognates: OHG bret, OS, OE bret, NHG Brett 'board'.

Diez (Wb. I, p. 84f.) gives Sp. brete 'foot-bell', Port. 'bird trap', taking it to be OHG brettan, corresponding to Lat. stringere 'to constrict'; he further 9p. 86) gives Sp. Port. Prov. brida, Fr. bride, OFr. bridel, Ital. predello 'fence' <= OHG brittil, prītil (MHG břiten 'to weave') also Ital. brettìne (for brettile?).

ML (REW 1294) gives Goth. *brid 'board, plank' corresponding to OFr. broi 'bird trap', Fr. brai(l), Prov. bret to Sp. Port. brete 'foot-bell'.

Corominas (I, p. 516) gives Sp. brete, probably from Prov. bret 'trap to catch birds' and this from Goth. *brid 'board, plank' (cf. NHG Brett id), here in the sense of 'bird-decoy to catch birds', later 'stock or clamp to hold prisoners fast'. Phonetically it is improbable that brete comes directly from Gothic, for even in Prov. the appearance of the Gothic -d is not altogether normal, but we would surely expect the Goth. -d to drop without leaving a trace in Sp. Therefore, we assume that the word must have been taken over when the Lat. -d was very fricative in a form like *briddu or *britu in the effort to reproduce the occlusive pronunciation of the Goths.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 232) gives Goth. *brids 'snare to catch birds' (cf. above) and (RFE XIX, p. 143)
indicates that since Gothic words from southern France could advance towards the North, we may thus have OFr. broi 'trap or snare to catch birds', Fr. brai and Prov. bret < Goth. *brids 'board, plank' (cf. NHG Brett). According to Wartburg (cf. FEW I, p. 517 under bret), the word could not be Franc. on account of the tonic vowel. Similarly, Fr. garer, Prov. garar 'to care for, to protect' come from the Goth. *warōn, while the Franc. form *warjan gave the origin of OFr. garir, etc. (cf. Gamillscheg, EWFS, 459a).

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 379) gives Goth *brid 'bird snare' > OFr. broi 'bird trap or snare' > Fr. brai, Prov. bret. He believes that the word must be of Gothic origin on account of the stressed vowel. The same word, but with the original meaning of 'board or plank' lives in Alpine Romance and Upper Ital. Since its meaning does not agree with that of the Gallorom. word, this Eastern *brid is counted among the East Gothic elements in Rom..

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 386) suggests Goth. *bridil 'little board, plank' (cf. *brid, RG III, p. 53) > Prov. bredola 'footstool', Como, Bergamo bradela.) although he adds that the Upper Ital. forms could also be of Langob. origin, (cf. RFE XIX, p. 239) he gives Goth. *bridil 'little board' corresponding to MHG brettel id > Prov. bredola.

6) Goth. brikan 'to break, destroy', to struggle, contend' > Sp. bregar 'to fight, contend, struggle'

Brikan is documented in the 3rd singular present brikith and 3rd singular preterite brak, among others, and in the following derivatives: ga-brikan, ga-brukans 'to break', uf-brikan 'to despise', and ga-bruka 'Brocken', among others (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 105).

Diez (Wb. 0, pp. 86f.) suggests a possible Celt. origin. He lists Ital. OPort. brigga, Sp. Port. Cat. Prov. brega 'quarrel, strife, contest', Sp. bregar 'to struggle, contend (with difficulties)', Port. brigar id, Sp. bergante 'villain, ruffian, rascal', Ital. brigate 'group of soldiers, army' > Fr. brigade id, all deriving from the stem brig- 'restlessness, activity, agitation', saying that nowhere do the Gmc. languages offer this stem. He therefore adduces a Celtic origin from the well-known Celt. briga in names of cities. He notes, however, that only in Ital. is the stem almost purely brig-, whereas in the southwest it varies back and forth among brig-, breg-, and barg-.

ML (REW 1299) gives Goth. brikan 'to break' > Ofr. broyer 'to tear apart', Prov. bregar id, Ofr. brie, Prov. brega 'quarrel', but no forms.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 222) on the other hand favors a Franc. origin. He gives Franc. brekan 'to break' > Ofr. brie and broier and says that it collides already in Southern France with Goth. brikan id, with which it merges (cf. RG III, p. 42). He further discusses Goth. brikan 'to break' (cf. RG I, p. 386), noting that Prov. bregar with a closed -e- renders a connection with Franc. brekan
improbable (cf. RG II, p. 114) and that the transition of -k- to -g- in Upper Ital. shows that the word was not first taken over from the Ostrogoths. He therefore adduces a VGoth. military term (cf. the case of Goth *spitus, below) as the origin. He also notes (cf. REE XIX, p. 239) that Sp. brega 'fight' from which the verb bregar derives is borrowed from Prov. brega id.

Corominas (I, p. 515), favoring a Goth. origin, gives Sp. bregar < Goth. brikan 'to break', perhaps via Cat. or Prov., noting that a number of special meanings have developed in Cast., such as 'to knead or pull dough' from Sp. bregar 'to cane, hit with a stick' (transitive) and 'to struggle, have difficulties' (intransitive). He only tentatively agrees with Gamillscheg (cf. above) that bregar in its intransitive meaning may be derived from brega, in which case it would be a Provençalism. Despite the fact, he says, that concrete meanings of bregar are somewhat less used in Sp. than in the neighboring languages, where primitive meanings also tend to disappear in favor of special ones, and despite the fact that brega does have more vitality in Sp. than bregar, the latter is still alive also and that from it comes the variant form brêga found in various parts of Spain. Deriv.: brega(?), embregar, bregadura, bregón.

Various Goth. origins have been postulated for this etymology: *brut*, *bruts*, *bruton* and *briutan* (cf. below).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 90) gives OHG broz 'sprout, bud' brozzen 'to sprout, bud' > Sp. brote, brota, also Sp. Prov. brotar 'to bud'.

ML (REW 1347) postulates Goth. bruts 'bud', corresponding to OHG broz > Cat. brot > Sp. brote id. Deriv.: Prov. broton > Sp. broton; Prov. brotar > Sp. brotar.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 376) posits a Goth. *bruton* (corresponding to MHG brozzen 'to sprout') > Prov. Cat. Port. brotar id, Prov. Cat. brot 'sprout'. He notes (RFE XIX, p. 229) that one must not necessarily concede that the Iberian forms are borrowed from Provençal.


8) Goth. gahlaiba 'companion, company, companionship' > Sp. compañero 'companion'

Gmc. cognate: OHG ga-leipo 'companion', derived from hlaifs 'bread', and meaning one with whom one shares bread.

Gahlaiba is a special case in point, since it is the basis upon which the Sp. calque (loan translation) compañero 'companion' is formed.
Diez (Wb. I, 136f.) gives Ital. compagno, Sp. compañero corresponding to MLat. companium 'company' < com and panis after the model of OHG gi-mazo or gi-leip 'sharer of bread'. (OHG gi- = Lat. cum).

ML (REW 2093) gives the calque *companio 'companion' Gmc. gahlaiba and thence Ital. compagno, OFr. compain, Fr. compagnon, Prov. companh, companho, Cat. companyó, Sp. compano > Sp. compañero 'partner', Sp. compañía 'company'.

Corominas (I, p.871) asserts thatSp. compañero is derived from the OSp. dialectal form compañía 'company'. which assumes a VLat. *compania id, formed at the same time as Merovingian Lat. companio, -onis 'companion', a calque from Goth. gahlaiba id. < hlaifs 'bread', and ga, which expresses company; (cf. also Feist, VWGS, p. 183 on this point). The OSp. compaña (first documented as companiera and companero) derives from an abstract *compania common to the various Med. Rom. languages. Corominas says that compañero 'companion' was perhaps more common with Rom. forms (cf. Sp. compañero, Ital. compagno) which can be derived from *companius, or more likely, the noun companio. Deriv.: OSp. compañá, compañeroa, compañía, compañero, compañon, acompañar, acompañador, acompañamiento, compañeroismo, etc..

9) Goth. *gainōn, *ganōn 'to yawn, open the mouth' > Sp. ganar 'to gain, earn, acquire, win, deserve'

Gmc. cognates: OE gānian 'to yawn, to gaze, to stare'. OHG geinōn 'to laugh', beside OE ginan, gi(o)nian, OS ginōn,
OHG *gīnen, 'to yawn'; OIcel. *gana (gainon or ganon): OE *ganian, 'opening, mouth' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 34 and p. 35).

Several variant forms are postulated for this etymon: *gəainon, *gainon and *ganon (cf. below).

Diez (Wb. II, p. 131) gives Sp. ganado, Port. gado 'herd', MLat. ganatus, 'that which has been gained or earned', 'possessions' corresponding to the verb ganar 'to gain- earn'. Further (Wb. I, p. 202) he gives Ital. Sp. Port. gana 'ardent desire', saying that it corresponds to OHG geinon semantically only in the meaning 'to gape or pant with thirst'. Further (Wb. I, p. 228) Diez gives Ital. guadagnare, Prov. gazarhar for gadanhar, OFr. gaagner, Fr. gagner 'to gain', 'to earn', OSp. guadañar 'to mow, harvest', Ital. guadagno, Prov. gazanh, Fr. gain 'gain' (noun); Sp. guadaña, Port. guadanha 'scythe, sickle'. He says that in view of its initial gu- it must be Gmc. and surmises that its basic meaning lies in OFr. gaagner 'to cultivate a field', whence the meaning 'to earn, gain' came. Diez suggests that the form leads back to OHG weidanon 'to hunt, chase' 'to graze' or weidanjan, from which the meaning was extended from the hunt and shepherd's life to the agricultural sphere. Beside the forms Ital. guadagnare 'to gain', 'to earn' exist Port. ganhar, OPort. guanhar 'to gain, earn'; however, Diez says that Sp. OPort. ganar can hardly result from this by syncope, and prefers to derive it from the noun Sp. gana, since the goal of desire is gain.
ML (REW 9483) gives Franc. Langob. waidanjan \( \Rightarrow \) Ital. guadagnar \( \Rightarrow \) Sp. guadanar 'to mow, harvest', but makes no mention of either Goth. *gainōn or *ganōn or of Sp. ganar or gana.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 382) gives Goth. *gainōn 'to open the mouth widely' (corresponding to OHG geinōn id OE ganian) \( \Rightarrow \) Cat. Sp. Port. gana 'ardent desire'; since Ital. gana id lives only in the literary language, he assumes it to be a late loanword from Sp. ganar 'to earn, to win' (cf. RG II, p. 94). Gamillscheg (RFI XIX, p. 240f.) also gives the variant form Goth. *gaainon (related to OHG geinon 'to plot, conspire') Ital. Sp. Port. Cat. gana 'ardent desire' and, noting that Ital. gana is not registered in any of the Ital. dialects, he concludes that the Ital. word is a borrowing from the Sp. or that the Goth. form *gainon belongs to the group of borrowings limited to Hispanic territory.

In support of the form Goth. *ganan as opposed to the form *gainōn defended by Gamillscheg, Corominas (II, p. 651) clarifies that the radical type gan- comes from the IE vocalism ghan-, while in other Gm. languages the word has the IE vocalism ghin-, ghoin- or ghi-, thence OHG ginēn (to MHG gēnen to NHG gānnen) and geinōn, OE ginian, ganian (\( \sim *\)gainjan), geonian 'yawn'. Corominas says that Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 382), following Diez's example, prefers to proceed from a Goth. form corresponding to an OHG geinōn, OE ganian, Goth. *gainōn, but that before we concede a reduction in Romance of ai to a (which is possible although
exceptional), we should bear in mind that this variant radical is found only in WGmc., but rarely even there, and that these forms do not evidence the figurative meanings of the Scandi-
navian forms, which all come closer to the Sp. meaning.
Deriv.: of gana: aganar, desgano, desgarar, desgana, desganó; ganoso.

Corominas (II, p. 654ff.) further says that Sp. ganar, OPort. ñar probably proceed from Goth. ganan 'to covet, desire eagerly', related to O. Scand. 'to open the mouth', 'desire with avidity', Fris. 'to view with avid gaze', whereas Sp. gana proceeds indirectly from the same Goth. word, the meaning of the verb developed under the influence of another Romance verb: Ital. guadganare, Fr. gagner, Oc. gazanhar, Cat. guanyar < Gmc. waidjan 'to reap, harvest', 'to gain, earn', from which Port. ganhar resulted by crossing.

Corominas finds that the efforts of various Romanists to derive Sp. ganar from Gmc. waidjan fall apart, and agrees with Diez, who correctly suggested that Sp. ganar came from a different Gmc. word pertaining to this lexical family, which originally meant 'to open the mouth' but which later crossed with a Gmc. waidjan also existing in Spain. This last point has been demonstrated conclusively according to Corominas. The original meaning of the Gmc. root waid-
was 'to seek food', likewise in Scand., hence 'to reap, harvest' and Sp. guadaña, 'scythe, sickle'. From this agri-
cultural content, it came later to mean 'to earn, to gain possessions', while in the same way 'to desire ardently'
came to mean 'to obtain' through semantic and phonetic crossing, which resulted in intermediate forms. Deriv: ganable, ganada, ganado, ganato, ganadería, ganadero, ganador, ganancia, ganancial, ganaciero, ganancioso.

Cor. (II, p. 651) also gives Sp. gana, a proper Cast. and Cat. word propagated from Spain to Portugal and Italy and in various dialects of these languages. He says that, although it is of uncertain origin, it is probably from a Goth. *ganō (feminine) 'desire, avidity' related to OScand. gana 'to open the mouth', 'to desire ardently', Fris. 'to view or seek with an avid gaze' (cf. above, Sp. ganar). Corominas considers the most reasonable etymology to be that of Braune, who relates it to the Scand. words cited above. Moreover, since it exists in Frisian, there is sufficient basis to suspect that it pertains also to the Goth. language and that it is lacking in Wulfilian texts due to the incomplete nature of these. This deduction is all the more reasonable because this root, which basically means 'to yawn', 'to open the mouth' is common, with vocalic variants, to all the Gmc. languages and reappears in Lat., Gk., et al. Therefore, although we know no documented Goth. word for 'to yawn', we may well postulate the verb *ganan.

10) Goth. *gana 'goose' > Sp. ganso 'goose'


Two variants are postulated for this etymon: *gans and *gansus (cf. below).
Diez (Wb. I, p. 202) mentions an early reference by Pliny to "gantae" and gives Prov. *ganta 'stork, crane', which, like all Rom. forms, he derives from OHG *ganazzo, (LG *gante, MHG *ganze) 'wild goose', 'gander'. Erroneously he says that the Spaniard used the HG form *gans for his Sp. word *ganso.


Corominas (II, p. 665) favors Goth. *gans > Sp. *ganso 'goose', noting that the word does not exist in any other Rom. languages except Sp. and Port. He explains the rarity of its appearance in medieval sources by the fact that Sp. *ansar < VLat. *ansar, *ansarus 'goose' was a more prestigious word. Corominas objects to Gamillscheg's postulated Goth. *gansus (cf. above) because it is not corroborated by the other Gmc. languages. He says that, since *gans was feminine, it could easily have been Romanized first into *gansa (cf. the case of *gaita below), from which the masculine *ganso was later derived to designate the male. Deriv.: *gansada, *gansear; *gansaron (which could be a hybrid of *ganso and *ansar).
11) Goth. *gasali 'companion' > Sp. agasajar 'to receive hospitably'.

Gmc. cognates: OHG gisell(i)o, MHG geselle 'house or room sharer', later 'companion', NHG Geselle 'companion', 'friend'.

Two variant forms are postulated for this etymon: *gasali and *gasalja (cf. below).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 205) gives Port. gasalha, OFr. gazaille, MLat. gasalia 'community', Port. agasalhar, gasalhar from the noun Port. gasalhado, Sp. agasajar, gasajar 'to receive hospitably' from OHG gisello, in older form gasalji, corresponding to Goth. saljan and OGH gaselljan.

ML (REW 3697) has Goth. gasalja 'companion' > Prov. gazalha 'community', 'company', from which are derived Prov. agazalhar 'to gather together', Sp. (a)gasajar, Port. agazalhar 'to receive hospitably', Sp. agasajo 'hospitality'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377) postulates Goth. *gasalja 'household (cf. OHG giselio) > Prov. gasalha, which lives also in the place name La Gazaille, and to which Rom. *adgasalire meaning VLat. adcompaniare, Prov. agasalhar, Sp. agasajar, Port. agasalhar correspond.

Corominas (I, p.51) gives Sp. agasajar < OSp. gasajo < Goth. *gasali 'company, companionship, social pleasure'. He says that *gasaljan, the accusative form of Goth. *gasalja, latinized to gasalianem is used on the Iberian Peninsula, explaining that the abstract neuter noun *gasali 'company', 'companionship' < *gasalja, on becoming Latinized, produced
gasalium in Castile and Portugal and gasalia corresponding to *compania in the south of France and Catalonia. OSp. gasajo > Sp. agasajar 'to receive with feasts, to treat with obsequious hospitality' originally, came later to mean 'to treat, to entertain', 'to wait upon'.

Corominas disagrees with Gamillscheg's proposed derivation of *adgasaliare parallel to *adcompaniare with the original meaning 'to accompany' from Goth. *gasalja, since documentation proves that agasajar is a fairly recent creation and should definitely express the idea of 'collective diversion' which characterizes OSp. gasajado and gasajo. He further disagrees with the feminine abstract form *gasalja proposed by Gamillscheg on the basis of the fact that abstracts of this type (e.g. sunja) are very rare and derive from primitive forms, while in this case the only documented one in the Gmc. languages is the masculine OHG gisellio 'companion'. He therefore finds the neuter type (e.g. reiki 'riches, excellence, abundance') derived from the adjective preferable. Deriv. agasajo, gasajo, gasajado, gasajoso, OSp. engasajar.

12) Goth. *grimma 'horrible' > Sp. grima 'horror, disgust'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. gremja, OSwed. graemja 'to make angry' OE gremian, gremman 'to irritate' OHG gremman 'to make angry', derived from the Gmc. stem /grem- in OIcel. gramr OE gram, OS OHG gram 'hostile', 'angry', corresponding to ablauting (Gmc. grimma- from IE ghremno- ?) OIcel. grimmr,

Both Goth. *grimms* and *greima* have been postulated for this etymon (cf. below). ML (REW 3867) gives OHG *grim* 'angry' > Prov. *grim* 'depressed, melancholy' from which are derived Prov. *grimar* 'to make sad', *grima* 'sadness, melancholy', Cat. Sp. *grima* 'Grausen, Schaudern', Sp. *grimazo* > Fr. *grimace* 'distortion of features or gestures', Port. *engrimanco* 'deceit'. He notes, however, (REW, p. 870, note 1) that Franc. *grima* 'mask' may also be partially involved.

Diez: (Wb. IIb, p. 135) suggests a Gmc. origin for Sp. Cat. *grima* 'Grausen, Schaudern', 'the horror one feels upon seeing something horrible' and perhaps also for Sp. *grimazo*, Port. *engrimanco* 'distortion, grotesque figure', He says, however, that OHG forms are difficult to assume in Prov. and that a VGoth. *grims* would yield *grem* in Prov..

Gamillscheg (RPE XIX, p. 235) first gives Goth. *greima* 'mask, disguise', masquerader', 'subterfuge' (related to ON *grima*, id. > Cat. *grim*, grima 'fright, horror', OSp. *grimar* 'to be cold', Sp. *grima* 'trembling, quaking' 'horror', 'disgust' [cf. EWPS, 490 b]). He says that a Goth. form *grims* 'terrible, horrible' (related to OHG *grim* id) would probably have yielded *grem*.
Contradictorily, Gamillscheg (RG I, 391) later gives Goth. *grimme 'horrible' corresponding to OHG grim 'angry', as the origin of the Rom. forms (cf. also only Ostrogothic *grimmiba, Ital. grinta, in RG III, p. 53 and only VGoth. *ingrimjis in RG III, p. 40) and doubts that Goth. *greima 'mask, disguises' also plays a role in the Iberorom. forms, Cat. grim, grima 'fright, horror'; OSp. *grima, *grimo which is not documented, although the derivations grimir 'to shudder with cold', grimiente 'ignorant', 'dirty, filthy, mean', also grimoso 'disgusting' are; Sp. grimazo 'panic, fright', which has entered Fr. as grimace (cf. EWFS, 490 b); Port. grima 'horror, disgust'; in Italy, Como grim 'angry', Bergamo gremi, ingremi 'to frighten, to cause to shudder' like OSp. grimir. There could already have been beside grimme 'horror' a form *grimmjan 'frighten' in Goth., to which *grimmipa also belongs.

Corominas (II, p. 788) gives Sp. grima 'disgust, horror on account of something', probably from Goth. *grimme 'horrible' corresponding to OHG grim or grimmi 'hostile' 'fearful, dreadful frightful, horrible'. Although he basically agrees with Gamillscheg (cf. RG I, p. 391) on this origin, he disagrees totally with Gamillscheg in regard to the fact that Fr. grimace 'grimace, wry face' is derived from Sp. (Cast. grimazo 'grotesque posture') and says, on the contrary, the Sp. grimazo comes from the French. According to Corominas, the geographic extension of the word grima and its family
is favorable to a Goth. origin, and its absence in Cat. and rarity in Prov. seem to indicate a late Germanism, after the period in which the Goths had their capital in Toulouse or Barcelona and says that the treatment of the short i of *grimme as i in Romance is then not strange; Corominas does not agree with Gamillscheg's first hypothesis (cf. RFE XIX, p. 235) based on Gothic *greima or *greimi 'mask', 'masquerader', which he finds unsatisfactory from a semantic point of view and which he believes renders the relationship with Fr. grimace more problematic.

Deriv: grimir, grimiente (cf. also agrimar - arrimar).

13)0Goth. *hagja 'guardian, protector' > Sp. aya 'guardian, governess'

Gmc. cognates: OHG hagan, hagian 'to protect, take care of, hagjo 'protector'.

Diez (Wb. IIb, p. 98) gives Sp. ayo, aya and says that it could be from the Gothic corresponding to OHG hagan, hagjan 'to protect, care for', hagjo 'protector, guardian', he also mentions a noun heio (protector' and the personal name Heio. He cannot decide, however, between a Basque and a Gothic origin.

ML (REW 3985) gives Goth. *hagja 'keeper, attendant, nurse', Sp. ayo 'private tutor, steward', aye 'nurse, governess' Ital. ajo, eja. He says it is doubtful, as one would have to suppose that the Gothic word would have survived in the nominative since usually an oblique form would have re-
mained, and that according to the gender of the word, the ending would have been replaced with o, although Sp. occasion-ally does use the a to denote masculine beings. He states that Lat. avia 'grandmother', avius 'grandfather' > aya, ayo is phonologically and semantically to be rejected and that Basque ayo comes from the Sp.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 382) gives Goth. *hagja 'guardian, protector' corresponding to OHG hagjan 'to shelter, protect' > Sp. aya 'nurse, governess', and derives from it the new masculine form ayo 'private tutor, steward', Port. aia, aio. He says that Ital. ajo, aja 'private tutor, teacher', 'governess' probably comes from the Spanish as a late loanword (cf. the case of *gainon above).

Corominas (I, p. 343) suggests that Sp. ayo is of uncertain origin but was probably taken from the feminine aya and this from the Lat. avia 'grandmother', in the meaning of 'older woman who takes care of children'. He finds it difficult to decide between two proposed etyma: Goth. *hagja 'guardian, protector' (corresponding to OHG heio) or Lat. avia. ML notes that in nouns having the structure of *hagja in Romance, forms proceding from the oblique cases usually predominate (cf. guardian, gasallán) on account of which we might expect *ayan; on the other hand, one can concede that *hagja produced first a masculine *aya, the ending of which changed to adapt it to the gender. Coro-minas says that the Lat. derivation presents fewer problems
despite the fact that ML finds the appearance of \( v_i \) as \( y \) impossible, which Cor. admits is not without validity. In favor of the Lat. derivation Corominas gives the OLat. synonym \textit{amo}, derived from \textit{ama} and coming from infantile language.

14) Goth. *\textit{haribairgo} 'lodging, shelter' \( \rightarrow \) Sp. \textit{albergue} 'lodging, shelter'.


The components of *\textit{haribairgo}, although not the compound itself, are documented: \textit{harjis} army and \textit{bairgan} 'to conceal, keep, protect', also the derivative \textit{ga-bairgan} (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 247).


Gamilscheg (RFE XIX, p. 145) gives Goth. *hariberk 'lodging, shelter' > Prov. auberc, Cat. alberch 'a protected place', shelter', Ital. OSp. albergo 'lodging, shelter'. He further (RG I, p. 367) gives Goth. *haribairg-'quarters, lodging' (cf. the Franc. parallel, RG II, p. 140) corresponding to *haribairgon 'to lodge, shelter', conceal', Romanized to albergum, albergare > Prov. auberc, Cat. auberch, OSp. albergar, with its derivatives albergada, albergueria, alberguía 'lodging, shelter'.

Corominas (I, p. 86) gives Goth. *haribairgo 'quarters, lodging, shelter' > Sp. albergue, probably via Cat. alberg or Prov. alberc. He also gives Goth. *haribairgon 'to lodge' > Sp. albergar id. According to Corominas, OFr. herberge comes from Franc. heribenca. He says that the Cast. e could be precisely explained by conceding that albergue is derived from albergar, but that the lack of diphthongization of the e of the noun and the verb indicate more the foreign origin of both words. It was commonly written with -v- in the Middle Ages. The -l- is explained by dissimilation of the two -r-, even as the form albergada is also to be found in the Middle Ages. Deriv.: albergar > albergada; albergue > alberguerco, albergueria; OSp. variant arvenguería (still without the dissimilation of the two -r-).

15) Goth. harihringe 'reunion of the army or legion' > Sp. arenega 'reunion of the army' (harjis plus *hrings 'circle, reunion').
Gmc. cognates: Goth. harjis, (cf. haribaírgo above; cf. also Holthausen, GEW, p. 43 and p. 11); Goth. *hřigis, OE OFris. OS OHG hring, NHG Ring, Eng. ring 'ring or circle'. Eng. harangue (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 48).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 31) gives Ital. aringo 'place for oratory' 'race track', fem. aringa, Sp. Port. Prov. arenga, Fr. harangue (aspirated h) 'public speech', saying that the French initial h makes the origin of the word clearly recognizable. OHG hring, MHG ring 'circle; meeting, showplace, place of exhibition', therefore the Rom. meaning 'that which is presented before an assembly'.

ML (REW 4209) gives Goth. hrings 'circle' ➔ Fr. rang, Prov. renoc 'row', MLat. harenga 'Versammlung, Rede' ➔ Ital. arringa, Fr. harangue, Prov. Cat. Sp. Port. arenga 'speech' Sp. Port. arengar 'to speak publicly'.

Gamillscheg (RG I pp. 387–388) gives Goth. *harihrings 'army group' corresponding to OHG ring 'assembly' (cf. the Franc. parallel II, 75) ➔ Prov. areno 'row', Ital. arringo, aringo 'arena' 'racetrack', corresponding to and touching upon the original meaning Prov. arengar, Ital. arringare, aringare 'to speak publicly'. From the Italian the word entered French: arenge 'solemn address'; in the 16th c. the word was written with h- and today is treated in liaison as if having "aspirated" h-. By popular etymology the word has been brought together with harenc 'herring' as 'haren-geries 'discours de harengères'.

Corominas (I, p. 256) gives Sp. *arenga ≈ Goth. *harihrings 'reunion of the army', composed of harjis 'army' and *hrings 'circle, reunion'. He says, however, that its study in Rom., above all in Cast., is still insufficient, that we need to study more closely its existence, or lack of existence, in the Midd. Ages, in order to decide whether it is an autochthonous Germanicism in Cast. or is imported. The Cat. and Prov. *arenga are old forms; arengar and Ital. arringa, arringare (and aring-), Port. arenga, arengar are frequent since the 16th c., but Fr. harangue, haranguer is a late word and a phonetic anomaly (-gue in place of -ge) surely taken from Prov. or Ital. Its geographical distribution indicates Goth. origin. It is probable that the Rom. languages took it from Clat., which supposedly is corroborated by the literary character of the word in all areas and would explain even better its military-judicial linguistic pertinence.

Corominas disagrees with Diez and ML that Sp. *arenga came from simple Goth. *hrings, with a inserted to facilitate pronunciation, since, in general, no vowel is inserted in the initial cluster hr- (cf. REW 4205-4220) and moreover only the French preserves even a trace of the Gmc. h-, which, although not pronounced, nevertheless prevents liaison. Consequently, it is more probable that it came from the compound *harihrings, with simplification of the two consecutive -ri- syllables by haplology. Given the general character
of the feminine form arenga, which is not well-explained by the ending of this etymon, one may believe that it was first formed from the verb arengar; nevertheless note that arengar is not documented in Cast. prior to 1726. Deriv.: arengar, arengador.

16) Goth. *haspa 'reel for winding yarn' > Sp. aspa 'reel for winding thread or yarn'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel haspa, OE haesp, Eng. hap, MDu. hespe 'hinge', MDu. haspe 'reel', OHG haspa 'reel for winding yarn', OHG haspil, MHG, MDu. haspel 'reel' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 43 f.)

Diez (Wb. I, p. 36) lists OHG haspa, haspel > Ital. aspo, Sp. aspa, OFr. haspie.

ML (REW 4069) gives Gmc. haspa 'reel for winding yarn' (cf. p. 1065, where it is listed as Langobard) > Ital. aspo, Sp. aspa and the deriv. OSp. enaspar, Val. naspar, but OHG haspe 'hinge' > Prov. aspa, Fr. happe.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 251) gives Goth. *haspa 'reel, spool, bobbin, winding frame' > Ital. Cat. Sp. aspa 'two crossed sticks or timbers', 'a type of reel or spool', 'arm of a windmill' > aspar 'to wind', aspador, aspadera 'reel, spool'. He gives Franc. diminutive *haspil (corresponding to MHG haspel 'reel') > OFr. hasple and Franc. *haspa 'door hinge' > Fr. happe, Prov. aspar 'to clasp, couple, link'. He says that this was a Gmc. domestic term, which very likely came into the language via early
VLat. Provençal (cf. the case of hilms) shows not the Goth., but the Franc. base, on account of which we may assume that *aspa meaning 'door hinge' superimposed itself on the older aspa meaning 'reel, spool, winding frame'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 203) gives Franc. haspa, 'bolt, hook' corresponding to MHG haspe id > Fr. happe 'clasp, hook', Prov. aspar 'to link or fasten together'; (cf. haspil, RG II, p. 97). He further discusses (RG I, p. 371) Goth. *haspa 'reel for winding yarn' corresponding to MHG haspe and the Franc. parallel haspa 'door hinge or hook' (cf. RG II, p. 98 and p. 99), saying that the original Prov. *aspa 'reel for winding yarn' disappeared, superseded by the Franc. haspa, thus Prov. 'to hook together' in contrast to the old meaning of Cat. Sp. aspa 'X-crossed sticks or timbers', 'reel, winding frame' > aspar 'to wind thread on a reel', Ital. aspo, aspa > annaspare, which probably point back to a Goth. *anahaspan (Goth. ana 'on, upon') 'to wind on a reel'. Goth *haspa was borrowed in Goth.-VLat. period; *anahaspan was Romanized in the Ostrogothic period.

17) Goth. hilms 'helmet' \( \supset \) Sp. (y)elmo 'helmet'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. hjalmr, OE, OFris., OS, OHG helm (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 45; also Kluge, EWDS, p. 303).

Goth. hilms is documented by Feist (cf. VWGS, p. 255).


ML (REW 4130) lists 1) Goth. hilms 'helmet' \( \supset \) Ital. Sp. Port. elmo id and Franc. helm \( \supset \) OFr. heaume, Prov. elm \( \supset \) OFr. elme, Sp. yelmo.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 367) clarifies that Goth. hilms 'helmet' from which OSp. Port. Ital. elmo developed was secondarily replaced in Prov. by the corresponding Franc. helm (cf. RG II, p. 82), which later made its way into Sp. and crossed with OSp. elmo, resulting in Sp. yelmo.

Whereas Corominas (IV, p. 774) says that Meyer-Lübke and Gamillscheg are in error and favors older form elmo, Elcock (cf. p. 246) states that OSp. elmo is definitely of Gothic origin, but crossed with and was superceded by the Franc. helm, resulting in the present Sp. yelmo.

18) Goth. *hrapan 'to tear or snatch away' \( \supset \) Sp. arrapar 'to snatch away', 'to carry off by force', 'to shave or crop the hair quickly or carelessly', 'to pull by the hair' \( \supset \) Sp. rapar 'to snatch or wrest away', 'to carry off, rob, plunder', 'to shave or shear'.

Gmc. cognates: Alem., MHG, NHG raffen 'to snatch, grab', 'to tear out by the hair', MLG rapen, Swed. rappe, OScand.
hrape, Icel. hrappr 'forcefully', Eng. rape.

Both the forms *hrapón and *rapon are postulated (cf. below).

Diez (Wb. I, pp. 341 f.) says that Ital. rappare (in arrappare), Sp. rapar 'to shave or shear' seem to come from Du., LG rapen, Swed. rappe corresponding to NHG raffen more readily than from Lat. rapere.

ML (REW 7057) gives Gmc.*rapon 'to snatch' (but cf. p. 1068, where he lists it as a Gothic word) > Ital. arrappare 'to snatch away', Cat. rapar 'to rob; Prov. rapar 'to snatch away', but no Sp. reflex. He also (REW 7077) gives Gmc.*raspon 'to scratch or rake together' > Sp. raspar id., but admits the semantic difficulty of a connection between the two.

Gamillscheg (RFU XIX, p. 147) gives Goth. *rapon 'to snatch or seize' among the older loans > Prov. rapar 'to seize', Cat. rapar 'to steal, to rob', Sp. rapar 'to cut the hair rapidly almost to the roots', 'to plunder', Ital. arrappare 'to snatch, seize, rob'.

Gamillscheg further (RG I, p. 367) gives Goth. *hrapón (cf. the Franc. parallel, RG II, p. 144) > Prov. rapar 'to snatch, seize', Cat. rapar 'to steal', Sp. rapar 'to plunder, shave the hair to the roots', Ital. arrappare 'to snatch, seize', noting that the Goth. word is often mingled with Franc. hraspon and hrampon (cf. RG II, p. 144) and also with Goth. *rappa (cf. RG III, p. 53).
Corominas (I, p. 277) gives Sp. arrapar 'to snatch, tear away' < Goth. *hrapōn id. He says that it was a direct loan from Goth. to Sp., which rapidly became archaic, although it still turns up in various parts of Spain with the meaning 'to scratch or claw' and is related to Val. arrapar id., Cat. esgarrapar. He says that Cat. and Prov. arrapar, Ital. arrapare 'to snatch, seize, rob' have retained more vitality than the Sp. reflex (cf. rapar below). Deriv.: (Ast.) arrapuñar.

Corominas (III, p. 998) gives also Sp. rapar 'to snatch, wrest or pull out by force', 'to carry off', 'to pull by the hair' < Goth. *hrapōn. He says that its existence in the 13th c. is deduced from that of the word barbarrapado 'clean shaven, having no beard' and that Port. Cat. rapar, Ital. rapare exist with the same meaning as Sp. rapar. He also mentions Cat. arrapar, Ital. arrapare 'to seize by the hair, seize violently', Prov. arrapar 'to snatch or wrest away', which has extended into French territory (cf. above, Sp. arrapar 'to scratch, or claw', which is, however, rare and unproductive). According to Corominas, by means of a comparison of these Romance forms with Gmc. forms, we can deduce the existence of a Goth. *hrapōn, the basic meaning of which, judging from its cognate forms, would be 'to seize or snatch'.

19) Goth. *ingrimjis 'terrible, horrible' > Sp. ingrimo 'solitary, lonely'.
Gmc. cognate: OHG grim.

The only documented form of the word seems to be
Goth. ingramjan 'to anger', related to OHG grim (cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 235). Two forms are postulated for this etymon: *ingrimjis and *ingrimeis (cf. below). Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 382) gives Goth. *ingrimjis 'terrible, horrible', corresponding to Goth. ingramjan 'to irritate, provoke', (cf. grim- RG III, p. 43) > Port. ingreme 'rough, rugged', South Am. ingrimo 'lonely'.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 235) postulates earlier
Goth. *ingrimeis > Port. ingreme 'craggy, steep, rugged', which has passed to Sp. in certain parts of America, in the form ingrimo with the meaning 'solitary, lonely'.

Corominas (II, p. 999) gives Sp. ingrino 'absolutely alone' > Port. ingreme 'rugged, steep' 'isolated', of uncertain origin. He says that in view of the Port. variants ingreme, ingrime and ingrímado, it is taken perhaps from the OFr. engremi 'angry, irritated', 'afflicted, sad', which is derived from grim, and this from Franc. gram id. Discounting previous proposals of a Latin origin, however, he finds credible Gamillscheg's proposal (cf. RG I, p. 382) of a possible Goth. base in *ingrimjis 'terrible' 'hostile'; related to OHG grim 'terrible' and OHG gram 'irritated' 'sad', from which a Goth. derivative ingramjan 'to irritate, provoke' is documented. He says that the existence of the Goth. adj. is conceivable, but unlikely, since the prefix in-
would not be easily explainable if coming from a purely adjectival formation and not from a verbal one, but that one cannot disregard the possibility.

20) Goth. laistjan 'to follow' > Sp. lastar 'to suffer, pay or answer for another'.

Gmc. cognates. OE lǣstan, OFris. lasta, lesta, OS lestian, OHG leistēn corresponding to OIcel. leistr, OE last, lǣst 'sole, footprint, step', MLG lest(e), OHG leist '(shoe) last, footprint', Eng. '(shoe) last' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 60; cf. also Kluge, EWDS, p. 435).

Goth. laistjan, as well as the derivatives afarlaistjan and galaistjan are documented (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 321).

Diez (Wb. II b, p. 143) says that Sp. Port. lastar 'to pay' is a legal term, which makes a Gmc. origin all the more likely. He suggests Goth. laistjan or perhaps OHG leistjan, leistēn as possible etyma, but says that the Sp. word may be only an abbreviated form of OHG fol-leistēn 'to support'.

ML (REW 4858) gives Goth. laistjan > Sp. lastar 'to pay', also the derivative Sp. lasto 'the right of a citizen to demand return payment from one for whom he has laid out money'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, pp. 382 f. and RFE XIX, pp. 235 f.) gives Goth. laista 'footprint' > Rom. lastare 'to walk in the steps of another'. He further gives Goth. laistjan 'to follow after', 'to achieve', corresponding to OHG leisten
'to fulfill a promise or a duty' => Sp. Port. lastar 'to pay for another under condition of repayment', also the derivative Sp. lasto. He notes, however, that as an old legal term, it quickly became archaic and passed from legal terminology into general use with the meaning 'to suffer unjustly', thus present Sp. Port. lastar 'to suffer for another'.

Corominas (III, p. 39) says that Sp. lastar is of Goth. origin, probably from Goth. laistjan 'to follow in the footsteps of another', which in other Gmc. languages means 'to fulfill a promise or a duty'. Without being more specific, however, he also suggests that Sp. lastar could proceed from some other Gothic word of the same root, but with a different ending and meaning.

21) Goth. lēwjan 'to betray, commit treason' => Sp. aleve 'treason, treachery'.


Goth. lēwjan, galewjan 'to betray' are documented in the Bible (cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 234; Feist, VWGS, p. 330).

Diez (Wb. II b, p. 96) lists Sp. aleve 'treacherous, unfaithful' and, doubting that it comes from Lat. allevare, suggests that it may come from Goth. lēwjan 'to betray'.

ML (REW 5007) gives Goth lēwjan 'to betray' => Sp. aleve 'unfaithful', Port. aleive, aleve 'treacherousness, unfaithfulness'.
Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 234) gives Goth *at-lēweis 'traitor' > Sp. aleve id., from which come the derivatives alevoso 'treacherous' and alevosía 'treason, treachery'. He says that the corresponding Goth. noun *at-lēweins survives in Port. aleive 'treason, treachery'. Gamillscheg further (RG I, p. 383) gives Goth. lēwjan 'to betray' (also fralewjan, galewjan id. probably *galeweins and perhaps *atleweins 'treachery') > OSp. aleve, Port. aleive 'treachery, treason', Sp. alevoso 'treacherous', alevosía 'treachery, treason', which has passed into Cat. as alevos, alevosía. He suggests that the -ei- of the Port. may be due to the fact that the final -i- of atlēweins, Latinized to atlewis moved into the stem (cf. RG III, p. 66) or it may be simply that the Port. aleive was borrowed from the Sp. aleve and adapted to the phonological system of Port.

Corominas says that Sp. aleve is of uncertain origin, but favors an Arabic origin. He says that Diez's etymology (cf. above) is impossible because aleve has only a secondary function much later as an adjective and previously functioned only as a noun. He believes that the form *atlēweins 'treason' proposed by Gamillscheg (cf. above) could yield only *alef, which exists nowhere. Nevertheless, he points out the facts that the pertinence of aleve to the vocabulary of feudal law and the scarcity of abstract Arabic words favor a Gmc. etymology, despite the incongruity of the -ei- in the Port. form.
22) Goth. lōfa 'palm of the hand' > Sp. luá 'glove of esparto grass for cleaning horses'


Lōfa is documented only in the dative singular lōfin and dative plural lōfam (cf. Feist VWGS, p. 336).

Diez (Wb. IIb, p. 146) gives OSp. luá and says that it is obviously from Goth. lōfa, ON lōfi 'flat hand', OE glōfa.

ML (REW 3803) proposes Goth. *glova 'glove' > Sp. luá (cf. Engl. glove). The fallacy of his statement that Diez's Goth. lōfa 'flat hand' is semantically ill-suited to Sp. luá, Port. luva is pointed out by Gamillscheg (cf. below).

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 383) gives Goth. *lōfa 'glove' corresponding to OIcel. lōfe, ONGlöfe (from galōfa) 'glove' OSp. luva, lua 'leather glove', Port. luva 'glove'. In a footnote he designates Meyer-Lübke's (cf. above) Goth. *glova as an impossible postulation (cf. Goth ganōhs corresponding to ON gnōga and similar cases). Further (RFE XIX, p. 236), he gives Goth. lōfa (related to OIcel. lōfe 'palm of the hand') > OSp. luá, luva 'rawhide glove' Port. lua 'glove' and Sp. luá 'a type of glove'.

Corominas (III, p. 140 f.) gives Sp. luá < Goth. lōfa 'palm of the hand', together with which existed the deriva-
tive *galôfa 'glove'. He says that, judging by the Riojan form goluba 'a type of rough glove', it is probable that the original Goth. lôfa had the meaning of 'glove'. OSp. luva > Sp. lúa is preserved now only in the special meaning 'rough glove of esparto grass for cleaning horses', having been replaced in Cast. by the guante 'glove' of Franconian origin via Cat. Corominas likewise says that Meyer-Lübke's *glova is an impossible form because its -v-, which does not correspond to the primitive -f- voiced in English, and also on account of the initial cluster, since the gl- of OE and Scand. is in this case a contraction of gal-, a contraction which is impossible in Goth.; from lôfa there is no phonetic problem, since it is a known fact that the literary Gothic ò was pronounced very close, much like the u of the Visigothic dialect. Thus, pronounced lufa in Visigothic, it passed to luva in Rom. via normal voicing and thence to lúa. Deriv.: luvero.

23) Goth. *mârbus 'marten' > Sp. marta 'marten'


Holthausen (GEW, p. 68) lists Prov. Cat. mart, Sp. Port. marta.

According to Diez (Wb. I, p. 267) Ital. martora, Sp. Port. marta, Fr. marte, matre all go back to a Lat. form martes, which he finds attested in Martial. He notes, however, that forms like martora, martre and others seem to point back to a Gmc. origin.

Whereas Gamillscheg (RG I, pp. 31, 383) agrees that the Cat. Sp. Port. forms are of Goth. origin (cf. also Reinhart, "El elemento germánico", p. 299). Corominas says that a Goth. origin is not certain (cf. also Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 396 f. and RFE XIX, p. 236 on this point).

24) Goth. *raupa 'booty, clothing' > Sp. ropa 'clothing'

Gmc. cognates are: OHG roub, OE refa 'booty, clothing'.

Diez (Wb. I, p. 353) gives Ital. OSp. roba, OPort. roba, Fr. robe, with tenuis Sp. ropa, Port. roupa 'clothing' with the older meaning 'war booty, booty'; also Sp. robo Port. roubo and the corresponding verbs Sp. robar, Port. roubar, OSp. roubir, OFr. rober from OHG roub 'spoils', verb Goth. bi-raubôn, OHG roubon, roupon; according to Diez, this word came into MLat. early.

ML (REW, 7090) gives Gmc. *rauba 'booty, clothing' > Ital. roba 'material, clothing', Fr. robe 'material, clothing, booty', Prov. rauba 'booty', Cat. roba 'material', Sp. ropa 'household furnishings, clothing, linens', Port. roupa 'clothing, linens'. He says that the p-forms have not been explained.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 241) gives Goth. *raupa 'disorganized heap or pile of things', documented from the form raupjan 'to seize, rob', surviving in the Tusc.
ropa 'disorganized heap'; Sp. ropa, Port. roupa show in-
their meanings the influence of VL. *rauba 'clothing',
proceeding from WGmc. Cat. presents (together with the
form ropatge, borrowed from Sp. ropaje) a form roba from
*rauba 'clothing, cloth'. Further, he says (RG I, p. 30)
that the forms spread throughout the western Roman Empire;
rauba 'possessions' corresponding to OHG roub, OE reaf
'booty', 'clothing' could be a WGmc. *rauba. Ital. roba,
Fr. robe, Prov. rouba, Cat. roba, then merged with a Goth.
word, as attested in Sp. ropa (cf. RG III, p. 43). Further-
more, he says (RG I, p. 255) that the Gallorom. rauba
'clothing' from Franc. rauba (cf. RG II, p. 102) just as
raubōn 'to rob' shows everywhere retention of -b-, that
the Gmc. -b- is not merged with the Lat. -b- (as in faba)
is explained by the fact that long before the Gmc. period
 intervocalic -b- had merged with -v- in VL.. In Prov. and
in Iberoromance the consonant shift does not occur after -au-. 
Gamillscheg gives (RG I, p. 391) Goth. *raupa 'disorganized
heap' corresponding to raupjan 'to tear or rip out' > Sp.
ropa, Port. roupa 'linen, clothing, things', which show
in meaning a cross with Gallorom. *rauba 'garment', Cat.
roba id. (cf. RG III, p. 102); Tusc. ropa 'disorganized
heap' is the original meaning.

Corominas (IV, p. 39 f.) gives Sp. robar 'to seize,
rob' VL. *raubare < Gmc. raubon 'to plunder, seize, rob',
Ital. rubare (with the -u- which regularly developed from
an original -au- in Ital. He believes that it belongs to the loans which VL At. made into common WGmc. via the Germanic mercenaries of the Roman Empire. Deriv.: robadera, robadizo, robado, robador, robamiento, robatorio.

Further in the same discussion Corominas gives Sp. ropa, OSp. raupa, roppa, related to Port. roupa 'clothing', 'linens', Cat. ropa with an older meaning 'mercantile goods transported via the sea' (whereas the other Rom. forms are evidently derived from the verb robar in the original meaning of 'spoils, booty'). Since in the Cast. form we are not able to explain the -p- as being due to a Rom. change, we may legitimately postulate a Goth. *raupa 'booty', which was not derived from *raubon, but rather from raupjan 'to pull out the hair, pluck the feathers, snatch' (as related to OHG roufen, OE rīpan).

25) Goth. reiks 'powerful, noble' > Sp. rico 'wealthy, rich, powerful, excellent, noble'

Goth. reiks (or *reikis, cf. genitive singular *Frība-reikeis) is documented only in the genitive plural masculine reikjane; the adjective meaning 'rich', the superlative form *reikists is attested only in the dative singular: reikistin, 'ruler, master'; seems to have been borrowed from Celtic (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 396).

Gmc. cognates OIcel. rīkr 'powerful', OE rīce, Fris. rīke, OS rīki, OHG rīhhi 'powerful, distinguished, grand', NHG reich, Engl. rich.
Diez (Wb. I, p. 349) gives the Ital. adjective rico, Sp. Port. rico, Prov. ric, Fr. riche, deriving them from OHG richi, Goth. reiks NHG reich. Diez says that the Fr. form corresponds to the OHG, that ch could come from OHG ch or from k before following i, not from a final ch or k which would have to produce a c. ML (REW, 7315) gives OHG, Langob. rihhi 'rich' > Ital. rico, Fr. riche; Prov. Cat. ric > Sp. Port. rico.

Gamillscheg (RPE XIX, p. 230) gives reiks, reikeis 'powerful, imposing' (both forms are documented); Sp. Port. rico. He disagrees with ML (cf. above), who says that it came from Cat. and maintains that this assumption is phonetically unnecessary. According to Gamillscheg we cannot tell whether the Ital. rico comes from Langob. (rīhhi) or, as the preceding forms, from Goth. For phonetic reasons, it cannot come from VLat., in spite of its geographic distribution throughout medieval Rom. Further, Gamillscheg observes (RG I, p. 375) that Goth. reiks could belong to the oldest Romanizations: Prov. ric, rica, Cat. rica 'powerful, rich, excellent', Sp. Port. rico, and Ital. rico, in which older ricus comes together with the more recent Langob. rīhhi (cf. RG, II, p. 117) for the Franc. parallel). The word ricus 'powerful, rich' was probably already in use in VLat. in the pre-Goth. period, as the sound developments in individual early-latinized names shows (cf. RG III, p. 70). Goth. reiks then superseded the older
ricus of military usage, as the Langob. rīhhi superseded the Goth. form in Italy.

Corominas (IV, p. 12) derives Sp. rico directly from Goth. reiks 'powerful', pointing out that this has always been the basic meaning, although later it also comes to mean 'noble, excellent' in Sp.. He agrees with Gamillscheg that Goth. is the origin of the three Iberian forms.

On the other hand, Corominas assumes that the Fr. forms must be derived from Franc. *rīki, and the Ital. from the Langob. rīhhi. He says that ML's idea that the Gmc. intervocalic k had to be voiced was a prejudice, as Gamillscheg has demonstrated. Deriv.: ricacho, ricachón, ricote, riqueza, ricura, enriquecer, enriquecedor, enriquecimiento. Deriv. compounds: ricohombre, ricahombría, ricahombre, ricadueña.

26a) Goth. *rēbs 'advice, counsel, provision' > Sp. arrear 'to adorn', 'to order, arrange'.

This word is not itself documented, but an obviously related adverbial derivative ga-rēdaba 'honorable, reputable' is corresponding to the adj. *ga-rebs which is derived from the Gmc. stem rēda- in OIcel. rāt 'advice, provision', (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 198 f.)

Gmc. cognates: Ocel. rāt, OE raēd, OFris. rēd, OS rād, OHG rāt 'advice, counsel, provision' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 81).
Diez (Wh. I, p. 343 f.) gives redo (in Ital. arredo), Sp. arreo, Port. arreo, Prov. arrei corresponding to the verb, Ital. arredare, Sp. arrear, Port. arreiar, Prov. arredar. He says that OHG rāt is a doubtful ety mon on account of the Romance e, but that Goth. garēdan 'to pro vide, arrange for' also cannot be decisive.

ML (REW 672) gives *arredare 'to arrange' and refers the reader to rēps, REW 7339", which, however, is non existent. i.e., not listed in ML (REW) anywhere; obviously he means that arredare is a Lat. word based on Gmc. (Goth.?) rēps, an assumption which is nowhere evidenced in his book. He gives Ital. arredare, Ofr. areer, Prov. arrezar 'to prepare, equip', Sp. arrearse 'to adorn oneself', Port. arrear 'to adorn'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 363) says Goth. ga-rēdan 'to take care of, make provision for' actually 'to provide with (rēps) advice, counsel' (corresponding to OHG rāt id; cf. also Goth. und-rēdan 'to take care of, provide for', 'to guarantee, vouchsafe', ur-rēdan 'to determine, define') becomes Romance conredare 'to equip' (cf. ML REW, 2252); further, arredare 'to make provision for' (cf. REW 672). From conredare he gives Ofr. corrier 'to prepare, put in order' (cf. under corroyer in EWFS 258a), Prov. conrezar 'to equip, fit out', Cat. conrear 'to prepare (the ground)', Sp. conrear 'to work the earth with a vineyard rake'. He notes that the word is sparsely represented in Italian, a
sign that no Gothic loanword is concerned here.

Further, he gives VLat. arrēdāre > Ofr. arrer 'to take care of, put in order', *reths > arrear; similarly Prov. arezar, Cat. arriar 'to wind, start (the clock)', Sp. arrear 'to drive (cattle); arreo 'adornment' corresponding to arrear 'to adorn, trim, arrange; Port. arrear 'to furnish; 'to adorn', Ital. arredare 'to equip, to embellish'. Arrēdāre and conrēdāre are originally military terms for equipping an army, which are later applied to agriculture, where they survive in popular usage.

Probably not a MLat. term, but still in the time of the Tolosan Empire the corresponding noun Goth. *rēps 'provision, advice' became Romanized; there was a second borrowing of the word later.

Further Gamillscheg (RFB XIX., p. 119) says the VLat. forms *conrēdāre and adrēdāre 'to equip, supply with stores, prepare, arrange' are commonly considered to be of Goth. origin; conrēdāre is the Latinized form of Goth. garēdan. That the Goths knew very early that the prefix ga- corresponded to Lat. con-, cum-, is demonstrated by many words formed on a Lat. model such as ga-qumps formed like Lat. conventus, and others. The form adrēdāre derives, it seems, directly from VLat. *rēdum 'care, provision', which proceeds in its turn from Goth. *rēps (OHG rāt 'care provision; cf. also the documented forms (Gothic) und-rēdan, ur-redan, which survive in OFr. roi 'order system, arrange-
ment' and Prov. a re 'in a line'. The Gothic origin of this word is conceded because the IE ē has been preserved here as ē while it has become ā in WGmc. Nevertheless it is possible that the WGmc. form rēd or garēdan had become Latinized before the change ē > ā, which we encounter for example in signs of e in Franconian up to the seventh century. The first testimony of ā > ē in WFranc. is found in 499 A.D., (cf. Brüch, Einfluss, p. 32 ff.) so that a form of Salian Franc. *garēdan could have become Latinized even about the year 450 to the form conrēdare. In any case, the Latinization of this word may be attributed to the fifth century.

Corominas (I, p. 279) gives Sp. arrear 'to adorn, embellish' from VLat. *arrēdare 'to provide, furnish', derived from Goth. *rēba 'advice, provision', a word common to all the Romance languages except Rumanian: Port. Cat. arrear, Oc. arrezar, OFr. areer, Ital. arredare. (cf. the variant Sp. arriar); also Sp. arreo 'successively, without interruption' is Goth *rēba in the sense of 'foresight' (cf. OFr. roi 'order, system, arrangement'), which from 'ordered, in order' came to mean 'successively'. Since a double Latinization in the same language is improbable (cf. 26b below) *ad rēdum > *atrēde > Sp. adrede and > arreo?), we are led to believe that the adverb Sp. arreo proceeds from Cat. arreu. Conrear 'to cultivate (the earth)' VLat. *corrēdare, an adaptation of Goth. garēdan 'to watch over,
care for', is another derivative of -reps; of the same origin are Cat. conrear, Oc. conrezar, Fr. corroyer, Ital. corredare, but the Cast. word is suspected of Catalanism in view of its limited vitality and because it is not found in Portuguese. Deriv.: arreo (noun) 'dress, ornament, finery; arreo (adverb) 'successively'; the variant verb form arriar 'to lower (a flag) in the sense of 'to arrange'; also arriar 'to equip'.

26b) Goth. reps 'advice, counsel, provision' > Sp. adrede 'knowingly, with intention, purposely'.

Corominas (I, 41 f.) says that Sp. adrede is of uncertain origin, but probably is from Goth. reps > at *red 'by advice, advisedly'; also Port. adrede id. To remove or obviate the phonetic difficulties of deriving it from a Lat. directus, various Romanists have conceded that it is a foreign word, taken from Cat. or Prov., where directus regularly gives dreit, dret. Particularly Diez (WB. I, 415) and ML (REW 2648) among others mention Cat. a dretes 'purposely, knowingly' as its source. We would expect the Castilianization of an *adret to have yielded *adrete according to the model of the suffix -ete, or *adredo (as for example vinyet-viñedo) but there are no Castilian words corresponding to -et in Catalan. Since we are treating an important word which has remained constantly in existence since the origin of the language, Corominas says that we can abandon the hypothesis of a Catalanism. He believes that there is no other explanation besides a Gothic origin.
Although *rēps* is not a documented form in Gothic, no one doubts its existence because it is a word common to all the Gmc. languages and gave a multitude of derivatives (garādan, etc.) documented in Bible Gothic, which have left copious evidence in Romance (conrear, arrear, etc., cf. Gamillscheg RG II, p. 290 f.). The use of the preposition Goth. *at*, semantically equivalent to Sp. *a*, was frequent in semi-adverbial constructions of the dative or accusative, e.g. Goth. *at maúrgin* 'in the morning', Sp. *por la mañana* id, similarly, Goth. *at andahtja* 'in late afternoon or evening' Sp. *por la tarde*. Thus the accusative construction *at rēd* 'advisedly, by advice' would be normal and the passage to the idea of *adrēde* 'knowingly' is natural (cf. Lat. *consilio*, *consulto*, which means the same). At rēd was Latinized to *strēde* > *adrede*; a brilliant confirmation of this hypothesis is the Art. *arrede* 'with intention'. Corominas says that since the contact of the Goths was in the center of Spain later than in Cataluña and Southern France, it is understandable that there the -*ē* would be preserved intact while it would be lost in the Lat. words (as pie < pedem). The only phonetic difficulty he sees is in the conservation of the -*e* in Cast. (in Portuguese it is regular); perhaps it is due to the influence of the variant *adedre*, comparable to the OSp. *pedricar* for *predicar*, which was frequent in the Middle Ages, since there exists also *adedrañás*. Deriv.: OSp. *adredemente*.
27) Goth. *sagjis 'minister of justice' > Sp. sayón 'minister of justice, executioner'

Gmc. cognates, OIcel. seggr, OHG sago 'sawer', OE seóg, OS segg 'man' (cf. Holthausen GEW, p. 83 under *sag-)
MLat. saio < *sagja 'royal official, public officer'.

Diez (Wb. II b, p. 174) gives OSp. sayon, OPort. saião 'servant of justice' from OHG sago, MLat. saio, sagio.

ML (REW, 7507) gives Goth. *sagio 'tax collector', Sp. sayón 'executioner'.

Gamillscheg (RG, p. 358) gives saio, sagio 'bailiff, jailer', Sp. sayón 'executioner'; he says, however, that according to its form, the word cannot be Goth. (cf. RG II, p. 74). Further (RPE XIX, p. 141) he says that the word is documented in the Leges Visigothorum as saio, sagio: corresponding to Sp. sayón 'constable, peace officer', 'executioner, headsman', which originally meant 'the one who executes the sentence'. The word is found in Isiodorus and in Casiodorus, the historian of the Ostrogoths but it cannot nevertheless (for morphological reasons) be Goth., and is rather of Franc. origin. The root of this word is found in the Lex Salica as the first component of sagibaro, sagsbaro, sachibaro and others, with the meaning of 'servant of the king', which could nevertheless bear the condition of freedom; *sagio is the simple form corresponding to these words. The form *sagio corresponds also to the Lat. sequi, with which sagi-baro signified 'member
of a retinue' or to *sagan, related to OHG wārseko *wārsaggjo actually 'soothsayer'. It is certain that the form is WGmc. (Franc.) and not EGmc. The word *saggio was one of the expressions of administrative terminology of the Franks, which wandered via MLat. to die later in Gallorom. territory.

Corominas (IV, p. 167 ff.) gives Sp. sayón 'minister of justice', proceeding from a Goth. *sagjas, derived from Gmc. *sagjan 'to tell, notify, intimate'. In eastern Iberia the Goth. word was Latinized to *sagius giving regularly Cat. saig 'minister of justice' while in the rest of the Peninsula under the influence of the synonym praeeco, -onis, it was converted into sagio, -onis, from which Cast. sayón, Port. saiño come.

The basic etymology given by Diez (cf. above), who observes that the word appears in the form sagio assumes consideration of a Gmc. sagen 'to tell, to intimate', Gamillscheg (cf. above) disagrees precisely from the semantic point of view, that it should have the legal meaning appropriate to a derivative of ansagen 'to notify, intimate, announce'. But so far as the form and exact nationality of the etymon is concerned, not much progress has been made since Diez. Corominas disagrees with ML (cf. above), who posits Goth. *sagio, since, besides the fact that there is no documentation of the word in written Gothic texts, the ending of the word corresponds in no
wise to the morphology of the language, where there are no masculines in -o. He negates Brüch's postulation of a VLat. *sagio, -onis < Lat. sagire on the ground that the Rom. and Lat. words met only in territory occupied by the Goths, where judicial relationships and affairs were completely Germanized, besides which the Lat. word is very rare, archaic and without Romance descendants. For this very reason Gamillscheg insists upon a Gmc. etymology, but touches again upon the fact that masculines ending in a nasal have in Gothic the ending -a, -an, which in no wise could yield Cast. sayón, Port. saíão; in consequence of this Gamillscheg believes that the word must have a Franconian origin. Corominas, however, says that the Franks had nothing to do with Spain prior to the eighth century, and that saio appears in Spain in San Isidoro, which is seventh century, and in the Lex Visigothorum even earlier, while there is not a trace of the word in France and other territories colonized by Franks and other WGmc. tribes. In Spain, there were no other WGmc. tribes except the Swabians, confined to the extreme North-east, but sayón and saig are general words throughout the Iberian Peninsula, including Catalonia. He says quite forcefully that the origin must be Gothic and that the key to the whole mystery is given to us by Catalan, despite the fact that this has so far been completely disregarded by Romanists. In Cat., the word is old and securely
rooted, but in the different form saig, also with the meaning of 'peace officer, executioner'. From this source, Cast. borrowed Sp. saje 'executioner, cruel person'. The word sais is preserved today in the Balearic Islands in the meaning of 'town crier, peace-officer'.

It is clear that the Cat. saig presents a form different from that of the documented Cast. and Port. forms. It comes from an older form *sagius, in which it is easy to recognize the actual Goth. form *sagjis which is derived from the verb *sagjan 'to speak solemnly, to intimate'. *Sagjis was Latinized normally to *sagius (or sajus, which is documented in Cassiodorus), from which comes Cat. saig. But in the interior and the western part of the Peninsula, where the Lat. word praeco, -onis flourished (note that this is foreign to Cat.), *sagjis was adapted to the form of its rival and Latinized to sagio, -onis. Deriv.: OSp. sayonia, sayonicio.

Corominas notes that the usual word for 'to say' in Gothic is qipan, which is far from casting doubt that the form *sagjan, corresponding to OE secégan, OLG seggian, OScand. segja. OHG sagēn, ought to have also existed in in Goth., as well as in all the Gmc. languages and in almost all the IE languages. He says that the existence in Goth. of a synonym qipan would permit the reservation of *sagjan for legal use only, corresponding to the NHG derivative ansagen, which is probably precisely why the
word does not appear in Wulfilian texts. Obviously Corominas' argument is the most convincing and most soundly explored.

28) Goth. *sahrja 'basket' ➔ Sp. sera 'large frail basket' *sahra

Gmc. cognates: OHG sahar 'sedge', OE seo, Eng. sedge, MLG segge 'reed'; OIcel. sog, OE saga, sago, MLG sago, OHG saga 'saw' and several others (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 83).

Diez (Wb. IIB, p. 173) quotes Sp. Prov. Cat. sarria 'net or basket made of reed' and OFr. sarrive; also Sp. sera, 'basket for coal', Port. seira 'basket made out of reed'. He considers a possible connection with OHG sahar, but also reminds us of MLat. sarax and Arab. sources.

ML (REW, 7518) gives Goth. *sahrja 'basket', from which he derives Sp. sera and Port. ceira 'basket for figs', but also Burg. *sarrja: from this he derives Cat. sarria, which in turn seems to have been borrowed as Sp. sarria.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377; cf. also RFE XIX, p. 23) postulates a Goth. form *sahrja, which supposedly underlies Prov. Cat. sarria, Sp. sera, Port. ceira and others. A Burg. source (as assumed by ML, cf. above) is improbable.

According to Corominas (IV+ p.196) Sp. sera probably goes back to Goth. *sahrja.

29) Goth. *sēti 'seat, residence' ➔ Sp. sitio 'place, spot, seat; location situation, site'
The Goth. correspondence to this Sp. word is listed neither by Holthausen (GEW) nor by Feist (VWGS).

Diez (Wb. IIb, p. 175) tries to derive Sp. sitio (place, spot, etc.), sitiar, asitiar (to besiege), Prov. asetiar, asetjar, from OHG sizzan, OS sittian 'to sit', also pointing out that there existed a Gmc. form bisittian 'to besiege'.

Contrary to this, ML (REW, 7782) postulates a VLat. *sedicare, in order to account for OPr. siegier, Prov. setjar, with the derivations Fr. siège, Prov. setge and Sp. sitja in the dialect of Valencia. According to ML the vocalic development in Rom. shows that these forms cannot go back to Lat. sedēs (which developed into Sp. seda 'bishop's see' and others); (cf. ML, REW 7781), but must be derived rather from a verbal derivation of Lat. sedēre 'to sit' (cf. ML, REW, 7780; cf. Sp. Port. seer). Prov. seti 'place, spot, location, etc.', Cat. siti, Sp. Port. sitio 'place, etc.; siege' are difficult, according to ML, because of the phonological correspondences. The assumption of a Gmc. influence, however, appears to be unnecessary to ML. ML rejects Diez' etymology involving forms like sittian etc.. The assumption of a borrowing from Franc. is excluded, according to ML, since the word is missing in the north of France. Also a back formation from VLat. *aseditāre (cf. ML, REW, 722) the meaning is 'to sit down' is also excluded.
Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377) says that the form *seiti
is required, which can be seen as an ablaut form to Goth.
sitan 'to sit'. This form would correspond closely to OIcel.
saeti, with a similar meaning. Prov. seti, which originally
must have had the meaning 'place, etc.', could also mean
'siege'; but this meaning could be due to the influence
of Prov. assetjar 'to besiege', which came from a Lat. source.
Note that Cat. seti, siti means only 'place, etc.' but not
'siege', contrary to what we find for Prov., where the
existing verb assetjar could exert such a semantic in-
fluence. Sp. Port. sitio shows that the ending was roman-
ized, parallel to forms like Sp. cirio < VLat. caereum.
The retention of the final -i in Prov., according to
Gamillscheg, shows that the Romanization was a later de-
development. On the other hand, Prov. seti could be seen in
parallel to words of Rom. origin such as cambi, sini, etc...

Corominas (IV, p. 241) accepts the postulation of a
Goth. origin for Sp. sitio with certain reservations, main-
taining that the exact source is still uncertain.

30) Goth. *skairan 'to shear' > Sp. esquilar 'to shear'

Gmc. cognates: OHG, OS, OE sceran, Alem. scheren,
OScand. skera, Eng. shear.

There is no mention of this word in Diez, Gamillscheg
(RG or RFE), or Holthausen (GEW) which is very strange,
because of its extension in so many Gmc. languages.
ML (REW, 8198) gives *squalidus, 'dirty', Sp. escalio 'waste land being put into cultivation' and the Port. derivative escalheiro 'hawthorn', corresponding to squalus (thornbush). He says that Sp. esquilar 'to shear animals' is formally not possible as a derivation.

Diez (Wh. IIB, p. 124) does give Sp. escalio, but it has absolutely nothing to do with Sp. esquilar.

Corominas (II, p. 404 f.) gives Sp. esquilar < OSp. and Arag. esquirar 'to shear', as a dialectal variant, or late loan from Goth. *skairan, related to the Gmc. cognates given above. Corominas observes that it is documented variously as esquirar, desquilar, and esquilar in Sp.

Corominas also calls attention to the dialectal form esquirar. This form, which is documented in medieval Arag. is today common in the high valleys of this region from Plan and Gistáin to Anso; it is also found in Cat. in certain areas. Corominas assumes that from esquirar came Andalusian esquirrar. The forms squirar, *esquilar cross with their synonym OCast. tondir (today tundir), Cat. tondere, resulting in Asturias and Santander in tosquilar, in San Ciprian de Sanabria tesquilare, in Port. tosquiar, in East Pyrenaeic Cat. tosquiar, in Prov. and others tousquirà. In Sp. and Port, by repercussion of the liquid, it changed to trosquirar, also chosquirar, chusq-. Port. trosquirar, and the cited tesquilare went to tresquirar,
which later yielded *trasquilar. The deriv. trasquirón yields today the etymological form with -r-.

The actual Cast. form which is also Cat., and the Port. esquiar show an alteration of the -r- of the Goth. *skaíran, which we find in another Goth. word (cf. espuela *spaúra), i.e. substitution of -l- for -r-, which can be explained by the different quality of the intervocalic Gmc. -r-, in contrast to the IbVLat. -r-. This is the most probable explanation in view of the old date of the Port. form showing this -l-.

Noteworthy is also the Rom. -i- in place of the -e- of the Goth. *skaíran: perhaps it comes from a late variant in the pronunciation of Goth. (we know that the -e- changed then to -i- in this language) or of the VGoth. pronunciation of this same vowel. Note that ai is a secondary alteration of i (due to the following -r-) which could not be general in all of the Goth. dialects. Be that as it may, the same seems to be true of tirar (if it is true that it comes from *taíran) and Prov. gurien(t) from Goth. *waíran (cf. garante), and even perhaps in espía from spaíha. Deriv.: esquila 'shearing season or place'; esquilador--desquilador; (dialectal) esquilo 'shearing'; from trasquilar comes trasquila, trasquilador, trasquiladura, trasquiladero, trasquilón--trasquirón.

Note that the form desquillaris shows what is probably purely a graphic -ll- for -l-. The l- is probably
an ultracorrection, natural from the dialectal origin of the forms, due to the Arag. tendency to replace the Cast. prefix des- with es-. There is also a variant eskerár, used in Fablo (between Broto and the Sierra de Guara) which could have to do with the e-radical of skaíran(?), but note that it is an isolated form.

Fr. déchirer, Prov. esquirar (variant esquirar) is explainable only by a Franc. skerran, cf. Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 223), who postulates a Franc. skirán.

31) Goth. skankja 'server of wine, cup-bearer' > Sp. escanciano 'server of wine, cup-bearer'


Diez (Wb. I, p. 164 f) gives Sp. escanciar, from OHG scencan, scenco; originally: scancjan, scancjo > MLat. scancio, scantio.

ML (REW, 7973) gives Goth. skankja 'wine server, cup-bearer' > Sp. escanciano, Port. escancão, also: Franc. *skankjo > Fr. échanson, but he says that the lack of this word in Cat. and Prov. speaks against old borrowing of it via the Romans; yet the rendering of Franc. -kj- by Fr. -s- is unusual; perhaps it was a borrowing from the Lat. spoken at Court. He also discusses Franc. *skankjan 'to pour' > OFr. eschancier > Sp. escanciar, Port. escancar
(or rather perhaps a back formation from 79737)

Gamillscheeg (RG I, p. 357) says, that similarly to wardja, the identically constructed *skankja 'wine-server' is documented in come scanciarum. The parallel Franc. forms skankjo (cf. RG II, p. 71), Sp. escanciano is MLat. scancianus (like guardián), to which escanciar 'to pour' corresponds. The two instances show the rendering of the Goth. n-stems through -anum pre-Iberom.; therefore the loan probably took place in the southern Goth. Empire in the Gallorom. area (cf. III, p. 29).

Gamillscheeg (RPE XIX, p. 139) also says previously that *skankja 'wine-server', is found documented in the Leges Visigothorum in the form come scanciarum. The form corresponding to the Franc. *skankjo appears in the Lex Salica (and from this we derive Fr. echanson). The Spanish form escanciano, actually escanciador, comes from MLat. *scancianus (cf. guardiano). From escanciano, moreover, developed escanciar. The two attestations of come scanciarum show that the inflection -anus, for the forms of the n-declination, corresponds solely to the early primitive period, which indicates that this evolution was probably produced in the Goth. reign of southern France. Later, the same forms were Latinized by means of the forms of the Lat. a-declination.

Corominas (II, p. 326) gives Sp. escanciar 'to serve wine' < Goth. *skankjan 'to serve drink' (cf. Germ. schenken,
OHG *scenken*, OE *scencan*, OScand. *skenkja*). Corominas observes that this form appears as OSp. *scancar*, much later as Sp. *escanciar*; similarly also Port. *escancar* or *escanciar* (of which the modern *escanciar* is an analogical change). Together with *escanciar* exists the Sp. noun *escanciano* 'wine-server' < Goth. *skankja* (genitive *skankjans*); while Fr. *échanson* (OFr. *eschanz*, *eschançon*) comes from the Franc. form *skankjo*. Corominas seems to think that the Sp. word was borrowed directly from Goth., in contrast to Gamillscheg and ML, who both indicate that it came into Sp. via VLat. He considers this an unnecessary supposition because the postconsonantal *i* before vowel is a general fact in Sp. (in contrast to the other Rom. languages), also in popular words of late introduction, if taken from Goth.; so far as the *-o* of *escanciano* is concerned (like the ending of *guardian* < Goth. *wardja*, *wardjans*), it may be secondary and due to the vacillation between *sacristán* - *sacristano*, *catalán* - *catalano* and other analogies, and in general to the greater frequency of the suffix *-ano* in Rom. Deriv.: Sp. *escancia*, *escanciador*, *escanciano*.

32) Goth. *skilla* 'small bell, cattle bell' > Sp. *esquila* 'cattle bell'

Gmc. cognates are: OIcel. *skjalla*, OHG *scella*, NHG *Schelle* 'bell', OE *sciellan*, MDu. *schellen*, OHG *scellan* 'ring, sound' NHG *schellen* 'to ring', *schallen* 'to sound'
Diez (Wb. I, p. 394) gives Ital. squilla, Sp. esquila
OHG skilla, skella.

ML (REW, 5662) gives Goth. *skilla 'bell, cattle bell'
OFr. eschele, Prov. esquella, esquilla Sp. esquila, Ital.
squilla; Cat. esquella. He observes that the vocalic
relationships are unclear; the e-form could be OHG, the i-
form probably not Goth., however; also the rendering of
Prov. sk- by squ- in Ital. has no other analogies.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 389) gives Goth. *skilla 'cattle
bell' Prov. esquila (cf. RG II, p. 129) which has wandered
into Sp.. He says that the Ital. parallels could be of
Langob. origin, noting however, that *skilla was probably
already in Rom., when the Langob. form superseded it.

Corominas (II, p. 404) gives Sp. esquila I 'bell,
cattle bell' Goth. *skilla, probably via Prov. esquilla.
He says that the only expression for 'cattle bell' which
is really popular among Cast. pastoral terms has always
been cencerro, but in classical Cast. esquila pertains
to the lexicon typical of the pastoral novel, and its
extension in this genre probably influenced the Ital.
squilla. However, the word in the language is far older
than the period of Ital. influence (cf. the variants
esquileta, esquilon). These things, together with the
antiquity of the diminutive in -eta, indicate that esquila
is not a direct Goth. borrowing, but is rather taken from
Prov. where this form is frequent since the Middle Ages. If *esquila were indigenous in Cast., we would expect (as a phonetic result of Goth. *skilla) the form *esquella, as in Cat. The Arag. esquila, esquillota, esquillón may be a direct borrowing from Goth. As Gamillscheg (RG I) agrees, Goth. *skilla is documented indirectly through Ital. squilla, Prov. esquila (-els) and Cat. esquella, and moreover by the form scilla, which is attested in Lat. at a very early date. Deriv.: esquilada, Arag. esquilar 'to ring the bell' (cf. skařran-esquilar) esquireta, esquilón. 33) Goth. *spāhōn 'to scout, to spy' > Sp. espiar 'to spy, watch closely'

Gmc. cognates: OHG spehōn, NHG spähen, MDu spien 'to scout, to watch closely, to spy' OHG spāhi 'clever, cunning' OICel. spā 'to prophesy' OSand. spār 'soothsayer' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 95).


ML (REW, 8136) gives Goth. *speha 'scout, spy' > Ital. spia, spione > Fr. espion, OFr. espie, Prov. Cat. > Span. Port. espía. Further (REW, 8137) he gives Gmc. *spēhōn 'to scout, spy' > Ital. spiare, Fr. épier, Prov. Cat. espiar > Sp. Port. espiar; he notes that the noun cannot be derived from the verb; he indicates that the double form points back to a Gmc. n-stem, the -a- especially
to Goth. He maintains that the verb cannot be a Rom. form, but that the corresponding Gmc. dialect cannot be pointed out.


Corominas (II, p. 390) gives Sp. espiar 'to watch closely to spy' < Goth. *spaïha, 'to scout, to spy'; also Sp. espaia 'spy' < Goth. *spaïha 'scout spy'. He says that there is no reason to believe that it comes from Ital., as some Romanists have supposed, since there are everywhere autochthonous Germanisms. The form in -a of Ital. spia, Prov. Cat. Cast. Port. espaia, and the rare Fr. espie, indicate a Goth. etymon in -a (gen. -ana), corresponding to the Longob. speho, which seems to be documented in Ital. spione > Fr. espion; the phonetic development of *spaïha > espaia is parallel to that of mea > OPort., Cast., OCat. Prov. Ital. mia, judaea >
judia, romaea > OCat. romia, etc. (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 173). Deriv.: espiador, espionaje (< Fr. espionnage).

34) Goth. *spau̯ra 'spur' > Sp. espuela 'spur'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. spori, OE spora, spura. Engl. spur, MDu. spore, OHG sporo 'spur', beside OE MDu. OHG spor 'track, trace' MHG spur, spür (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 95; also documented Goth. spaurds 'racetrack, stadium' in Feist, VWGS, p. 443).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 391) cites Ital. sperone, speone, OSp. esporon, Sp. espolon, espuela, OSp. espuera < OHG sporo, accusative sporon, wherefore the double forms; he says that the verb Sp. espolear is from the Rom. noun, not from the OHG verb sporon.

ML (REW, 8178) gives Goth. spora 'spur' > Ital. sp(e)-rone, Fr. éperon, Prov. Cat. esperó, Sp. espuera, espuela, esporon, espolon, Port. espora, esporão.


Corominas (II, p. 399 f.) gives Sp. espuela 'spur' < Goth. *spau̯ra, which is documented variously as in OSp. espula (understood espuola), (e)spuera, Sp. espuela; also Port. espora; but the antiquity of the form with -l- is verified by OPort. espola and in other dialect forms. This consonantal change could be explained by the influence of the
diminutive suffix -ola, Cast. -uela; but the parallel case of esquilar suggests that the difference in manner of articulation of the Hispanic intervocalic -r- (shorter and more fricative) and the Gmc. -r- could be at least partially the cause of this substitution of sounds. The other Rom. language, Ital. sperone, Fr. éperon, Prov. esporon, and even Cat. esperó (variants: sporó, esporón) come from the Langob. or Franc. *sporo (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 384). Deriv.: espoleta, espolín (variant: espuelín), espolique, espolista, espolada, espolazo; espolear, espoleadura; OSP. espolón (synonym of espuela) and probably an adaptation of Gallorom. esporón; espolonar (or espolonear), espolonada (or espolonazo).

35) Goth. *spitus 'roasting rack spit' > Sp. espeto 'spit, poker, large pin';

Goth. *spitus 'roasting rack, spit' > Sp. espita 'spigot, spout', Goth. *spitus 'roasting rack, spit' > Sp. espetón 'spit, poker, large pin'

Gmc. cognates: (Goth. *spitus) OE spitu, OHG spiz, MLG spit, Eng. spit, beside Norw. spit, OHG spizza, spizzi, MHG spiz 'pout'. (Goth. spiuts) OIcel. spjöt, OS spiot, OHG spioz, beside OIcel. spjota, Norw. spjote 'pointed arrow' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 96).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 393) gives Ital. spito; Sp. Port. espeto 'roasting spit', from OHG spiz 'spit, point' beside LG spit 'roasting spit'; synonyms with -d are: Ital. spiedo, Sp. espedo, spiedo; he questions whether the mediae
by accident stand for the tenues or whether the word is from OHG 'spear' with $\text{r} > \text{d}$ in Ital. (?).

ML (REW 8163) gives Goth. *spiuta 'spit' and indicates on (p. 836) Sp. espeto (for 8163), but then doesn't mention it there. He also gives Franc. *speut > OFr. espieu, espiet > Ital. spiedo, espièdo, Fr. épieu, Prov. espeut.

Gamillscheg (RPE XIX, p. 242) gives Goth. *spitus 'pike, spit' surviving as a very old OGoth. loan in Ital. dialect forms as spedo, spitu, ispidu 'spit'; he says that the word is found in MLat., having been documented in the form spitus in the 8th c. Gamillscheg quotes OFr. espoit, which could also be of the same origin, but all these related words could pertain to PGmc. *spitus (OHG $\text{griz} 'spit') which would belong to the first series of Gmc. words incorporated into VLat. A place apart is occupied, by virtue of the maintenance of the intervocalic $-t-$, by OSp. espeto, Sp. espetón 'spit' and the verb espetar, which come from the VGoth. period.

Further, Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 373) gives Goth. *spitus 'spit', and says that it must belong to the oldest MLat. loanwords, although it is not retained in Gallorom., since it lives in Alpine Rom. and in Ital. it even made the change from $-t-$ to $-d-$ (cf. Engadine) spait 'needle, point, spit', Lombardic sped, Calabrian spitu, etc.; this *spitus is thus the old expression, which in Middle Italy the Tuscan spiedo (cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 81)
coming from Franc. superseded; on account of Franc. *speut, *spitus was not retained in the south of France. To it belong further: Sp. espetón, OSp. Port. espeto 'roasting spit'.

Corominas (II, p. 390) gives OSp. espeto, Sp. espetón 'spit' from Goth. *spitus, cognate with OS spitu Eng. spit, OHG spiz, NHG spiess. He notes that *spitus seems to be a word distinct from NHG Spiess (with long -i- in the Gmc. dialects), and corresponding to OHG spioz, OS spiot, OScand. spjöt 'javelin, dart', from which come Fr. épieu, Prov. espeut, although Ital. spiedo, proceeding from the other Gmc. word, combines both meanings and from this the OSp. variant espiedo 'spit' and OFr. variant espiot developed. He agrees with Gamillscheg (cf. above) that Ital. forms spait, spēd, ispidu, etc. among various forms of Southern Italy, come from *spitus. Deriv. espetar, OSp. espetal (synonym for espeto) espetera, espetellarse OSp. *espetiello (dialect).

36) Goth. *spola 'reel, spool' > Sp. espolín 'small shuttle for brocading'

Gmc. cognates: MLG spōle, OIce. spōla, MDu. spoele, OHG spuola, spuolo, NHG Spule, Eng. spool (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 96)

Diez (Wb. I, p. 393) gives Ital. spola, spuola, Sp. espolín from OHG spuolo 'Spule'.
ML (REW. 8167) gives Goth. *spola 'Spule' > Ital. sp(u)ola to Prov. espolo 'shuttle' Fr. espole and the Ital. derivative spoletto; he also notes that Sp. espolin < Fr. espolin could be based on Prov. *espolin, also Franc. *spol > Prov. espol, from which Prov. espulet, Cat. espolet 'spool holder' are derived.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 121) notes that *spola 'spool reel' comes from an EGmc. dialect, but not from Goth., on account of the open -q- (Prov. espolo, Ital. spuola) to which a WGmc. form with final -o (cf. OHG *spolo) corresponds. Further, Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 373) gives Goth. *spōla 'spool' corresponding to OHG spuolo, which survives nowhere, as one would expect; the Rom. form espola rather shows an open -q- (cf. Prov. espol, Rom. *spōłum, a back formation of spōla) which also survives in Alpine Rom., e.g., spieul, spuol, spoul, spoil; spōla survives in Prov. espolo, Ital. spuola which thrives throughout the Ital. language area. In Iberorom. the word is lacking. The open pronunciation of the -q- in *spōla shows the influence of the semantically related *rocca 'spindle clip, distaff' (cf. *rukka, RG I, p. 372) except that in the case of *spola the Gallorom. form has not been corrected by a later OGoth. form *spola; *rukka, and *haspa are witnesses to the significance of the VGoth. household industry.

Corominas (II, p. 398) gives Sp. espolin 'small shuttle for brocading', taken from Fr. e(s)poulin and
Prov. *espoulin*, a diminutive of Prov. *espol*, which is to be derived from Goth. *spōla* id. (cf. OHG *spuolo*, NHG *Spule*). He says that like the Fr. *(e)spoulin*, it is found only in modern times. OFr. *espole* is very rare, and it is probable that it comes from Prov. In any case, the Sp. form had to be taken from Fr. or Prov. and could not be an autochthonous Germanicism in view of its very special meaning and of the absence of the primitive form *espōla*.

37) Goth. *stakka* 'stake' > Sp. *estace* 'stake, picket, pile, pole'


Holthausen additionally gives a series of Rom. words which could have developed from the Goth. word *stakka*: OFr. *stache*, Prov. Cat. Sp. Port. *estaca* 'stake, picket, etc.' Moreover, he assumes that there was a Goth. verb *stakkōn* 'to tie to a stake', corresponding to OFr. *estachier*, Prov. Cat. Sp. Port. *estacar* (cf. Holthausen, *GEW*, p. 98). It should be noted, however, that the meaning of Sp. *estacar* is 'to fence with stakes' rather than 'to tie to a stake', which seems to indicate that the Sp. verb was a secondary derivation from Sp. *estaca*, rather than a direct
development of Goth. *stakkōn. Another derivation is Sp. estacada 'stockade'. The Goth. stem assumed to underlie these Rom. words is also discussed by Feist (VWGS, p. 448 f.)

Diez (Wb I, p. 394) gives Ital. stacca and lists OE staca, OFris. MLG stake 'stake', without indicating which dialect was the one from which this form was borrowed.

ML (REW, 8218) postulates Goth. *stakka as the source of OFr. estache, MFr. attache, Prov. Cat. Sp. Port. estaca. Sp. estaca (according to ML it has the meaning 'to tie cattle to a stake') is a derivation from Sp. estaca and must also be based on a Goth. form, since a derivation from VLat. attracticare, *attagicare is impossible; OFr. estachier is older than attachier. There is also a Sp. word estacha 'rope attached to a harpoon (used in catching tummy)', which phonologically would suggest a derivation from Fr. forms, but ML points out that it would be difficult to imagine that a word used on the coast of Spain would have been imported from central France.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 378) mentions Goth. *staka and *stikka, but says that only the latter should correspond to OFr. estache, Prov. Cat. Sp. Port. estaca. Corominas (II, p. 410 f.) agrees that Sp. estaca is probably of Goth. origin.
38) Goth. taikn(n) 'mark' > Sp. tacha 'fault, defect, stain';
   Goth. taikns (f.) 'sign, miracle' > Sp. taco 'plug, peg'.

   The Goth. form taikn is attested only in the accusative singular. It corresponds to OIcel. teikn, OE tācn, Eng. token, OFris. tēken, OS tēkan, OHG zeihhan, but also to OE tāscan 'to teach' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 106).

   Holthausen notes that this etymology is left unexplained, however, and refers to the feminine form Goth. taikn-s. This stem is also discussed by Feist (cf. VWGS, p. 472).

   ML (REW. 9534) lists Goth. taikn, taikka, corresponding to Ital. tacca 'notch, stain, fault, defect, quality, condition', Fr. tache 'stain', Prov. Cat. taco 'stain, patch', Ital. tacone. No mention is made of Sp. According to ML, a related stem was also borrowed from Franc. into the Rom. languages, Franc. *tekka, which could account for Ital. tecca 'fault, defect', OFr. teche 'fault, defect' the development of a doublet in -a, -one in Ital. taca, tacone indicates a Goth. masculine n-stem, according to ML (which would be a parallel development to the attested form Goth. taikns).

   Diez (Wb I, p. 404) mentions Ital. tacco, Sp. tacha, but also a Sp. form atacar, Fr. attacher 'to fasten, to attack'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 374) assumes that Goth. *taikns* was Romanized as *taccum*, which is attested in Prov. *taka 'stain*, tacon 'patch*, Sp. Port. *taco 'plug, peg*, Ital. tacco, but also *tacca 'sign*. Although this etymology is certainly unclear, we can assume that Goth. *taikns* was involved (Cf. also Corominas, IV, p. 333 on *taco*).

39) Goth. *taujan 'to do, execute, construct' > Sp. *ataviar 'to trim, adorn, dress richly*

Goth. *taujan* is documented in the preterite *tawida* and in various derivative forms: *gataujan* and *gatēwjan*, among others (cf. Feist VWGS, p. 474).

Gmc. cognates are: OIcel. *týja, tēja 'to help*, OE *tōwian 'to prepare*, OS *tōgian 'to make, to do*, MLG MDu. *touwen*, OHG *zouwen 'to prepare, to order', 'to arrange*, OHG *zawjan* (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 107).

Diez (Wb. II b, p. 97) gives Sp. Port. *ataviar 'to adorn*, atavío 'finery, adornment*. He says that an Arab. derivation is impossible and that it corresponds phonologically to Goth. *ga-tēwjan 'to arrange, put in order*, but also to *taujan* (tawida) and other Gmc. cognates, all meaning 'to do, to prepare*. He notes that in Sp., *a* (equivalent to Lat. *ad*) is prefixed to the verb.

Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 237) gives taujan 'to do, to make' and apparently also 'to prepare, to adorn or embellish' (cf. also the related Goth. form gatewjan 'to order, to arrange'), which survives in Cat. Sp. and Port. ataviar.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 393) also gives Goth. taujan 'to do, to affect' and the derivation probably *attaujan 'to put in order', in the sense of MDu. touwen, in Cat. ataviar' order, arrange', 'embellish', 'adorn'.

Corominas (I, p. 317) gives Sp. ataviar 'to adorn or dress richly' from Goth. taujan 'to do, make, execute'. He says that it also exists in Port. (and in Cat., where it is a Castilianism). According to him it is not improbable that a Goth. derivative *attaujan existed in the meaning of 'to prepare', which is the meaning of Du. touwen of the same origin. (Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, 249 for possible representatives in Ital. and Rum. of this same Gmc. word.). Deriv.: atavió.

40) Goth. *bahuks 'badger' > Sp. tasugo 'badger'

Holthausen (GEW) and Feist (VWGS) do not list this Goth. stem.

According to Diez (WB I b, p. 410) Ital. tasso, Sp. texon and tasugo, Port. teixugo 'badger' seem to correspond to a MLat. word taxus 'badger', which is attested for the 8th and 9th c. Diez also mentions OHG dahs, Germ. Dachs, he tries to derive these forms from Lat. taxea 'fat,
grease', pointing out that Isiodorus already indicated that the name for this animal was due to the fact that it lives on its own fat throughout the winter months. But this is certainly very hypothetical, as Diez himself admits.

ML (REW, 8606) postulates a Gmc. form *taxo 'badger' as the underlying form of Ital. *tasso, Prov. tais, OFr. taisson, Prov. tais, Sp. tejon, tasugo, Port. teixugo. He also mentions that the Sp. Port. forms probably go back to Goth. *bahsus, which could also be the basis of Ital. and Prov. forms, but this assumption is not necessary here. ML states that the form *taxo, which is attested since the 4th c. A.D. could be a Rom. as well as a Germ. formation. A special difficulty is presented by the Sp. variant from tasugo, which we would expect to be *tejugo, parallel to Port. teixugo.

Gamillscheg (Cf. RG I, p. 27, esp. fn. 1) shows that Sp. tasugo cannot be a continuation of VLat. *taxus, as it had been assumed by ML. Instead of this he assumes that there was a VGoth. form *bahsuke, which has to be explained as a diminutive of Goth. *bahsus. The -k- suffix in this case would be a parallel to OE bulluc 'young steer'. The same formation is also attested in a number of Gmc. names. On the other hand, several Iberian forms testify to the fact that the Gallorom. form *taxo also entered the Iberian Peninsula: Cat. teixo, Sp. tejon, a Port. form
*teixaðn* is not attested. However, at one time it must have existed since otherwise Port. *teixugo* (in which /x/ corresponds to Lat. /s/ rather than Goth. /hs/) could not be explained. Prov. *tais* could correspond to VLat. *taxus*, but not VGoth. *bahsus*, but it could also be a back formation from *taison*. Corominas (IV, p. 411) agrees that the Sp. word is probably of Goth. origin (Cf. also Gamillscheeg, RG, I, p. 384).

41) Goth. *triggwa* 'treaty, alliance' > Sp. *tregua* 'truce, rest, repose, respite'

The noun *triggwa* 'treaty, alliance' is also documented as the adjective *triggwa* 'loyal, dependable' from which it is derived, (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 480).


Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 237) gives *triggwa* 'alliance' Sp. *tregua*, Port. *tregoa*. He says that the Sp. form presupposes a base with -ɪ- or with -e- (cf. *yegua* from *equa*). As in the case of *hilms-helm* the Franc. form has superimposed itself. Further, Gamilschegg (RG I, p. 369) gives Goth. *triggwa* 'alliance', Sp. *tregua*, Port. *tregoa* 'cease fire, which presuppose an -ɪ- or -e-. He says that Prov. *trèga*, *trèva* is Franc. *treuwa* (cf. RG II, p. 133), but as is to be assumed in the case of *hilms-helm*, it is also to be supposed that the Franc. word replaced the Goth.. Ital. *tregua* 'cease fire' is likewise of Franc. origin, as the old form *triegua* shows (cf. also with open -e- the Parman *trègua*, Apulian *treghe*, *tregue* 'unification'), but *trigga* 'hesitation, delay', *trigar* 'to delay' in the dialect of Trient is again clearly Goth. Prov. *triuba*, together with *trèga*, seems to come from OAlem..

Corominas (IV, p. 562) gives Sp. *tregua* 'truce' < Goth. *triggwa* 'treaty'. He says that it occurs also in Sp. in the meaning of 'space of time given to someone to complete an obligation', but that we do not know whether this comes from a special usage derived from the Goth. meaning or whether it is simply a figurative use of *tregua* in its ordinary meaning. He says that the meaning 'suspension of hostilities' is in general use throughout all the periods. Goth. *triggwa* means 'treaty' but also 'alliance'. He assumes that Port. *trégoa* (and variants)
like tregua, trega, which exist respectively in OCat. and OProv. are from Goth., but that in these languages, the form treva predominates, which together with Fr. trève comes from the Franc. *triuwa (OHG triuwa 'fidelity'), related to the cited Goth. word, which is derived from the adjective Goth. triggws 'true, loyal', in Ital. tregua, to judge by the vocalism of the dialectical forms, the influence of the Franc. word seems to have superimposed itself upon the Goth. Deriv.: treguar, OSP. atregar or atreguar.

42) Goth. priskan - 'to thresh, thrash, tread' > Sp. triscar, 'to tramp, to stamp the feet'

Goth. priskan is documented only in accusative singular masculine of the present participle, for which the form *priskandan is assumed instead of priskaidai, the form actually found, and in the dative singular of the present participle, priskandin 'to thresh' (Cf. Feist VWGS, p. 503, and Fowkes, Studies, p. 48 f.).

Gmc. cognates OIcal. priskia, pryskva, OSwed. priska, pryskia, OE perskan, MLG derschen, dorschhen, OHG dreskan. NHG dreschen, Eng. 'thresh'.

Diez (Wb I, p. 422) gives Ital. trescare, Goth. priskan, OHG dréscan, NHG dreschen, and says that it actually means 'to tramp the feet'.

ML (REW 8715) gives Goth. priskan 'to thresh', Tuscan trescare, 'to stamp, tramp', Ital. trescare 'to dance, jump or frisk about', OFr. troschier 'to dance' Prov. trescar,
Cat. trescar 'frequent flying in and out (of bees)', Sp. triscar 'to trample with the feet, to joke, tease', Port. triscar 'to argue, fight, cause confusion'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 393) gives Goth. priskan 'to thresh', probably also 'to stamp the feet' which developed to Sp. triscar 'to stamp or tramp' 'to mix', trigo triscado 'grain, the straw stems of which have become so entangled that it can be moved only with difficulty', Port. triscar 'to cause confusion' 'to argue, fight', and the noun trisca 'argument', Lomb. trescà 'threshed grain; in Latium tresca 'to walk on grapes with the feet', in Abruzzen tresca 'to have grain trampled by animals'. This still signifies in OGoth. the primitive way of freeing grain from the husk, not threshing with a threshing flail. Beside it the Gallorom. word *trescare 'to dance' has also made its way into use-age (cf. RG II, p. 112). The Ital. word could also be of Langob. origin.

Gamillscheg (RPE XIX, p. 237) gives Goth. priskan 'to pound, grind with the feet', documented in the meaning 'to thresh, tread out', > Sp. and Port. triscar 'to mix one thing with another, to entangle, involve in difficulties', 'to make noise with the feet or to give a blow with the foot'. The Ital. trescare 'to pound with the feet, to thresh, tread out' seems to come from the OGoth. (cf. the difference in the result of the treatment of the Gmc. -i-). The same word, but from Franc. *preskan survives in the OFr.
treschier Prov. trescar 'to dance, to frisk about', from which comes Ital. trescare 'to dance', tresca 'dance'. In this word we find a case of the cultural influence of the Carolingian time.

Fowkes (Studies, p. 48 f.) says that despite the infrequent occurrence of priskan in Goth., it is well-known and of frequent occurrence in the other Gmc. languages, always with the meaning of 'to thresh, to thrash'. He seems to agree with Feist (VWGS, p. 503) that the original meaning was 'to stamp the feet', this being presumably the earliest method of threshing grain, to judge from the survival of the word in loans throughout the Rom. languages meaning 'to dance, stamp the feet, etc., but says with ML (REW, p. 722) that there is ample evidence that the meaning 'to thresh' was also present in Gmc. at the time that these words were borrowed into Rom. (cf. especially dialectal Ital. forms), and states that the Gmc. word borrowed into Rom. clearly meant 'to thresh', whatever other meanings may have been present or subsequently acquired.

Corominas (IV, p. 585 f.) gives Sp. triscar 'to stamp the feet, to frolic about' from Goth. priskan 'to thresh', from which it changed to 'to frolic, to make merry', 'to kick, stamp'. He says that the Port. triscar, Cat. trescar, have meanings analogous to the Span. in the Prov. trescar, OFr. treschier and Ital.
trescane, the idea of 'to dance' predominates. According

to Corominas, the Fr. form assuredly comes from the Franc.

*preskan, while the Sp. and Port. forms without doubt
derive from the related Goth. priskan, Ital. vacillates
between the Goth. and the Langob., the Prov. and Cat.
forms between Goth. and Franc. (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I,
p. 393, who decides for Franc.). Corominas says that the
Goth. source is more probable, in view of the pronunciation
tresca in Cat., tresca in Prov. The difference in vocal-
ism is explained because the Goths were not firmly settled
in Central Spain until a much later date than the time
of their domination in Catalonia and Southern France.
Meantime the Lat. -ī- gave way to the Gmc. -i-. He says
that we could also concede that the word entered VLat.
from PWGmc. and that in Cast. and Port. it was then
influenced by the Goth. vocalism. Deriv.: trisca.

43) Goth. wai - 'alas!, woe!' > Sp. ¡guay! 'alas!, woe!'.

Wai is documented as an interjection meaning 'alas',
also in wai-nei as an interjection 'if only not... ', and
wai-fairjan 'to lament, bewail', among others (cf. Feist
VWGS, p. 541).

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. vei, vaē, OE waē, wæ, OS, OHG
weā, NHG Weh, Engl. woe 'alas!' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 117).

Corominas (II, p. 822) gives Sp. guay 'alas!' (an
interjection of lament) from Goth. wai id. (it is inter-
esting to note that he makes a diphthong of it). According
to Corominas guai is used in the same manner and meaning in Port. and Ital., in which it even figures in Dante, a date which excludes the possibility of an Arabic etymology despite the fact that wai is also Arabic and used in Arabic as an interjection of both lament and admiration. The fact that the Gothic and Romance usages are solely of lament speaks more for the Goth. origin, likewise the ample cognates in other Gmc. languages. The antiquity and prolific character of the word are confirmed in Ital. by abundant derivatives: guaire 'to lament, bewail', guaiio 'misfortune, sorrow, disgrace', etc. The absence of the word in other Romance languages further evidences the fact that it is a Gmc. loan and not an onomatopoeic autochthonous creation. In Sp. the use of guay now tends to become archaic and to be converting itself into a poetic term. Deriv.: guaya, guaias 'songs of lament', guayar, guayado, guayadero.


ML (REW 9480) gives Goth. wai 'woe'; Ital. guai, Fr. ouais, Sp. guay, Port. guai. Deriv.: Ital guaire 'to whine, whimper', guaiio 'whining', Sp. guayar id., guaya 'lament', OPort. guaiar 'to wail, bewail, cry', guaia 'lament'.
He says, however, that the Rom. words were probably not borrowed from Gothic wâi, OHG wai, rather were independent onomatopoetic word creations.

44) Goth. wardja 'sentinal, guard' > Sp. guardia 'guard (body of armed men, cf. guardia civil)'

Gmc. cognates are: OHG warto 'keeper', Goth. -ward-s (GEW, p. 121) 'keeper, guard', OIcel. yrâd-r, OE weard (as in Eng. lord < OE hlæf-weard), OS ward, OHG wart, Goth. *wardon 'to watch', OIcel. varða, OE weardian, OFris. wardia, OS wardon, OHG warton, all these forms go back to a Gmc. root underlying Goth. war-s 'aware, cautious, on the alert', OIcel. var-r, OE waer, Eng. aware, OS war, OHG gi-war, and various other derivations (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 120).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 230 f.) gives Ital. guardare Sp. guardar and derives these words from OHG warten. Ital. Sp. guardia, according to Diez, corresponds directly to Goth. wardja, OHG warto, warta.

ML (REW, 9502) gives Gmc. *wardan as the etymological source for Ital. guardare, guardia, Fr. garder, Prov. gardar, Cat. gardar, Sp. Port. guardar, with the following derivations: Sp. Port. guarda,
guardia 'guard, sentinel', Sp. guardián, Sp. guardoso 'economical, saving', Prov. esgart (> Sp. esguarde) 'regard, consideration', Sp. reguardar 'to watch, to look at'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 356 f.) assumes Goth. wardja 'feminine guard' to be the basis of Rom. forms. Goth. wardja is attested in three instances as a military term. According to Gamillscheg, it was Latinized as guardianus in all areas which came under the reign of the Goths. He notes, however, that in the VGoth. Leges not the Latinized form is used (which seems to have been taken over as early as in the fifth c.), but the Goth. form with -a-. Accordingly, Sp. guardián, Port. guardião must be derived from MLat. Contrary to this, guardia can be assumed to go back directly to Romanized VGoth. (Cf. also Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 369).

Corominas (II, p. 815) agrees that the ultimate source is probably Goth., but he also notes that Sp. guardia is perhaps a military Italianism which was borrowed from Ital. in the 16th c.
3.2 Probable Etymologies

1) Goth. andbahti 'office, service' \(\Rightarrow\) Sp. embajada 'embassy'

Gmc. cognates: OHG ambahiti 'service' corresponding to OHG ambahiten 'to serve'. Both Goth. andbahti and andbahtjan are documented forms (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 6f.).

According to Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 379) Goth. andbahti 'office, service' is derived from Goth. andbahts 'servant', which itself is borrowed from Gaulish ambactus. From ambactus we have Gallorom. ambactia \(\Rightarrow\) Prov. ambaissat, ambaissada 'embassy', whence the Ital. Fr. Sp. Port. forms. He says that the Franc. development ambascia, ambaxia 'commission', which appears in the Lex Salica, perished again quickly in northern France and that the word which survives only in southern France in its original development belongs to the oldest Goth.-MLat. constituents of Rom.. He gives (RFE XIX, p. 232) Goth. andbahti (Latinized to ambactia) \(\Rightarrow\) Prov. *ambaissa 'commission' and from the derivative Prov. ambaissada 'embassy' \(\Rightarrow\) Ital. ambasciata \(\Rightarrow\) Fr. ambassade.

Corominas (II, p. 224) says that Sp. embajada 'embassy' was taken from OProv. ambaissada 'embassy', which ultimately came from Gaulish ambactus 'servant' via Goth. andbahti 'service' \(\Rightarrow\) MLat. ambactia, with obvious assimilation processes.

2) Goth. anga 'barren, rake', 'fishing hook' \(\Rightarrow\) Sp. angazo 'rake', 'instrument for catching shellfish'

Despite the fact that Goth. anga and Sp. angazo have been ignored by other Germanists and Romanists, Corominas says that Sp. angazo 'rake (agricultural term)', 'hook
(fishing term)' is derived from Gaulish *anga and this in all probability from Goth. *anga 'rake, harrow', 'hook'. Although Corominas gives Goth. *anga, not *anga, the word is not found in Wulfilas and not listed in Feist (VWGS) or Holthausen (GEW).

3) Goth. azgō 'ash' > Sp. ascua 'glowing coal'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. aska, OE asce, essce, aexe, Fris. ask, OHG asca, MLG asche, NHG Asche, Eng. ash.

Diez (Wb. I, p. 96) gives Goth. azgō, not *asguo and (Wb. II, p. 760, Footnote) Basque ausko 'ashes' and ausko egum 'Ash Wednesday'. He says that both the Goth. and the Basque forms differ from the Sp. in meaning, but that the Basque form corresponds both phonologically and semantically more closely to the Sp.

ML (REW 8051) gives Basque ausko 'coal' > Sp. Port. ascua 'glowing coal'.

Reinhart (El elemento germánico, p. 297), however, lists it as a Swabian form aska > Sp. ascoa 'glowing coal'.

Corominas (I, p. 298) nevertheless says that Sp. ascua probably has its origin in Goth. azgō.

4) Goth *brepms 'vapor' > Sp. brétama 'vapor'

Corominas (I, p. 516) states that Sp. brétama 'vapor' probably comes from Goth. *brepms 'vapor'. The fact that other Romance cognates are lacking and that the word is found only in Cast. speak for a Goth. origin.

5) Goth. *brikeins 'apt to break' > OSp. brozno, Sp. bronco 'rough, uneven, brittle'
Diez (Wb. I, p. 89) mentions only Ital. bronco 'roughness' of possible Gmc. origin.


Corominas gives OSp. brozno of uncertain origin, but probably from Goth. *brukeins 'splintery, apt to break' derived from Goth. radical gabruka 'fragment', brikan 'to break'.

6) Goth. *flaskō 'wicker case for a bottle' > Sp. frasco 'bottle'


Diez (Wb. I, p. 179) merely mentions Sp. flasco, frasco and says that it was the name of 'a vessel' common to both the Gmc. and Celt. languages.

ML (REW 3355) gives Gmc. flaska, -un 'bottle' > Ital. fiasca, OFr. flasche, Ital. fiascone, Fr. flacon, Prov. flasco and Sp. Port. frasco < Ital. fiasca.

Gamilscheg (RG I, p. 203) gives Franc. flaske 'bottle' > OFr. flasche.

Corominas (II, p. 568) says that Sp. frasco 'bottle' is probably from Gothic *flaskō 'a wicker foundation for a bottle' such as (cf. Kluge, EWDS, p. 201) was used for vessels in olden times. He asserts that all evidence points to the fact that Sp. frasco has its origin in an autochthonous Gmc. form on the Iberian Peninsula of Gothic origin. He explains that the change fl- > fr- often occurs because of the rarity of such clusters in OSp., that ordinarily in Cast., Lat. l preceded
by a consonant and followed by a vowel absorbs the preceding consonant to produce *gibila. Similar to other Sp. reflexes of Goth., this word was probably Romanized somewhat later, when this linguistic process was already well advanced.

7) Goth. *gabila 'pitchfork' > Sp. gavilán 'hawk'

Gmc. cognate: NHG Gabel 'fork', OHG gabala, OS gafala.

Diez (Wb. IIb, p. 132) gives Sp. cap-el-an > gav-il-an and says it is a diminutive of Lat. cap-ellus 'a small hawk'.

ML (REW 3628) gives *gabilane 'bird of prey' > Sp. gavilán, Port. gavião, but says the origin is unknown, but that, since the forms on the Iberian Peninsula show the form of Goth. names ending in -ila, a Gmc. origin is probable.

Corominas (II, p. 709) says that Sp. gavilán is the name of a bird of prey and of various objects of a curved, pronged form, of the same uncertain origin as Port. gavião id, but probably from Goth. *gabilia, -ans. He notes the typical Goth. diminutive ending -ila as further indication of a Goth. origin.

8) Goth. gaits 'goat' > Sp. gaita 'musical instrument re-sembling a bagpipe'


Corominas (II, p. 612 ff.) says that Sp. gaita 'a musical instrument similar to a bagpipe' and cognate words are spread far and wide, from the Iberian Peninsula through Africa, and even to Turkey and eastern Europe, and is particularly pop-ular in Galicia, a province of northwest Spain, where the
word probably originated. Corominas postulates the Goth. etymon gaits, since the bellows of the instrument is made of goatskin, and since the Gmc. people themselves named the instrument after the animal that was sacrificed for its production.

ML (REW 3752) gives Turkish ghajda 'shepherd's instrument', Sp. Port. gaita.

9) Goth. *hramnīla 'little raven' > Sp. rámila 'raven'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. hrafn, OE hraefn MLG raven, OHG hraian Eng. raven.

Corominas (III, p. 985 f.) says that Sp. rámila is probably from Goth. *hramnīla, diminutive of *hрабне 'raven', particularly in view of its typically Goth. diminutive ending, although it could possibly be of Swabian origin (cf. Reinhart?).

10) Goth. *laigōn 'to lick' > Sp. lagotero 'wheedler, flatterer', 'wheedling, flattering, fawning'

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 29) merely postulates a Gmc. stem *laig- without saying more about any dialect from which it could have been borrowed.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377) notes that Goth. *laigōn 'to lick' is attested only in the derivative bilaigōn, which survives in Prov. lagot 'flattery', Cat. llagot and the corresponding verb llagotejar 'to flatter'. Similarly we find Sp. lagotear, which could also come from the Goth.

Diez (Wb. IIe, p. 343) lists Prov. lagot 'flattery' > Sp. lagotear and says cf. Goth. bi-laigōn 'to lick'.

According to Corominas (III, p. 14) Sp. lagotero 'flatter, wheedler' was taken from Cat. llagoter or Prov. lagotier 'to flatter' which probably stem from a Goth. origin such as *laigōn, as suggested by ML and Gamillscheg (cf. above), which is deducible from the documented Goth. bilaigōn.

11) Goth. rauda (raups - raud-is?) 'red' > Sp. roano 'roan-colored'

ML (REW, 7100) gives Lat. ravidus 'grey' > Sp. roano
Ital. ro(v)ano, Fr. rouan, Port. roudão 'dappled',

Corominas (IV, p. 37) says that Sp. roano 'roan colored (of a horse)', 'reddish' which was formerly in common usage and is still used today in some areas, probably comes from Goth. rauda (accusative raudan) 'red'. Deriv.: rodano, raudano, roán, ruano, roano.

12) Goth. *ribjō 'protective covering' > Sp. ripia 'shingle for roofing'

ML (REW, 7223) gives Lat. replum 'doorframe' > Prov. reble, Sp. Port. ripio.

Diez (Wb. I, p. 483) says the Sp. and Port. forms are incompatible both semantically and phonologically with a Lat. origin.

Corominas (IV, p. 30f.) gives Sp. ripia 'covering of planed wood or other smooth material', probably from Goth. *ribjō 'protective covering'.

13) Goth. sakan 'to quarrel, to litigate' > Sp. sacar 'to extract'

Gmc. cognates: OICel. saka, OE, OS sacan OHG sakkan, corresponding to OHG sakka 'lawsuit', NHG Sache 'matter,
affair, business', OE sacu, OFris. seke, OS saca, Eng. sake (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 84).

Goth. sakan 'to quarrel, to litigate' is documented by Feist (cf. VWGS, p. 407).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 360f.) gives Sp. Port. sacar, OFr. sachier 'to pull, to pull out', Fr. saccade. He says that it originally meant 'to bring to oneself, to make one's own', as LG sakkand and Eng. sack 'bag' (in expression 'to bag something' or 'to have something in the bag or sack').

Corominas (IV, p. 107) says that Sp. sacar 'to extract' probably comes from Goth. sakan 'to litigate for' and that from this legal usage it passed into common usage and took on its present meaning. The fact that it belongs exclusively to Port. and Cast. in Rom. further points to a Gothic origin.

14) Goth. *walbapairs 'wild pear tree' > Sp. guadapero 'wild pear tree'

Gmc. cognates: OE weald, OFris., OS, OHG wald, NHG Wald 'forest', OHG pira, bira, OS pere, Eng. pear.

Goth. *walbapairs is a compound composed of Goth. *walps 'forest' and *pairs 'pear tree'.

Corominas says that Sp. guadapero 'wild pear tree' probably comes from Goth. *walbapairs id, a compound of *walps (or walp.us) 'forest' and *pairs 'pear tree'. Although the Goth. word for 'pear tree' is not actually known, we assume that the Goth. term was taken from Lat. (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 14) as were names of fruits and trees in the other
15) Goth. warjan 'to protect, control, defend' \(\rightarrow\) Sp. guar-
ecer 'to protect, help, heal, restore'

Gmc. cognates: OIcel. verja, OE, OS werian, OFris. 
wera, OHG weren, 'to defend, protect' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, 
p. 121).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 232) gives Ital. guarire and related 
Rom. forms from Goth. warjan corresponding to OHG werjan, 
NHG wehren 'to defend'.

ML (REW, 9054) gives Gmc. warjan 'to defend' \(\rightarrow\) Ital. 
guarire, OFr. garir, Fr. guérir, Prov. garir, Cat. garir, 
Osp., OPort. guarir, Sp. guarecer 'to heal, to cure'.

Gamilscheg (RG I, p. 223) gives Franc. warjan 'to 
protect' \(\rightarrow\) OFr., Prov. garir 'to defend, protect' and says 
that the verb has the meaning in Gallorom. 'to heal, to 
cure', in which it became widespread. He says that a Goth. 
loanword of the same stem appears to survive in Iberorom. 
Further (RG I, p. 384) he gives Goth. warjan 'to protect, 
defend' \(\rightarrow\) Sp. guarir 'to protect, take care of', corres-
ponding to guarida, 'official care, official protection', 
'refuge', guarecer 'to protect, to help', Port. guarida 
'refuge'. The same word, but in the meaning 'to heal, to 
cure', is borrowed from Franc., thus OSp. guarir, Sp. guar-
ecer 'to heal', which indicates a semantic cross between 
the two.

Corominas (II, p. 817) gives Sp. guarecer \(<\) OSp. guarir 
'to protect, save, heal, restore' \(<\) Goth. warjan 'to protect,
defend' probably mixed with another Gmc. *warjan with a different semantic significance. He notes that Gmc. -jan verbs usually yield Sp. -ir verbs.

16) Goth. *widan 'to join, unite, gather' > Sp. guiar 'to lead, to guide'

Gmc. cognates: OHG wetan 'to bind, to join' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 124).

The documented form is gawidan 'to join together' (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 211).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 234 f.) says that the initial gu- speaks rather clearly for a Gmc. origin, but leaves open the question as to which stem.

ML (REW 9528) gives Goth. *wida 'guide, who leads a stranger' > Ital. guida ( > Fr. guide), OFr. guie, Prov. guiza, Cat. Sp. guia, from which Cat. Sp. guiar is derived.

Corominas (II, p. 827 ff.) says that Sp. guiar probably comes from a Goth. *widan related to gawidan. He notes, however, that the word is common to all western Rom. languages (cf. Fr. guider < OFr. guier < Franc. witan) and that, although the initial gu- suggests a Gmc. origin, no clear etymology is yet known. He considers the old legal significance of the word guiar 'to hide someone, guaranteeing his security' further reason to consider the Goth. base, since, pursuing the old legal meaning, one proceeds to 'to accompany someone, guaranteeing his security or safety' and thence to 'to guide, to lead'.
1) Goth. *wibralaun 'payment in exchange for something' > Sp. galardón 'reward, prize'


The compound Goth. *wibralaun is composed of documented wibra 'against' (cf. Feist, VWGS, p. 570) and laun 'payment, reward' (cf. Kluge, VWDS, p. 446).

Diez (Wb. I, p. 236) says that Sp. galardón (also gualarcon) instead of gadarlon could itself be explained by metathesis, which is not uncommon in this language, if it were not necessary or advisable to explain several other Rom. languages in terms of the same process of deriving -l- from -d-. He believes that the word must have been folk-etymologically influenced by Lat. donum.

ML. (REW 9529) gives Franc. Langob. widarlon 'reward, payment' > Ital. guiderdone, OFr. gueredon, Prov. gazardé, guírdo, Cat. guardó, gallardó, Sp. galardón, Port. galarðar > Sp. galardonar.

Corominas (II, p. 623) says that Sp. galardón < OSP. gualardón is of Gmc. origin, probably from Goth. *wibralaun. He explains the probable phonetic development of the word as older Rom. *gwerdraun, gwedralaun (transposition of -r- is a frequent phenomenon in Cast.) > gwelaridaun, gualardón via metathesis, whence the Sp. form galardón (dropping of u after g was an occasional occurrence in Cast.).
3.3 Possible Etymologies

1) Goth. *alisna 'awl' > Sp. lesna 'awl', OSp. alesna 'awl'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 5) gives Sp alesna, OFr. alesne, Ital. lesina, all of them meaning 'awl', corresponding to Goth. *alisna and similarly Kluge (EWDS, p. 9) and Meyer-Lübke (ML, 346). This Goth. etymon, however, is not attested in Wulfila.

Diez (Wb. I, p. 249) tries to derive these forms from OHG alansa, alasna. Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 13) notes that OHG alansa cannot be the source for the Sp. word lesna and tentatively points out a Goth. origin.

Corominas (III, p. 83) quotes lezna < OSp. alesna and derives this form from Wgmc. *alisna, attested in OHG alansa, alunsa, and Alem. alesne, but says that *alisna itself would have to be derived from the form ala. Further he says that Cat. alene, (which therefore cannot be considered a Castilianism or Provençalism as ML (REW) and von Wartburg (FEW) suppose), as well as OProv. ale(se)na, Fr. aléne, Ital. lesina are words which come from WGmc. via VLat.

2) Goth. *bautan 'to beat' > Sp. botar 'to beat or strike'

The Goth. origin of this word, as implied by Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 32) is doubtful. Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 221f.) mentions Franc. bôtan, with an older form bautan, as related to OE bêatan 'to beat, to push, to hurt'; this Franc. form appears to be attested in Fr. bouter, Prov. Cat. botar 'to beat, to push'. Since Sp. Port. botar can also mean 'to push away with force, to throw away', noting that
Ital. buttare has the same meaning and that the Ital. form cannot come from Franc. bōtan, bautan, he concludes that the Ital., Sp. and Port. forms go back to a Goth. *bautan, which probably had this meaning. However, since Goth. *bautan could have resulted in Sp. botar, but not Port. botar, he assumes that the Franc. and the Goth. forms became mixed on the Iberian Peninsula. Similarly, ML (REW, 1007) lists both Franc. bōtan and a Gmc. form bauten, which is listed as a Goth. word on p. 1063; Diez (Wh. I, p. 79) quotes only an Ital. form bottare, which he tries to relate to MHG bozen 'to beat, to knock'.

Corominas (I, p. 500) disagrees with Gamillscheg and says that not only would Goth. *bautan have given *boutar in Port., but that also the area of the word's vitality, along the ocean from Portugal to Santander and País Vasco, indicates that it came from Franc. bōtan 'to beat, to hit', as related to OScand. bauta, MHG bö(z)en.

3) Goth. *blagks (= *blanks) 'white, shining' > Sp. blanca 'white'

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 47) indicates that the Sp. word must be derived from a Gmc. form *blank-, which could be Goth., in this particular case. Holthausen (GEW, p. 15) quotes this as a starred form and relates it to Fr. Prov. blanc. Gmc. cognates are: OE blanca 'white horse', OICel. blakra 'to blink', MDu. blaken 'to shine', OHG blecken, 'show'. ML TREW, 1152) quotes Gmc. *blank as the origin of Ital.
bianco, Fr. Prov. blanc, considering the latter form as the probable source of Sp. blanco, Port. branco. ML (REW, p. 1063) assumes that the Gmc. etymon came into Rom. via Franc. (cf. also Corominas I, p. 469 on this point). Diez (Wb, I, p. 65) quotes Ital. bianco, Sp. blanco as derived from OHG blanch, MHG blanc.

4) Goth. *blunds 'blond' > Sp. blondo 'blond'

ML (REW, p. 1179) gives Gmc. *blund as the source for Ital. biondo, Fr. blond and Prov. blon, which in turn was the source of Sp. blondo. On p. 1063 he says that *blund was Franc. A derivation of the Rom. forms from Lat. *albundus is difficult because of the consonant cluster in the reflex. The derivation of these forms from Gmc. *blaubs 'weak', as attempted by Diez (Wb. I, p. 68f.) is phonologically and semantically impossible.

The Goth. form *blund-s is postulated by Holthausen (GEW, p. 16) and related to Ital. bionda. However, the source for Sp. blondo was probably a Franc. word (cf. Corominas, I, p. 471).

5) Goth. *brasa 'glowing coal' > Sp. brasa 'fire, flame'

ML (REW, 276) derives the following Rom. forms from Gmc. *brasa: OFr. brese, Fr. braise, Prov. Cat. Sp. brasa, Port. braza. Holthausen (GEW, p. 17) lists a Goth. form *brasa, related to Swed. brasa 'fire'. Although he considers the Goth. word the source of the Rom. forms, the Goth. origin of the Sp. word is uncertain (cf. Corominas, I, p. 510).
6) Goth. *brukja 'crumb, fragment' > Sp. broza 'garbage, chips'

Gamilscheg (RG I, p. 369) postulates Goth. *brukja, related to WGoth. gabruka 'crumb', as the source for Prov. *brousso 'little crumb of cheese', Cat. brossa, Sp. broza 'garbage, chips' and various other forms like bross, brocco, etc. in a number of Ital. dialects. He also mentions a MLat. brocius 'concreti lactis grmus, massa'. Holthausen (GEW, p. 18) lists a Goth. *brukja and relates it to Cat. brossa, Prov. brousso. (Cf. also 7) in regard to this etymology.

7) Goth. *brusti 'currycomb, wool comb' > Sp. bruza 'currycomb'

According to Gamilischeg (RG I, p. 369f.) *brusti seems to have existed in OGoth. and VGoth.. It was related to OIcel. bursti 'broom with stiff bristles', a derivation in Goth. was *brutillo 'burr'. The word was Romanized as *brustja, a form corresponding to the Goth. accusative. This seems to have been the source for Sp. bruza. In Upper Italy we find brustia 'wool comb' in several dialects. These forms require an underlying form with closed stressed -u-. The Sp. form broza, 'brush' which also occurs would require the assumption of an o-form, however. This etymon was probably confused with the stem *broccia 'bushes, underwood', but the -o- could also be due to a Franc. *borstja.

According to ML (REW, 1417), OFr. brosse 'bushes', Fr. brosse 'brush', Prov. brosa 'bushes, underwood', and
also Sp. broza 'garbage, chips', Sp. bruza 'brush' and Port. broca 'brush' all go back to a Gmc. *burstia. He points out, however, that phonologically most plausible would be a basis like *brokja, *brottja, so far as Fr. Prov. is concerned, whereas Sp. and Port. would require a closed -o-.

Although we must concede that this etymology (as well as 6 above) is highly unclear, it is at least possible to consider a Goth. origin for both. (Cf. Corominas, I, p. 534).

8) Goth. *falwiska 'ashes, spark' > Sp. falúa 'fallow'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 27) gives Goth. *falwiska, as related to OHG falawisca, OICel. folski, and considers OItal. falavesca, MFr. fallervuche to be derived from it. Goth. *falwiska itself is a derivative of Goth. *falw-s, which is related to OE fealu, Eng. fallow, OS OHG falo, OICel. fol-r. Rom. words derived from the Gmc. etymon are: Fr. fauve, Prov. fabb. The derivation of Sp. falúa from Goth. *falws, *falwiska is doubtful. (Cf. Corominas, II, p. 480).

9) Goth. fani 'mud' > fango 'mud'

Goldschmidt lists Sp. fango and derives it from a Gmc. form *fanj- (Kritik, p. 46). Holthausen (GEW, p. 27) derives it from Goth. fani 'mud'. Gmc. cognates would be: OICel. fen, OE fenn, Eng. fen, OS feni, Du. veen, OHG fenni 'swamp'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 370) notes that Goth. fani, a neuter word, was Latinized as *fanum, which became *fangum, since */nj/ had developed to */n/ in Rom. He relates Prov.
fanc, fanh, Cat. fanch, to Sp. fango, fangal and Ital. fango, fanga 'mud, dirty pond', which is attested in Italy as well as in Sardinia. It is not impossible that the source for the Sp. word was a Goth. form (cf. Corominas, II, p. 487).

10) Goth. *fat 'clothes' > Sp. hato 'bundle of clothes'

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 51) derives Sp. hato, OSp. fato, from a Gmc. source *fat-. Such a form is not listed for Goth. by Holthausen (GEW).

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 376) postulates Goth. *fat, as related to OIcel. fōt (plural form) 'clothes', which seems to be attested in Savoyen as fata 'pocket', an in Sp. hato, Port. fato 'bundle of clothes'. The same form is attested as Sp. hato 'herd, flock'. Gamillscheg assumes that this word was Romanized twice. At least the former instance could possibly come from Goth.

11) Goth. fōdr 'sheath' > Sp. forrar 'to line, sheathe, cover'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 30) lists this word, which is attested for Goth. Gmc. cognates are: OE fōder 'sheath', OIcel. fōðr, MLG vöder, OHG fuotar 'lining (of dresses, etc.).

According to Corominas it is at least possible that the Sp. verb is to be derived from this source (cf. Corominas, II, p. 557). Probably Sp. forrar was taken from Cat. folrar (also forrar), or possibly from OFr. forrer, derived from OCat. foure, OFr. fuerre 'sheath, scabbard', proceeding in turn from Goth. fōdr 'sheath', or possibly
from its cognate, Franc. *fodar. Sp. derivatives are: forro, forradura, aforrar, enforrar, with the variants forar, enforar, ahorrar.

The noun forro turns up at a very late time only, and a little earlier we find enforro and aforro, on account of which there can be little doubt that forro came from the verb forrar, and not directly from the Gmc. (Goth.? fōdr, as the Cat., Prov. forms, etc.

12) Goth. *hagka (= hanka) 'hip' > Sp. anca 'posterior'


13) Goth. *harpa 'harp' > Sp. arpa 'musical stringed instrument'

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 45) had already tried to establish this Sp. word as being of Gmc. origin. He also noted one instance with an initial fi-, OSp. farpa (Kritik, p. 64).

Holthausen (GEW, p. 43) lists Goth. *harpa and notes that it might be attested in Prov. Cat. Sp. Port arpa, Fr. harpa. Gmc. cognates are OICel. harpa, OE hearpe, Eng. harp, OHG har(p)fa and several other forms.

The Goth. origin of this word is questionable. Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 197) doubts its Goth. origin in Rom. languages and Corominas (II, p. 273) assumes that it was probably Franc..
14) Goth. *harpōn 'to grab, to clutch' > Sp. arpar 'to grab'

Holthausen lists this word as Goth., indicating that OItal. arpare, Fr. harper, Sp. arpar, Prov. Cat. Sp. arpa 'claw', Fr. harpaye 'bird of prey' and various others could be derived from it. However, Goth. was probably not the source for the Sp. word. Corominas does not list this etymology.

15) Goth. *hrampō 'hook' > Sp. ramplón 'a piece of metal with rough edges'

This word was probably taken from Ital. rampone 'type of hook'. According to Corominas (III, p. 988 f.) perhaps a Goth. feminine noun *hrampo (Romanized to *rampo or to *rampo > Ital. rampone) coexisted with a Franc. verb *hrampon > Fr. ramper. (cf. also *krampa (18) and *krappa (20) below).

16) Goth. *hraustjo 'weight' > Sp. rezon 'a small anchor for special purposes!

According to Corominas (III, p. 1115) this Sp. word could possibly go back to a Goth. origin.

17) Goth. *kasts 'group of animals, brood of birds' > Sp. casta 'animal species, race or lineage of men'

A Sp. derivation is the verb encastar 'to improve a race by breeding'. Holthausen (GEW) does not list this etymology for Goth.. However, according to Corominas (I, p. 722) the Sp. words could perhaps go back to such a Goth. source.
18) Goth. *krampa 'hook' > Sp. grampa 'staple, clamp; hook for carrying weights; cramp'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 57 f.) lists this word for Goth. Gmc. cognates are: Norw. krampe, OS crampo 'hook', beside OS crampo, OHG krampf 'spasm, cramp'. Also OHG crampf, crumpf 'bent, curved' OE crympan 'to curl, to crisp' and others with related meanings. Holthausen also notes the following Rom. forms as possibly derived from the Goth. form: Ital. Sp. Port. grampa. This form seems to be a variant of Goth. *krappa (cf. *krappa (20) below).

19) Goth. *kramp- 'spasm, cramp' > Sp. calambre 'spasm, cramp'

According to Corominas (I, p. 586) Sp. calambre could possibly be of Goth., but perhaps also of Franc. origin. In both cases it was introduced via Fr.. Cf. also *krampa (18) above and *krappa (20) below.

20) Goth. *krappa 'hook' > Sp. grapa 'clamp, clasp, clutch; cramp iron, holdfast; mangy ulcers in the joints of horses'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 58) lists the Goth. form, mentioning MLG krāpe, OHG krāpfo 'clasp, hook, claw' as Gmc. cognates. He also gives Ital. grappe, Prov. Cat. Sp. grapa 'clasp, hook' and Fr. grappe 'grape'.

According to Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 367; cf. also RFE XIX, p. 145) Goth. *krappa is the source of these Rom. forms. Corominas, however, states that this is probably not the case, that the Sp. form must have been taken over from Cat., which in turn had borrowed it from Franc. *krappa, developing grampa as a variant form.
21) Goth. *kretain 'to scream, to cry' > Sp. gritar 'to scream, to yell' OSp. cridar.

Holthausen (GEW, p. 58) gives the Goth form together with some Gmc. cognates: MLG krīten, Du. krijten, MHG krīzen, noting, however, that the etymology of these words is uncertain. In addition he lists a number of Rom. forms: Ital. gridare, Fr. crier, Prov. Cat. OSp. cridar, Port. gritar. Corominas (II, p. 791) doubts the Goth origin of this Sp. word, but says it is, however, possible.

22) Goth. *krukkja 'crutch' > Sp. croza 'shepherd's crook'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 58) lists Goth. *krukkja and gives the following Gmc. cognate forms: Norw. krykkja, OE crycě, Eng. crutch, OS OHG kruckia, which is related to OIcel. kraki 'stick with a hook, anchor', krōk-r 'hook', krōkil-l 'staff', Swed. krā(c)kla 'stirring spoon, staff', OHG krācho, kracco 'an instrument formed like a hook'. According to Holthausen, the following Rom. forms correspond to Goth. *krukkja: Ital. gruccia, Fr. crosse, Prov. crosa, Sp. croza. This etymology is possible, but dubious. We should probably assume that the Gmc. source was Franc. rather than Goth.

23) Goth. *kundjan 'to multiply' > Sp. cundir 'to spread, yield abundantly; to expand, multiply, propagate, grow'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 59) assumes the existence of a Goth. weak verb *kundjan, derived from the attested stem -kund-s meaning 'stemming from' (cf. forms like āirpakunds in WGoth.). Gmc. cognates are OIcel. -kund-r, OS OE -cund, corresponding to OIcel. kund-r 'son', MHG kunder 'creature, being'. He
notes the following Rom. forms derived from the Goth. word: Cat. Sp. *cundir, with essentially the same meaning. The possibility that Sp. *cundir could stem from Goth. *kundjan had previously been noticed by Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 46). 24) Goth. *laska 'scrap, torn piece' > Sp. lasce 'chip from a stone'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 61) lists Goth. *laska, as related to MHG lasche 'scrap, torn piece', OIcel. laski 'the part of the glove which covers the wrist'. He also mentions Sp. lasca in this context. The possibility of deriving this Sp. word from Gmc. (Goth.?) had previously been mentioned by Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 60). According to Corominas (II, p. 39) this etymology is doubtful and Sp. lasca may well come from another source.

25) Goth. *leista 'a strip serving as a border edge' > Sp. listes 'slip of paper, shred of linen, selvage; list, catalog'

Goldschmidt quotes this Sp. word as evidence for Gmc. elements in Sp. without saying anything about the specific dialect. (Kritik, p. 24 f.). He considers Gmc. *lista 'strip' to be the underlying form. Holthausen (GEW, p. 62) gives a Goth. *leista, which would be related to OIcel. OHG lista, OE MLG liste, Eng. list, quoting also Prov. Sp. lista as Rom. evidence.

According to Corominas (III, p. 110), the Sp. form goes back to WGMc. *lista 'strip, fragment' rather than Goth. It seems that the word might have come from Franc., as Gamillscheg
(RG I, p. 232) supposes, but it is even more probable that is taken from WGmc. via VL.

26) Goth. *magan* (to be able, have the power) > Sp. *desmayar* 'to dismay, disturb, to do'

According to Holthausen (GEW, p. 66) Gmc. cognates are: OIcel. *maga*, OE *magan*, Eng. *may*, OS OHG *magan*. Corominas (II, p. 147) assumes that it is possible that the Sp. form *desmayar* goes back to Goth. *magan*. It probably came into Sp. via OFr., as the phonological form suggests. A derivation of this Sp. verb is *desmayada* 'pale, faint, discouraged'. Perhaps Sp. *amagar* 'to threaten' belongs with it, although its exact origin is unknown (cf. Corominas, I, p. 178 f.).

27) Goth *manwjan* 'to prepare' > Sp. *manir* 'to store meat until it is tender enough for cooking'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 68) gives Goth *manwjan*, which is derived from *manwus* 'ready'. Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 367) says that Goth. *manwjan* seems to have been Romanized to *admanuire*, which underlies Prov. *amanoir*, *amanavir* 'to prepare', OFr. *amanevir* (attested especially in the eastern region); derived from it is *amanevi* 'prepared, ready for something'. Similarly, we find Cat. *amanir* 'to prepare, to cook' Sp. *manir*, Port. *manido* 'tender (referring to meat)'.

28) Goth. *marzjan* 'to annoy, to irritate' > OSp. *amarrido* 'sadness, melancholy'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 69) lists the following Gmc. cognates for this Goth. word: OE *mierran*, Eng. *mar*, OS *merrian*, OHG *merrien* 'to annoy', as related to OHG *morsāri* 'mortar',
MGH zermürsen 'to crunch', Germ. morsch 'decaying', etc.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 29) relates a list of Rom. words to WGmc. marrjan, Goth. marzjan, such as Prov. marrir 'to grieve, to depress', marrir 'disturbed, lost', similarly Cat. marrir 'sorry, depressed', marriment 'sadness, melancholy', OSp. amarrido 'sadness', Ital. smarrire 'to get lost'. The OSp. form shows that a Lat. prefix had been attached to it. However, it is not likely that the Goth. word was the source for the OSp. form.

29) Goth. *mapwa 'meadow or pasture' > Sp. mata 'shrub, bush' 'sown with grazing for cattle or other animals (agricultural term)'

Holthausen (GEW) and Feist (VWGS) do not list a Goth. word corresponding to the postulated form Goth. *mapwa. Gamillscheg (RFE XIX, p. 236) mentions Port. moita, mouta 'shrub, bush' (cf. also ML, REW, 5435), which could go back to a Goth. form *mapwa. However, Gamillscheg notes that this etymology is highly uncertain, since a stem *map- is not attested in Gmc. Perhaps OHG mad 'meadow' could correspond to Goth. mapwa. Corominas (III, p. 287) also lists Sp. mata 'shrub, bush', which probably goes back to Lat. matta 'a kind of grass mat', but again perhaps to Goth. *mapwa.

30) Goth. *maurhwallus 'edible fungus, morel' > Sp. morilla 'morel'

Holthausen (GEW) and Feist (VGWS) do not list Goth. elements which could correspond to this etymon. Corominas,
(III, p. 440), however, mentions that Sp. *morilla* is probably taken from Fr. *morille*, which seems to have been borrowed from OHG *morhila* (Germ. *Morchel*). However, it is also possible that a Goth. form *maurhwalus* or perhaps *maurhwalo* (feminine) was the source for these words.

31) Goth. *milti* 'spleen' > Sp. *esmaltar* 'to enamel, embellish' *smalt-s* 'enamel, glazing' > Sp. *esmaltar* 'to enamel, embellish'

Goth. *milti*, with the accusative *miltja*, is not listed in Holthausen (GEW). According to Corominas (II, p. 378) Sp. *esmaltar* has to be derived from a Gmc. form *smalt- 'to liquidate, to melt', which was probably Franc. rather than Goth. Holthausen lists the stem *smalt-s* also for Goth. (GEW, p. 94). Gmc. cognates are: OHG *smalz*, MLG *smalt*, Norw. *smolt*, *smult* 'grease, dripping'. Corominas assumes that the Franc. stem *smalt- was mixed up with Goth. *milti*, accusative *miltija*. The latter form could probably turn up as a Goth. nominative (cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 377).

32) Goth. *mundilofa* 'a kind of protective glove' > Sp. *manopla* 'a piece of armor protecting the hand'

This Goth compound is not attested; it is composed of Goth. *munda* 'protection' and Goth. *lofa* 'flat hand'. For Goth. *munda* which is present in the personal names *Monderrigus*, *Mondicu-s*, *Mundila*, Holthausen (GEW, p. 73) lists the following Gmc. cognates: OIcel. *mund* 'hand', OE *mund* 'hand, protection, security, peace', OS -*mund* in personal names, MLG *munde-loes* 'without protection', *munt-bor* 'guardian; trustee', OHG *munt* 'hand, protection, guardianship'. Goth. *muns
seems also to be related. *Manwus 'ready' (cf. Holthausen, GEW, p. 68). For Goth. *lofa, which is attested only in the dative *lofin, Holthausen (GEW, p. 65) gives the following two Gmc. cognates: OIcel. *lōfī and OHG laffa, both meaning 'flat hand'. According to Corominas (III, p. 240), the Sp. word manopla is related to Cat. manyopa, Port. manopla. All these forms are of uncertain origin, however; the Iberian forms may go back to a VLat. *manupulus or perhaps to Goth. *mundilofa. The consonantal cluster in this case could have caused a metathesis, resulting in *manopla, which then was changed to manopla.

33) Goth. *raka 'care' > OSp. raca 'iniquity, wrong, injustice'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 80) gives a Goth. stem *rak-, which is attested only in personal names such as Race-mīrus, Raza-mundus, and which is related to OIcel. røk 'representation, development, reason, cause', OE racu 'course of development, explanation, report', Eng. rake, OS rake, OHG rahha 'speech, account'. These are in turn related to OIcel. rak-r, MLG rak 'straight, correct'.

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377) tries to establish a connection between Goth. *raka 'care', on the one hand, and Prov. racarse 'to be afraid of', Cat. racar 'to grieve' and OSp. raca 'iniquity, wrong, injustice'.

34) Goth. *rakan 'to rake' > Sp. rague 'the act of recovering lost objects from the sea (salvaging)'
Corominas (III, p. 1005) points out that the origin of the Sp. word is quite uncertain but that a derivation from Goth. *rakan is at least not impossible. The word *rake is not listed by Holthausen (GEW), but is postulated for Goth. by Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 377), who lists the following Gmc. cognates: ODu. OE racu 'rake', as an ablaut form to *rikan 'to accumulate, heap up'. Holthausen (GEW, p. 82) lists Goth. rikan, which is attested in WGoth. with the same meaning, and which is related to MLG reken, OHG rehhan 'to rake', OIceI. reka, OHG rehho 'rake', OE raca, racu, Eng. rake, MLG rake, Swed. raka 'rake' and OIceI. rake 'to rake'.

35) Goth. *randa 'brim, edge of a shield' > Sp. randa 'lacework'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 80) lists Goth. *randa, *randus- which is related to OIceI. rond, OE OS rand, OHG rant, ramft. Holthausen also mentions Ital. Prov. Sp. randa, OFr. rande as possible derivations. Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 368) lists Prov. randa 'end, edge' and a randa 'completely; side by side' which semantically fit the meaning 'edge of a shield' in Goth. Prov. randar means 'to embellish with lacework' (i.e. originally 'to put a border around something'). The Sp. word randa 'lace-work' corresponds directly to this. Cat., on the other hand, shows the original meaning in ran a ran 'up to the edge', and also Ital. randa 'end'. This leads Gamillscheg to conclude that the Goth. stem *rand- was Romanized with the meaning 'edge of a shield' during
the time of the kingdom at Toulouse.  

36) Goth. **reiran** 'to tremble' > Sp. **rehilar** 'to tremble, to move rapidly' 

Holthausen (GEW, p. 81) gives a Goth. form **reiran** which is attested in WGoth., and also a nominal derivation **reiro** 'trembling'. According to Corominas (III, p. 1071) this Goth. verb could possibly be the source for Sp. **rehilar**.  

37) Goth. ***rukka* (?) 'distaff' > Sp. **rueca** 'distaff' 

Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 372) postulated Goth. ***rukka**, corresponding to OHG **rocko**, Germ. **Rocken**, Spinnrocken. The reflex of this Gmc. form, however, is missing in Prov. Phonologically it seems difficult to establish a Goth. origin for this Sp. word since Sp. **-ue**- would presuppose an **-o**- rather than the **-u**- we would have to assume for an underlying Goth. word. Thus, Gamillscheg considers the possibility that besides a Goth.-VLat. ***rukka** we may have to take an additional form **rocca** into account, which could be the source of some of the Rom. forms. This form would have to be assumed for the Gallorom. region of VLat. Gamillscheg reminds us of the fact that ***rucca** 'distaff' was obviously confused with **rocca** 'rock' in some areas, especially in the south of France.  

Corominas (IV, p. 78 f.) states that there can be no doubt that Sp. **rueca** must be of Gmc. origin, although a Lat. source has occasionally been postulated (cf. 4.1.3.1). Corominas assumes that a Goth. form ***rukka** must have existed, as can be seen from the Ital. form **rocca**. The Sp. **-ue**-,
however, presents difficulties and would require the assumption of a form with -o- in the Gmc. dialect. Corominas says that the Rom. forms probably go back to a common Gmc. form *rokkja. The direct Goth. origin of the Sp. word rueca appears to be questionable.

38) Goth. *runa 'mystery, counciliation' > Sp. adrunar 'to guess'

According to Diez (Wb. II, p. 406) this Sp. word may be of Goth. origin. The Goth. word rūna, as listed by Holthausen (GEW, p. 83), has the following Gmc. cognates: OIcel. OE rūn, OS OHG rūna, and also Norw. rjōna, 'to chat', OE rēonian 'to plan; to complain', MHG rissen 'to lament'. However, the Goth. origin of Sp. adrunar is highly doubtful.

According to ML (REW, 7448) it corresponds to OHG rūnon 'to whisper', or perhaps also to Goth.*alrūna 'mandrake root'.

39) Goth. *skairnjan 'to scorn' > Sp. escarnecer 'to scorn'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 89) gives the following Gmc. cognates for Goth. *skairnjan: OHG scernōn, scerōr 'to ridicule', sciro 'buffoon, juggler', OE scīerniġe 'female juggler', OIcel. scirra 'to frighten'. Holthausen also gives OFr. Prov. Cat. escarnir, Prov. esquernir as derived from Goth. or another Gmc. dialect.

The Sp. form escarnecer developed from an OsSp. escarnir. This form, according to Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 222) could go back either to Franc. or to Goth. Gamillscheg decides in favor of a Franc. form *skernjan. Corominas states that Sp.
escarnecer could go back to Goth. *skairnjan (cf. Corominas, II, p. 338 f.).

40) Goth. skattjan 'to estimate' 'to evaluate' > Sp. esca-
timar 'to argue with subtlety'

    Goth. *skattjan, is not attested. However, Holthausen
(GEW, p. 90) mentions Goth. skattja 'money-changer', which
is derived from Goth. skatt-s 'coin'. This has the follow-
ing Gmc. cognates: OIcel. skatt-r 'tax; treasure', OE
sceatt 'tax, tribute; money, possession', OHG scaz 'money,
treasure'. According to Corominas (II, p. 344) Sp. esca-
timar, OSp. escatima 'subtle argumentation' could possibly
be derived from Goth. *skattjan.

41) Goth. skaus-s 'flap, skirt; seam, border' > Sp.
escotar 'to cut out'

    Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 60) mentions Sp. escotar and
assumes that it developed from Gmc. *skaus. According to
Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 383) this form could perhaps be Goth.
Apart from Sp. escotar we find Port. descotar with the same
meaning. Gamillscheg also notes that this Goth. word (at-
tested in the dative singular) is found only on the Iberian
Peninsula, which speaks for a Gothic origin.

42) Goth. *skiuhs 'shy, timid' > Sp. esquivo 'elusive, evad-
ing, coy, reserved, cold, shy, timid'

    Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 33) mentions the Sp. form
esquivar and says that the meaning of it would fit OHG
skiuhan, whereas phonologically we would think of a form
*skiuwan, which would not have been impossible in OHG.
However, he leaves open the question as to whether other dialects of Gmc. might be involved.

If it came from Franc., the Franc. form would have to be *skeuh, which could not have given Fr. eschif. This seems to indicate an underlying Goth. rather than a Franc. form here. The OFr. verb eschivit would then directly go back to Goth. *skiuhan (rather than *skiuhan); OFr. eschivir secondarily gave eschiver, eschif and other derived forms.

Corominas (II, p. 409 f.) is of the opinion that Sp. eschivo (together with its derived forms) must be of Gmc. origin, coming from a Gmc. form related to OE sceoh, Eng. shy, MHG sieich, Alem. schew 'timid'. Goth. origin cannot be excluded and must be considered a possibility. A derivation from an old adjective Goth. skiuhs would remove the difficulties also in regard to OFr. eschiver.

43) Goth. *stāmpjan 'to trample; to paw' > Sp. estampar 'to crush, crunch'

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 45) mentions the Sp. word, postulating a Gmc. *stāmpōn as the possible origin. Holthausen (GEW, p. 98) gives a Goth. *stāmpjan, related to OE stempan, MLG stempen, OHG stemfen, and lists Prov. Cat. estampir 'to re-echo' and Sp. estampido 'crack, clap' as probably derived from it. According to Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 223) both Franc. and Goth. underlying forms must be assumed for the Rom. evidence. Franc. *stāmpjan seems to be the source of OFr. estampir 'to crush', which is still vital in a region in which Franc. elements prevail. The
Sp. word could also be Goth., but this is uncertain.

44) Goth. *\text{strings} 'thread, string(?)' \rightarrow Sp. \text{estringa} 'cord, ribbon'

Holthausen (GEW) and Feist (VWGS) do not list a Goth. stem *\text{string-}. According to Corominas the Sp. word was probably taken from Ital. \text{stringa}, which is probably Gmc., perhaps Goth. The Sp. word was hardly taken directly from Goth.

45) Goth. *\text{striup} 'strap, string(?)' \rightarrow Sp. \text{estribo} 'stirrup'

This Goth. word is not listed by Feist (VWGS) and Holthausen; Holthausen (GEW, p. 101), however, gives Goth. *\text{straupon} 'to rib, to strip off', which is related to OE \text{striaepan}, Eng. \text{strip}, LG \text{ströepen}, OHG \text{stroufen}, MHG \text{striefen}, \text{strupfen} 'to strip off'; this appears to be an ablaut form of the stem in question. Corominas (II, p. 449) compares the Sp. word to Port. \text{estribo}, Cat. \text{estrep}, Prov. \text{estreup}, \text{estriup}, \text{estrieu}, OFr. \text{estrieu}, \text{estrief}. The Fr. form is \text{étrier}. Corominas says that this group of words is of uncertain origin, but perhaps Gmc. The Gallorom. forms seem to correspond to a Franc. source: *\text{streup}; the Iberian forms could correspond to the Goth. counterpart, which would be *\text{striup(s)}.

46) Goth. *\text{tappa} 'peg, plug' \rightarrow Sp. \text{tapa} 'lid, cover'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 106) mentions this Goth. form which has the following Gmc. cognates: Icel. \text{tappi}, OSwed. \text{tapper}, OE \text{taeppa}, Eng. \text{tap}, MLG \text{tappe}, OHG \text{zapfo}. Holthausen also lists Rum. \text{tapa} 'plug, tap' and Sp. \text{tapa}. The Goth. origin
of this Sp. word is at least not impossible. Gamillscheg (RE I, p. 384) mentions Cat. tapa, tapa, Sp. tapa, Port.
tampa and assumes that these words were borrowed from Goth.
47) Goth. *brauhs 'chest, coffer' > Sp. troj 'a kind of 
granary'

Holthausen (GEW) does not give this stem for Goth.
According to Corominas (IV, p. 595), however, it is possible
to derive the Sp. form from a Goth. source.

48) Goth. *bwaljo 'towel' > Sp. toalla 'towel' OSp. tovaja

This Goth. word is not listed in Holthausen (GEW), but
it can be related to Goth. bwan 'to wash' and bwal 'bath;
baptism' which are both attested forms (cf. Holthausen, GEW,
p. 115). Holthausen lists OIcel. pvā, OE ðwean, OS OHG
thwahan as cognates of bwan, and OIcel. p val-l 'soap',
OE ðweal, ðwæl, OHG dwahal 'bath' as cognates of bwal.

According to Gamillscheg (RG I, p. 203) the source
for the corresponding Rom. words is Franc. rather than
Goth. Gamillscheg points out that Franc. *bwalja, cor-
responding to OHG dwahilla, both meaning 'towel', is prob-
ably the source for Fr. touaille, Prov. toalha, Ital.
tovaglia; the same form is also to be found in the Rom.
languages of the Alps (Rheo-Rom.). Gamillscheg also lists Sp. toalla
and Port. toalha.

Corominas (IV, p. 466) seems inclined to assume Goth.
rather than Franc. origin. At least the OSp. form tovaja
would correspond to Goth. more directly than to Franc. Sp.
toalla could go back to the later influence of Ital. tovaglia.
49) Goth. ufjō 'abundant, superfluous' > Sp. ufano 'conceited, haughty'.

Holthausen (GEW, p. 115) lists Goth. ufjō and the following Gmc. cognates: OIcel. uf of 'big amount, too much', OHG uppig 'empty, vain', MHG üppec 'superfluous, playful, wanton'. Holthausen also mentions Prov. ufăn, Sp. ufano as possible derivations, coming from a Romanized *ufanus. (Cf. Gamillscheg, RG, I, p. 375). Phonologically the form would be rather irregular. According to Corominas (IV, p. 642) it is not impossible that the Sp. word is due to an underlying Goth. form.

50) Goth. *usqillan 'to flow, sell, to bud, to blossom' > Sp. escullirse 'to let fall, escape, slip from the hands'.

According to Corominas, Sp. escullirse, which is related to Cat. esquitllar, esquittlarse, Prov. esguilla, esguilla, esquilha, and which developed from OSp. escullarse (or escular) could possibly be derived from a Goth. verb *usqillan, which, however, is nowhere attested.

51) Goth. *waipō 'field, pasture' > Sp. guadaño

*waipanjan 'to cultivate' > Sp. guadañar 'to mow'.

Goldschmidt (Kritik, p. 29) mentions Sp. guadañar, stating that it could possibly be derived from a Gmc. source *waidjan 'to hunt', which, however, is nowhere attested and does not fit semantically. ML (REW, 9483) says that Sp. guadana must have the same origin as OFr. guaignier 'to cultivate the land', Cat. guanyar 'to earn, gain', which come from WGmc. *waidanjan.
We shall probably follow Corominas' assumptions (II, p. 804). We would then conclude that Sp. guadaña is to be derived from a Goth. root waip-, which corresponds to a Goth. *waipo 'field, meadow, pasture'. This would be a cognate form of OHG waida, Germ. weide, which have the same meaning. The verb Sp. guadañar seems to correspond to a Goth. verb *waipanjan, but since as a verb this form is more recent than the noun, it is more likely a Sp. derivation from the Romanized noun. Since there is no better explanation available, we assume that these Sp. words are possibly borrowed from Goth..

52) Goth. *walda 'dyer's weld' > Sp. gualda 'weld, wild wood'

Holthausen (GEW, p. 119) lists the Goth. form, which is related to MLG wolde, MDu. woude, Eng. weld. He also gives several Rom. forms corresponding to the Goth. word: Ital. Sp. gualda, Fr. gaude, and derived from the same root: Sp. Port. gualdo 'yellow, ice, dyed with weld'.

It is at least possible that Goth. is the source for the Sp. word Corominas (II, p. 809) says that it can be either Franc. or Goth. in origin, but that it undoubtedly came into Sp. via OFr..

53) Goth. *wranks (?) 'distorted (?)' > Sp. renco 'lame, with a distorted or wrenched hip'

Corominas (IV, p. 24) says that the Sp. word renco could go back to any one of several postulated Goth. etyma,
(cf. also Corominas, III, p. 1085, and Gamillscheg, RG I, pp. 228, 273, 370) although he considers Goth. *wranks the most likely among suggested forms.
CHAPTER IV

PHONOCLOGICAL ANALYSIS

4.0 Preliminary Remarks

The phonological problems of the Gothic loanwords in Spanish will be dealt with in this chapter as follows: taking each of the Gothic phonemes, we will trace its reflex in Spanish and formulate subsequent assumptions as to the phonemic or allophonic structure of Gothic as well as of IbVLat. Since the loanword evidence is not always extensive enough to justify conclusions independently, we must occasionally resort to the evidence afforded by place names as well as personal names, as discussed for example in Wrede (Ostgoten), Marchand ("Sounds"), Dietrich (Aussprache), Gamillscheg (RG I and RG II and RFE XIX) and Sachs (Ortsnamen). Of course our final conclusions will rest not upon these discussions, but insofar as possible upon the results of our study of the Spanish reflexes of Gothic loanwords.35

The evidence of loanwords is obviously more reliable, since in names we often find folk-etymological interpretations, 

35Since English meanings are given throughout the preceding chapter, they are not repeated in this chapter; cf. the alphabetical listings in §3.1, §3.2 and §3.3 above for specific Gothic forms.
such as Goth. Thiud- which seems to have been confused more or less deliberately with Gk. theōs, Goth. Liub- which seems to have been identified with Lat. leo. Aside from this, place names have apparently been repeatedly Romanized, as is evidenced by palatalized as well as non-palatalized reflexes of Gothic /k/ in a palatal environment in certain place names.\(^{36}\) Thus names appear to be important in establishing certain conclusions as to relative chronology and may also be of help in other respects where loanword evidence does not permit an independent conclusion; however, as we shall see below, the phonological development of the loanwords is much more regular.

4.1 The Consonants

4.1.1 Labials

4.1.1.1 Gothic /p/

a) Goth. initial /p/ may or may not correspond to the Sp. /p/ of pantano, which possibly reflects the Goth. etymon *palb-. This, unfortunately, is a very questionable case and we are, for lack of evidence, in no position to prove that Goth. /p/ was preserved as Sp. /p/ in the environment #__. However, if this etymology were correct, the preservation of Goth. /p/ would correspond to the preservation of Goth. /t/ (and Goth. /p/) as Sp. /t/, and Goth. /k/ as Sp. /k/ in initial position, which we would expect.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{36}\) Cf. §4.1.3.1 and §4.3.

\(^{37}\) Cf. §4.1.3.1 for examples.
b) Goth. intervocalic /p/ appears to correspond to Sp./p/ in the following etyma, which are both positively of Gothic origin:

*hrapōn > arrapar (also rapar); *raupa > ropa.

Sp. tapa, which could possibly stem from Goth. tappa, as well as Sp. grappa (the medial cluster is merely a spelling variation for a single phoneme /p/) from Goth. *krappa, might testify to the development of Goth. geminate /pp/ as a single phoneme /p/ in Sp.. Although the evidence is highly uncertain, we would expect a replacement of /pp/ by /p/, parallel to the treatment of /tt/ as /t/ in Sp. (and also of /kk/ as /k/ in Sp., if Sp. rueca can be derived from the Goth. form *rukka, which is unfortunately questionable).

This treatment of geminates allows no specific conclusion, since either the development of Lat. -CC- > IbVLat. -C- was not yet finished (in which case Goth. geminates could undergo the same treatment) or Goth. geminates were unusual clusters and were consequently replaced by single phonemes in sound-substitution.

c) Goth. /p/ in clusters is preserved as Sp. /p/ and in initial position, Goth./sp-/ regularly became Sp. /esp-/: Pos.: *haspa > aspa; *spaína > espía; *spaúra > espuela, espuela; spitus > OSp. espeto, Sp. espetón; *spola > espolín;

Poss.: *harpa > arpa; *harpon > arpar; krampa > grampa; hrampo > ramplón; stampjan > estampar.

All these examples seem to indicate that Gothic /p/ entered IbVLat. at a time when the development of Lat. intervocalic
IbVLat. /b/ had already been concluded. This is parallel to the development of Goth. /t/ in Sp. (cf. §4.1.2.1). The correspondence between Goth. *striup and Sp. estribo might appear to be a possible counterexample to such a generalization. However, this etymology is a dubious one.

4.1.1.2 Gothic /b/

The Goth. graph for the phoneme /b/ might have represented a labiodental (or bilabial?) voiced (or lenis) stop or fricative.\(^{38}\) On the basis of a postvocalic final coalescence of /b/ and /f/, /d/ and /p/, it is generally accepted that Goth. /b/ was realized as a fricative rather than a stop.\(^{39}\)

According to Valencia\(^ {40}\) IbVLat. had a phoneme /v/, probably realized as a voiced bilabial fricative (which had developed in the environment V_V) from a merger of Lat. /b/ and /v/ around the year 1, as pointed out by Lausberg\(^ {41}\), and a phoneme /b/ which was a result of Rom. "sonorization" of Latin intervocalic /p/.\(^ {42}\) The reflex of Goth. /b/ in Sp., which is usually spelled "b" probably joined the IbVLat. reflex of Lat. intervocalic /p/, i.e., the phoneme /b/. Around the 16th c., the realization of OSp. /b/ became a

---

\(^{39}\) Cf. Penzl, "Orthography", p. 222.
\(^{41}\) Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 366.
\(^{42}\) Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 367.
fricative which merged with OSp. /v/. The general result is therefore a Sp. /b/, which is realized as a fricative in medial position. However, since Goth. /b/ might still very well have been a fricative at the time of the borrowings into IbVLat., we cannot know exactly what the character of this process was.

(Goth. initial /b/: Pos.: bandwō > banda II; brikan > bregar; *brut > brote; *brid > brete; Prob.: *brepms > brétema; *brukeins > brozno; Poss.: bautan > botar; *blanks > blanca; *blunds > blondo; *brasa > brasa; *brukja > brozo; *brusti > bruza, brozo.

Medially we find /b/ twice, /v/ once: Pos.: *haribaírgo > albergue; Prob.: andbahti > embajada; *gabila > gavilán.

In dealing with the two occurrences of /b/ we have to consider juncture as a factor possibly involved. Note that both occurrences of /b/ are morpheme-initial. This might indicate that /b/ had a different allophone after a morpheme boundary, which is a common feature of many languages.

Some Gmc. personal names also testify to the assumed development. Lat. graphic representation renders Gmc. /b/ very often by "v." Thus we find Gmc. Gibericus beside Givericus, and Gabadus and Marivadus. Moreover, writing Indiscriminately from the 3rd c. A. D. on in IbVLat., which indicates

---

43 This has been pointed out by Kremer, "Behandlung", p. 455.
44 Cf. Wrede, Wandalen, p. 103.
that a merger had probably taken place in this case. Gmc./w/, on the other hand, is often spelled "v" in Lat., but hardly ever "b". Lat. "b" as a graphic rendering of Gmc. /w/ does not appear until much later in documents of the Goths.

Gmc. /b/ appears as either "v" or "b" in the environment V_V, but only as "b" in the environment V_V. Jordanes constantly writes "v" for Goth. /b/ in the environment V_V.

4.1.1.3 Gothic /f/

The Goth. graph "f" seems to have developed from the Lat. letter "f" rather than from the corresponding runic sign. In the transcription of Biblical names it is used to represent Gk. "ph". The phonetic value of Lat. "f" was undoubtedly a labiodental voiceless fricative, whereas the Gk. sign "ph" probably represented a voiceless bilabial fricative. Since there is no alternative criterion available, all we can say is that the WGoth. graph "f" probably rendered either a sound similar to the phonetic value of Lat. "f" or of Gk. "ph".

a) Goth. initial /f/ seems to have resulted in Sp. /f/ in loanwords. One exception, *fato > hato, however, might be taken to indicate that Goth. /f/ was still a voiceless

---

45 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 9.
46 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 94.
(or fortis) fricative in initial position. So far as the feature of bilabial or labiodental articulation is concerned, our loanwords do not offer criteria for distinguishing between the two possibilities, although we can be sure that IbVLat. /f/ was realized as a labiodental. In the case of a bilabial articulation, this phoneme would still have been closer to IbVLat. /f/ than to any other phoneme in the inventory, and a sound substitution would have been the result.

The following loanwords demonstrate the correspondence of Goth. /f/ to Sp. /f/ in the environment #____: Prob.: *flaskō > OSp. flasce, Sp. frasco; Poss.: *falwiska > falúa; fani > fango; fodr > forrar.

In one case we find Sp. /h/ corresponding to Goth. /f/, provided Sp. hato goes back to Goth. *fato. The development of /f/ to /h/ in initial position is common in Sp.; according to Menéndez Pidal, this change is of pre-Rom. Iberian origin.\(^49\) Lausberg\(^50\) points out that the origin of this change, presumably Basque\(^51\), is to be found in

\(^{49}\)Cf. Baldinger, Sprachräume, p. 5.

\(^{50}\)cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 302.

\(^{51}\)It has been indicated to me by Professor Fowkes that the same change is characteristic of dialects in the south of Italy, e.g. of Calabrian, where of course no Basque substratum exists. This shows that we are dealing with a sound change which is quite common in Romance.
the north of Spain, from where it extended gradually into the southern dialects.

However, we cannot state with absolute certainty that this Sp. sound change can be made responsible for the variation between /f/ and /h/ in our loanwords, since such an assumption would require that the different reflexes of Goth. /f/ point to different times of borrowing. It must be borne in mind that Sp. hato is somewhat doubtful as a Goth. loanword; thus the majority of the Goth. words in Sp. show an /f/ which did not take part in such a sound change.

According to Wrede\textsuperscript{52} OGoth. /f/ shows no deviation from WGoth. /f/ so far as the evidence provided by names is concerned. Dietrich\textsuperscript{53} notes that /f/ must have shown rather strong friction in initial position. Very often it is rendered by "f" in Lat. transcription (e.g. Goth. *fribu- appeared as Lat. Fredu-); sometimes /f/ appears as "p" in clusters: cf. Uftahari vs. Optila, obtilla (in Jornandes). In Gk. this transcription ("p" for /f/) is frequent. Dietrich also mentions an instance in which Cassiodorus writes Phaeba for Goth. *Feba.

Evidence such as this could be tentatively interpreted as indication for a voiceless bilabial articulation of Goth. /f/. This assumption would be supported by the occasional

\textsuperscript{52}Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 169.
\textsuperscript{53}Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 75.
alternation of "f" and "b" in the graphic representation of /f/. However, these spellings are rare occurrences and I do not consider them sufficient to allow a definite statement.

b) Goth. /f/ in intervocalic position is rarely attested in our material. However, in parallel to the intervocalic allophones of other Goth. fricatives such as /p/ (and perhaps also /h/) we might expect Sp. sonorization in the position between vowels. Perhaps the correspondence of Sp. lúa to Goth. lef[a] can be interpreted on this basis, since the intervening form luva, which still shows a voiced labiodental fricative, is attested in OSp. The correspondence of Goth. mundilofa to Sp. manobra seems phonologically unlikely.

c) Intervocalic or final clusters containing a reflex of Goth. /f/ are not attested in Goth. loanwords in Sp. However, perhaps the combination /fj/ should be listed here, which may be seen in Sp. ufano, corresponding to Goth. ufjo.

4.1.2 Dentals
4.1.2.1 Gothic /t/

a) Goth./t/ was surely a voiceless (or fortis) dental stop of some kind.\textsuperscript{54} It was interpreted initially in terms of the IbVLat. phoneme /t/, which in turn preserved a Lat./t/ (cf. Lat. tempus > Sp. tiempo).\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54}Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 38.
\textsuperscript{55}Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 304. The fact that "t" was occasionally written for /p/ and also "p" for /t/ by Goth. scribes in the Wulfilian Bible, has been interpreted
A few Goth. loanwords show this development: Pos.: 
triggwa > tregua; (perhaps also tau Janet > (a) taviar, if a - is to be derived from Lat. ad-, which was added later; taikn > taccq; Poss.: *tappa > tapa.

b) Intervocalic Goth. /t/ is preserved as /t/ in Sp. IbVLat. possessed a phoneme /t/, which occurred as a single intervocalic phoneme\(^{56}\), where it stood in opposition to the reflex of Lat. /d/. Thus the substitution was very straightforward. We must assume that the development of sonorization of Lat. /t/ in intervocalic position had already been completed by the time of the Goth. borrowings.(cf. § 4.1.1.1). In contrast to the initial position as well as certain clusters, in which Goth. /t/ and Goth. /p/ merge in IbVLat., in intervocalic position both are kept separate. Goth. intervocalic /p/ seems to merge occasionally with IbVLat. /d/.
The following correspondences may be shown: Pos.: *epitus > OSp. espeto, Sp. espetón; *brut > brote; *seti > sitio; (note, however, the absence of palatalization) Prob.: gait(s) > gaita; Poss.: *bautan > botar; *kreitan > gitar; *fat- > hato; *skaut(s) > escotar.


as an indication that the late Goth. /t/ was realized as a strongly aspirated sound. However, these scribal mistakes, common as they were in the manuscripts of the Goth. Bible, as Marchand (cf. "Sounds", p. 60 ff.) points out, do not necessarily indicate dialectal developments. In addition, such an irrelevant feature as aspiration could have no effect on the substitution process of IbVLat.
Goth. geminate /tt/ might be present in Sp. escatimar, which possibly derives from Goth. *skatt-jan skatt-s, but the etymology is doubtful. A more probable case is Sp. látigo corresponding to a Goth. *laittug. We might follow Goldschmidt57 in assuming that the Gothic geminate /tt/ (a combination of two phonemes, as a matter of fact) behaves like earlier Lat. /tt/, which became a single phoneme in IbVLat. This assumption is also based on an agreement with the treatment of other geminates. (cf. I 4.1.1.1).

c) The Goth. cluster /st/ corresponds to IbVLat. /st/ in medial position, which is derived from Lat. /st/, e.g. Lat. costa > Sp. cuesta.58 This preservation is also evidenced by Goth. loanwords, showing the epenthetic vowel /e/ in Sp.: Pos.: laistjan > lastar; *staka > estaca; Poss.: *kasts > casta; *leista > lista; stampjan > estampar; strings > estringar; striup > estribo.

Another cluster may also show the correspondence of Goth. /t/ to Sp. /t/. Goth. miltja and *smalts seem to be involved in the etymology of Sp. esmaltar, a correspondence which would establish the preservation of /t/ in the cluster /lt/.

d) The effect of a palatal element on a preceding Goth. /t/ in loanwords is not clear (contrary to the case of Goth. /k/). In a questionable case or two, we might postulate a

57 Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 53.
Goth. etymon with a /t/ which seems to correspond to a Sp. /θ/ as a reflex of an earlier palatalized /t/: *hraustjō > rezón, which is a possible Goth. loan into Sp. However, this etymology presents phonological difficulty otherwise, since Sp. /e/ cannot be a regular reflex of Goth. "áu"; (Sp. /o/ would be expected here instead). On the other hand, a preceding /s/ should prevent palatalization, as is shown by the better established correspondence of Goth. laistjan > lastar, which belongs in the positive group.

Another possible, but questionable case showing a palatalized reflex of Goth. /t/ is the following one: flautjan > lozano (cf. § 4.1.6.2).

Other loanwords do not show palatalization: Pos. sēti > sitio (the effect of the following palatal element can be seen by the vowel mutation /e/ to /i/, which was an IbVLat. development, however.\textsuperscript{59} Poss.: *skattjan > escatimar; the gemination of /t/ in this etymon would not have prevented palatalization since geminates were treated as single consonants in IbVLat. (cf. the possible reflex of Goth. *krukkja > Sp. croza).

We might conclude that the palatalization of /t/ in IbVLat. preceded the palatalization of /k/ and was completed at an earlier time. It is significant in this context that the first evidence for palatalization in Lat. was a /t/ in the 2nd century, while evidence for all the

\textsuperscript{59}Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31.
other palatalizations is of a much later time. This would mean that palatalization in IbVLat. was a gradual development. Unfortunately our evidence for this assumption is too insufficient to make it more than a possibility.

4.1.2.2 Gothic /d/

a) Goth. initial /d/ is not attested in loanwords in Sp.; however, the expectation would be that Goth. /d/ is represented by [d] in this position, whereas in medial position, especially between vowels, one would expect a [ð], parallel to what has been found for Goth. /b/ and Goth. /g/, as well as /p/. In general we find that the development is different for initial position and consonantal clusters on the one hand and intervocalic position on the other.

Perhaps the situation found in early transcription of Gmc. names can back up the assumed general development for initial /d/.. As Dietrich notes, initial "d" in Gk. and Lat. transcription seems to indicate pronunciation as [d]. Goth /d/ in Goth. *daghari is rendered by Procopius as dagari. Similarly a VGoth. name (673 A. D.) is attested as Dagarus.

b) Reflexes of Goth. /d/ in other positions seem to indicate that it was usually preserved as /d/ (probably

---

60 Cf. Llorach, Fonología Española, p. 233. According to Llorach palatalization in the sequence /ti/ becomes common in the 4th c. A.D. in IbVLat..

61 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 71 f..
pronounced [\d\]), especially in clusters, but that it was lost in other positions, especially between vowels. This is shown by the following loanwords: Goth. /d/ > Sp. /d/: Pos.: bandwō > banda II; wardja > guardia; Poss.: blunds > blondo; *kundjan > cundir; *linda > lendo; *randa > randa; *walda > gualda. Goth. /d/ > Sp. Ø: Prob.: rauda > roano; *widan > guiar; (perhaps also mundilōfa > manopla).

An interesting double case is to be found in Sp. arrear, which is probably derived from a formation on the basis of Goth. *rēps, whereas Sp. adrede is probably to be derived from Goth. *at-rēd-, which, Latinized to *atrede, developed into Sp. adrede.

Sp. forrar may also testify to the assumption of a development of Goth. /d/ into a fricative. This form seems to go back to a Goth. fōdr, where /dr/ between vowels apparently developed into Sp. /rr/ by way of assimilation.

Also the assumed loss of Goth. /d/ in Goth. andbahti belongs in this context: Goth. /d/ seems to have been lost between /n/ and /b/; when /n/ and /b/ later came into contact, /n/ was in turn assimilated and became /m/. The result of these processes is Sp. embajada.

In one case, we find Sp. /t/ as a possible reflex of Goth. /d/. Goth. *brid seems to correspond to Sp. brete.

Finally it should be noted that our assumption of the representation of Goth. /d/ as a voiced fricative in some environments is not necessarily supported by Wrede's and
Dietrich's findings for Goth. names. Wrede$^{62}$ points out that WGoth. /d/ seems to have an unchanged reflex in OGoth. He notes that WGoth. /p/ must have developed into a voiced fricative between vowels. It is written "d" and sometimes "th" in Lat. documents. But there is no occurrence of the spelling "t" or "th" for intervocalic Goth. /d/. Only in final position does he find an interchange of the graphs "d" and "th", which he takes as evidence for his assumption that the older fricative had been preserved in Goth. here. As Dietrich$^{63}$ notes, Cassiodorus writes Dummerith -rēps. The same form turns up as -rit in Jornandes: Irmenerit. Later VGoth. spellings follow the practice of writing "d", e.g. Recared, etc. Dietrich also maintains that intervocalic Goth. /d/ was pronounced [d] in later Goth..

4.1.2.3 Gothic /p/

a) All words which are positively, probably or possibly of Goth. origin seem to testify to a sound substitution of Goth. /p/ > Sp. /t/ in the environment#$_. This substitution can be explained on the basis of the fact that IbVLat. did not possess a phoneme which was phonetically like the Goth. /p/. The phonetic value of the WGoth. graphic sign "p", which

---

$^{62}$Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 171; cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 15 f., where arguments are given against the assumption of a runic origin of this Goth. letter.

$^{63}$Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 72.
apparently had been adapted from Gk. theta\(^{64}\), must have been somewhat similar if not identical to the phonetic value of this Gk. phoneme. This assumption is supported by the fact that Goth. "\(p\)" was also used to render Gk. theta in Biblical names. Probably Goth. /\(p\)/ was realized as a voiceless (or fortis) fricative articulated "anywhere from the interdental to the prepalatal points of articulation."\(^{65}\) This seems to have been true for WGoth. in general, but for later Goth., only for the allophone after # and in clusters. In intervocalic position it was apparently a voiced sound, perhaps [\(ð\)].

The nearest equivalent to initial voiceless /\(p\)/ seems to have been IbVLat. /\(t\)/, which substituted for the sound nonexistent in the native system. The only difference between IbVLat. #\(t\)- and VGoth. #\(p\)- appears to have been the manner of articulation, i.e., explosion vs. friction. We may conclude that the other features were probably identical. A similar substitution process may be seen in the replacement of Gk./\(θ\)/ by It.Sp. /\(t\)/: Gk. thallus appears as It.Sp. tallo.\(^{66}\)

A few Sp. loanwords demonstrate the replacement in question: Pos.: briscan > triscar; bahsuko > tasugo; Poss.: bwahtjoy > OSp. tovallla, Sp. toalla; *brauhs > troj.

\(^{64}\)Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 15 f., where arguments are given against the assumption of a runic origin of this Goth. letter.

\(^{65}\)Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 41.

This substitution is somewhat better attested in the transcription of Goth. names in documents. Goldschmidt mentions Trasamundus, for *brasamundus. According to Dietrich the same name also occurs in Cassiodorus as Transimund, which undoubtedly is a case of interpretatio Latina, where EGoth. bras- was felt to be identical with Lat. trans-. Dietrich also mentions that initial Goth. /p/ is often rendered by Lat. "th", which seems to indicate that attempts were made to represent the audible difference between Goth. /p/ and Lat. /t/. But it must be noted that the transcription of Gk. theta was also variant. Unnecessary though not wholly implausible is Dietrich's indication that Goth. initial /p/ might have developed into an aspirated /t/ in the 5th c. But this would be a very unusual development for a Gmc. language of that time.

The regular rendering of Goth. /p/ by Lat. "th" in names containing Goth. *piuda-, *peuda- indicates an underlying folk etymology as seen in previous examples, where these Goth. forms were confused with Gk. theós and thus called for the graph "th", which in Lat. scribal tradition seems to have been somewhat better established for the transcription of Gk. theta, than for Goth. /p/.

67 Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 53.
68 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 76.
69 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 75.
70 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 75 f.
b) Intervocalis Goth. /p/ must have had a phonetic value which was different from initial /p/. Whereas initial /p/ is well established in reconstruction as a voiceless fricative, it has been assumed that Goth. medial /p/ was realized in Sp. as a voiced fricative. Wrede\textsuperscript{71} points out that /p/ is rendered by "th" and "t" in initial position in names, but /p/ almost always by "d", sometimes also by "th", but rarely by "t", in medial position, where the variation especially between "d" and "th" betrays the effort to transcribe [\delta]. Dietrich\textsuperscript{72} notes that in earlier transcriptions of Goth. names, medial /p/ is occasionally written "t" in Lat., cf. Fretila, Fritigernus, from Goth. *frīp̥-, which later appear as Fredila, Fredigernus. Similarly Goth. *neīp̥- occurs as nid- in Nidisclus. The name of the OGoth. king Quidila appears to be a hypocoristic derivation from Goth. qīban.

Similarly, Hrothisthius is written for *hrobis-bius\textsuperscript{73} in the 5th c., Mathasuenta for *mapa-swinba\textsuperscript{74} in the 6th century in OGoth.; in the 7th c. and later, however, the Goth. stem *hrōb- 'fame', is rendered by rūd-; Rudorich (7th c.), for *hroba-reiks, Rudesind (9th-10th c.), for Goth. *hroba-swinbs in VGoth. documents.

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 171 f..
\textsuperscript{72} Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{73} Cf. Kremer, "Behandlung", p. 453.
\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Kremer, "Behandlung", p. 426.
We may conclude that the phonetic value of Goth. /p/ in the position V_V was that of a voiced fricative, which accordingly could not be substituted by IbVLat. /t/ as in initial position. Whereas initial Goth. /p/ merges with IbVLat. /t/ and Goth. /t/ in loanwords, intervocalic /p/ seems to take the same development as Goth. /d/ in Sp.. Perhaps the loanwords evidence can be taken to indicate that WGoth. already had a voiced intervocalic allophone for /p/\(^{75}\), whereas this assumption would be rather doubtful, if based only on the evidence of scribal errors in the OGoth. manuscripts of the Bible.

The following loanwords seem to demonstrate the assumed development: Pos.: *rēb(s) > arrear, (also adrede); Poss.: *waibō, *waipanjān > guadāño, guadānār.

c) Goth. /p/ seems to correspond to Sp. /t/ in consonantal clusters, which indicates that Goth. /p/ in this position must have had a voiceless articulation, as in initial position. The voiceless allophone of Goth. /p/ in clusters appears to have merged in loanwords with Goth. /t/ and IbVLat. /t/ in this position. This is true for most of the loanwords in Sp.: Pos.: marbus > marta; Prob.: *brēms > brētema.

Sp. brētema is a rather interesting case since the development in this case involves svarabhakti in the cluster /tm/, although this seems to have been an acceptable sequence

\(^{75}\text{Cf. Penzl, "Orthography", p. 222.}\)
in IbVLat. Perhaps the development can be explained by assuming the following succession: \(*brēpm(s)*\ via loss of /s/ in the environment \(-\#\) (cf. § 4.1.6.1 (d)) to \(*bretm*\, where the cluster /tm/ was not tolerable in the environment \(-\#\); the next step would have been the development of an excrescent /e/ between the two members of the coda. But this is of course only a tentative assumption.

Poss.: \(mabwa > mata; *palp-> pantano\) (with addition of the Rom. ending \(-ano\)).

Sp. \(mata\), from a possible Goth. \(mabwa\), is also an interesting case, since Goth. /w/ seems to function as a consonantal allophone in this environment. Perhaps /w/ was lost later, parallel to \(bandwō > banda\). This etymon is, however, a doubtful case.

Two other occurrences of Goth. clusters require different assumptions. Both Sp. \(galarðón\) and \(guadapero\) present phonetic difficulties. Sp. \(galarðón\) (OSp. \(gualardon\)) is perhaps to be derived from Goth. \(*wibralaun\) and Sp. \(guadapero\) to be derived from Goth. \(*walbapair(s)*\). In these cases the Sp. reflex appears to be /d/ rather than /t/. Perhaps we should modify our statement that Goth. /p/ is voiceless in (all) clusters by saying that it had a voiced allophone in combination with /l/ and /r/. This, on the other hand, would contradict our example Sp. \(marta\), from Goth. \(marbus\), and

\[^{76}\text{Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 40.}\]
\[^{77}\text{Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 40.}\]
also Sp. pantano, from Goth. *paltb-. In view of this scant and contradictory evidence we can formulate no more definite conclusions at this point.

4.1.3 Velars
4.1.3.1 Gothic /k/

a) Goth. /k/ corresponds to Sp. /k/ in the environment #-. A few loanwords show this correspondence: Poss.: *kramp > calambre; *kasts > casta; *kreitan > OSp. cridar, Sp. gritar (?); *krukkja > croza; *kundjan > cundir.

However, in a few other cases we have a correspondence Goth. /k/ > Sp. /g/ in the environment #_: Poss.: *krama > grampa; *krappa > grapa. (Cf. also Sp. gritar from Goth. *kreitan?).

The regular development seems to have been a correspondence of Goth. /k/ to *GoVLat. /k/. This assumption is also supported by Wrede's observation that WGoth. /k/ seems to exist also in *GoGoth.\(^{78}\) The evidence for the Sp. correspondences of Goth. /k/ in other environments seems to point in the same direction. The /g/ as a reflex of Goth. /k/ may be explainable on the basis of dialect borrowing.

b) Goth. /k/ corresponds to Sp. /k/ in the environment V_V. Pos.: reik(s) > rico; *staka > estaca (or if this

\(^{78}\) Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172.
etymon is correctly reconstructed as *stakka, it testifies to the development of the VkkV-group; taik(n) > tacca; Prob.: *brukeins > brozno; sakan > sacar; Poss.: *rakan > raque.

Parallel to our findings for /tt/, /pp/ we can also tentatively establish a correspondence Goth. /kk/ > Sp. /k/ in the environment V_V, but this development has no certain evidence in the loanwords.

Pos.: *stakka > estaca.

The Goth. origin of Sp. rueca (which would correspond to Goth. *rukka) is highly questionable. This may not even be a Gmc. word, as has been occasionally assumed; for the time being a hypothetical Gmc. *rokka suggests a more satisfactory reconstruction, as has been pointed out already by Pogatscher in his review of Mackel's study on the Gmc. elements in Fr. and Prov.\(^79\), in which he says that Sp. rueca could possibly go back to a Gmc. *rokka, parallel to Gmc. *hosa (cf. Sp. huesa) and Goth. spaúra (cf. Sp. espuela), but not to Goth. *rukka. Harri Meier\(^80\) proposed a VLat. *rupica, which was supported by Maurer\(^81\), and

---


\(^80\) Cf. Harri Meier, "Etymologie und Wortbildungslehre", Romanische Forschungen LXVIII (1956), p. 15 ff..

contradicted by Rohlfs. \(^{82}\)

However, since Goth. /p/, /t/, /k/ as well as the corresponding geminates seem to take the development of the Lat. double consonants in IbVLat., we can safely assume that Goth. /kk/ was treated like Goth. /k/ in intervocalic position.

In one case we seem to meet an apparent counterexample to the generalization stated above: Sp. bregar undoubtedly corresponds to a Goth. brikan. But this example does not force us to question our rules since in this case the Sp. form, showing /g/, has presumably been mediated by Cat. or Prov..

c) The preservation of Goth. /k/ in clusters in Sp. is better attested than the preceding correspondence. The following loanwords testify to this: Pos.: *skairan > esquilar; skankja > escanciao; *skilla > esquila; briskan > triscar; Prob.: *flasko > CSp. flasco, Sp. frasco; Poss.: *blanks > blanca; *hanka > anca; *laska > lasca; *skairnjan > escarnecer; *skattjan, *skatts > escatimar; *skiuhs, *skiuhjan > esquivo. Perhaps also: *usuillan > escullirse.

d) All Sp. reflexes of Gothic words in which /k/ precedes a palatal element show the effect of palatalization (with the exception of *skilla > esquila, which is a special

case). Pos.: \textit{skankja} \textgreater{} \textit{escancier}; Prob.: *\textit{brukeins} \textgreater{} \textit{brozno};
Poss.: *\textit{krukkja} \textgreater{} \textit{croza}; *\textit{brukja} \textgreater{} \textit{broza}. Although Sp. \textit{croza}
is not a well-established case, since it is only possibly of
Goth. origin, it can serve to demonstrate the treatment of
Goth. geminates under palatalization. Goth. geminates are
treated as single consonants in IbVLat. and become palatalized.
This means that Goth. geminates were interpreted as single con-
sonants in the transfer from one language to the other, before
the development of palatal allophones into palatal phonemes
took place in IbVLat.

We can also formulate an assumption concerning the
relative chronology of this IbVLat. sound change from our
loanword evidence. Since the intervocalic Goth. /k/ (or
/kk/) before a palatal element was probably represented by a
slightly palatalized allophone of the phoneme /k/ (similar
to modern Germ. or Engl.), which was identified with the
IbVLat. /k/ in this position, we may conclude that palatal-
ization in this language must have still been a non-
phonemic feature of the phoneme /k/ in this position. Other-
wise one would have felt Goth. /k/ to be different from the
palatal phoneme in IbVLat. and therefore the speaker of IbVLat.
would have substituted Goth. /k/ by IbVLat. /k/ rather than
/ć/ in this position.

Since we know that the main period of Goth. influence on
the Sp. language ended near the end of the 6th c., or perhaps
somewhat later, we may also conclude that this palatalization
cannot have been completed prior to the 5th c.. However, this
seems to be true only for /k/, but not for the Goth. phoneme /t/ (cf. § 4.1.2.1). This assumption is supported by the fact that Sp. place names (or Iberian place names in general) of Goth. origin show /k/ as well as palatalized /č/ as a reflex of Goth. /k/ in a palatal environment. The relevance of this observation has been pointed out by Gamillscheg.\(^3\) In place names we find the following alternations:

Goth. \textit{kinbs}: palatalized: 
\textit{Cende, Cendemil, Cendufe};
non-palatalized: \textit{Quende, Quindimil}.

Goth. \textit{Rikila}: palatalized: \textit{Recea}; non-palatalized:
\textit{Requiao} (in Portugal). Goth. \textit{Rikimunbs} corresponds to
\textit{Recamondo, Rezmondo}; Goth. \textit{Rikiswinbs} (or \textit{isinbs}) appears
as \textit{Requezende} as well as \textit{Recesende}.

Sachs\(^4\) gives both \textit{Quindimil} and \textit{Cendemil} as being
found in the province of Lugo. This alternation can be
explained by assuming that the palatalized forms are
earlier forms which show the same sound changes as the
Corresponding loanwords in Spanish; obviously, these names
were Romanized before the time of the palatalization in Sp.
The non-palatalized forms seem to represent later forms,
since these names must have been Romanized at a time when
the palatalization in IbVLat. was already completed and a
palatal allophone of Goth. /k/ could no longer be repre-
sented by a Romance palatalized /č/. At this stage, the

\(^3\)Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 51 f.
\(^4\)Cf. Sachs, Ortnamen, p. 20.
Goth. /k/ in this position corresponded to IbVLat. /k/.

As Sachs points out\(^{85}\), the occurrence of non-palatalized as well as palatalized reflexes in the northwest of the Iberian Peninsuls corresponds to the migration of Goth into this part of the country, which followed the invasion of the Arabs. For some time at least, it must have been possible to represent Goth. /k/ by IbVLat. /k/ as well as by /č/. Sachs interprets this as an indication that palatalization gradually developed during the first half of the 8th c.\(^{86}\)

4.1.3.2 Gothic /g/

a) In initial position Goth. /g/ was obviously still a voiced occlusive which was interpreted as IbVLat. /g/ and pronounced [g]. The following loanwords testify to this development: Pos.: *gans > ganso; gasali, *gasalja > OSp. gasaja, Sp. agasajar; *gainön > gana; *ganan > ganar; Prob.: *gabila > gavilán; gaita > gaita.

These show that /g/ in this position merges with the development of Lat. /g/ in this environment since the latter had been preserved as [g] before the vowels /a/, /o/, and /u/. Before /e/ and /i/, however, Lat./g/ disappeared. Gamillscheg\(^{87}\) also mentions some evidence for palatalization of VGoth. /g/ before the diphthong "ai" in placenames

---

\(^{85}\) Cf. Sachs, Ortsnamen, p. 5 and p. 20.

\(^{86}\) Cf. also Gamillscheg, RPE XIX, p. 255 f., on this point.

\(^{87}\) Cf. Gamillscheg, RPE XIX, p. 251 f.
and takes this as proof that the Goth. diphthong must have been monophthongized to [ē] (as maintained by Wrede, Meyer-Lübke and most other researchers in the field) or at least developed to a more palatal diphthong [êi]. He mentions Gilhe (Oporto), coming from *Geli or *Gili, Gelvira (Viano do Castelo), Germil etc., which seems to go back to Goth. *gails. He also points out that the Goth. word *gais 'spear', which is present in several placenames on the Iberian Peninsula, seems to imply the same development. But the generality of this development is questionable since the loanword evidence seems to point towards a different development of Goth. "ái" (cf. § 4.2.2.1). However, it should perhaps be mentioned that Goth. *gainōn could have been confused with Goth. *ganan; both Goth. stems implied here result in Sp. gan-. The etymology for the Sp. word gaita is not without certain doubts. Thus, the evidence available here is too small to allow us to give a more definite statement.

Evidence for [g] as the realization of initial /g/ is also given by OGoth. names, as it has been pointed out by Wrede. 88

b) Goth. /g/ in the environment V_V corresponds to Sp. /g/. The question as to whether it is true that Goth. /g/ was realized as a voiced velar fricative in this position 89 cannot be decided on this basis since not only [g] but also a

88 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172.
89 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172.
voiced velar fricative would have been interpreted as /g/ in
IBVLat., since the phonetic value of this phoneme would have
been the closest correspondence to the Goth. sound in both
cases.

However, on the basis of the parallel to Goth. inter-
vocalic /p/, /b/ and /v/ one can perhaps assume that the inter-
vocalic allophone of Goth. /g/ was also a fricative rather than
a stop. This seems to be supported by the fact that Goth. /g/
shows a special development in the neighborhood of palatals
which presupposes a fricative articulation. This has also
been pointed out by Wrede.\textsuperscript{90}

Goth. /g/ in the environments V_i and V_j seems to merge
with the following palatal element which results in a secondary
diphthong [ai] in the first case and in [aj] in the second
case. This development, as has been pointed out by Wrede\textsuperscript{91},
must have been a Goth. sound change since the results of it
occur relatively early in documents. Goth. names such as
Daila are to be derived from *Dagila, which is perhaps a
hypocoristic diminutive on the basis of the Goth. stem *dag(s)
in this case. A few Goth. loanwords in Sp. show the result of
this change: Pos.: *sagjis, *sagja > sayón; *hagja > aya.
A very doubtful case is Sp. desmayar, which sometimes has been
brought together with Goth. magan. With Goldschmidt\textsuperscript{92} one

\textsuperscript{90}Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{91}Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{92}Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 62.
would postulate a Goth. form *magjan, in order to account for the phonological development; unfortunately this etymology cannot be confirmed.

However, this special development of /g/ in a palatal environment can perhaps serve to show that the intervocalic allophone of /g/ in Goth. must have been fricative, as suggested for other reasons by Braune. 93 Wrede has also pointed out that the preservation of /g/ in names such as Fandigild, Winigild might indicate that the alleged change did not take place in cases where /g/ was the onset of the next morpheme. 94

The normal development of Goth. intervocalic /g/ in Sp. is demonstrated by the following loanwords: Prob.: *laigōn > lagotear; *laittug > látigo; Poss.: magan > amagar.

Dietrich 95 notes that written forms of Goth. names such as Eila (cf. Agila, Egila), Rainmir (from Goth. *ragin), Aiulf (cf. Aigulf) suggest that the special development of /g/ in a palatal environment is due to the development of a palatal fricative as an allophone of /g/. The same appears to be true for names like VGoth. Sisebut (cf. Goth. *sigis-). A similar process is attested for MHG and many other languages.

94 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, pp. 172; cf. also § 4.1.1.2 for a similar argument concerning juncture.
95 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 73 ff.
c) Goth. /g/ is preserved in all clusters in Sp. loanwords, with the exception of /zg/. Pos.: *haribaírго > albergue; *ingrimjís > íngrimo; *grimms > grima; *harihrings > arenza; Prob.: anga > angazo; Poss.: strings > estringar.

Goth. azgō is probably the underlying form of Sp. ascua (cf. § 4.1.6.2). Sp. renco seems to go back to Goth. *hrings, where Goth. /g/ corresponds to Sp. /k/ in a nasal cluster. Perhaps this must be explained on the basis of indirect borrowing; the phonological correspondence is in any case not the normal one.

4.1.3.3 Gothic /h/

During the IbVLat. period, Lat. /h/ had already been lost. Whether the Goth. phoneme /h/, which Wulfila represented by the Lat. letter "h"96 was still pronounced like the Gmc. (fortis) velar fricative or merely represented aspiration, is difficult to say97, since the rendering of Biblical names in the Goth. Bible is highly inconsistent.

However, it has been pointed out that Wulfila also could have chosen Gk. "x"98, which represented [x] at that time, if such a sound was the phonetic value of the Goth. phoneme /h/.

Certain scribal errors, such as dropping correct /h/

or inserting /h/ in etymologically unjustified positions, could back up the assumption that the Goth. graph "h" still represented a voiced velar fricative. Wrede points out that the development towards aspiration can be assumed at least for OGoth.; he quotes the much later forms of CGoth., cf. iel, ael, ano, seis, (corresponding to WGoth. halls, hallus, hana, sais), which are supposed to show the final stage of a presupposed Goth. development from Gmc. [x] (as it was preserved for a longer time in WGmc. dialects, cf. below) via voicing and loss of fricatio to Ø.

Goldschmidt notes that the representation of /h/ in the Lat. transcription of Goth. proper names is unstable already in Jornandes, as shown by "h" in Halaricus (from *ala-reiks), versus the loss of "h" in Ariaricus (from *harja-reiks).

Dietrich states that Goth. /h/ can in no position have been a [x]. He notes especially the tendency for /h/ to disappear in the environments _a and _ç_; cf. Alatheus (from *Alhabeus). Goth. harja was rendered everywhere by Lat. aria-. However, other factors might also be involved here, as the constant preservation of /h/ in hildi- possibly suggests. We conclude that Dietrich's assumption cannot be entirely valid.

99 Cf. the examples listed in Krause, Handbuch, p. 125.
100 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 175, also n. 3.
102 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 77.
Whatever the phonetic value of it might have been, Goth. /h/ seems to have had no direct correspondence in the phonemic system of IbVLat.. The reflex of Goth. /h/ is ø in Sp..

a) Goth. /h/ > Sp. ø in the environment #-. Pos.: *haribaírgō > albergue; *haspa > aspa; *hrapōn > (ar)rapar; *hagjō > aya; *harihrings > arengo; *hrings > renco; hilms > OSp. elmo, Sp. yelmo; Prob.: *hramnila > rámila; Poss.: *hanka > anca; *harpa > arpa; *harpōn > arpar; *hraustjō > rezón; *hrampō > remplón.

b) Goth. /h/ also disappears in medial position. Pos.: *spāíha > espía; *harihrings > arenga; *sahre > sera; (perhaps also *pahsuks > tasugo?); Poss.: *maúrhwallus > morilla; *skiuhs; *skiuhjan > esquivo; (perhaps also *pwahljō > Osp. tovalla, Sp. toalla).

Some other cases which offer phonological difficulties could be rejected on the basis of the total evidence, e.g., Goth. *praúhs, which has been assumed to be the basis of Sp. troj, also andbahti, which cannot directly correspond to Sp. embajada.

We can assume with Gamillschev\(^\text{103}\) that the alleged differences between the reflexes of Gmc. /h/ in WGmc. and EGmc. dialects left distinct traces in Rom. phonology. Whereas /h/ was realized as a voiceless (fortis) fricative in WGmc. (cf. Sp. trigar < Sues. prihan, Prov. jequir, OFr. jehir < Franc. jehan, OFr. tehir, It. tecchire < Franc. *pihhjan), it was

\(^{103}\text{Cf. Gamillschev, RFE XIX, p. 254 f..}\)
either a voiced (lenis) fricative or merely aspiration in Goth. and left hardly any traces, except perhaps in the cluster /lh/, as in Falhowin, which may underlie the Sp. placename Falcuino (Barcelona), and in gemination, cf. VGoth. Fah-hild > MLat. Fagildus. 104

4.1.4 Nasals

4.1.4.1 Gothic /m/

a) Goth. /m/ corresponds to Sp. /m/ in the environment #. Pos.: *marbus > marta; Poss.: magan > (a) magar; magan > (des) mayar; manwjan > manir; marzjan > OSp. (a) marrido; mabwa > mata; *maurhwalus > morilla; mundilofa > manopla.

This correspondence is testified only by questionable etymologies, with the possible exception of *marbus. IbVLat. had a phoneme /m/, which had a distribution very similar to that of Goth. /m/. The sound value of Goth. /m/ was probably more or less identical to that of IbVLat. /m/.

b) Goth. /m/ corresponds to Sp. /m/ in the environment V_V. Pos.: *bramön > bramar; *ingrimjis (*ingriméis?) > íngrimo. Goth. /mm/ appears possibly as Spanish /m/ in the environment V_V. 105 Pos.: *grimms > grima.

104 Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 255.

105 Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., §§ 491-504, § 518 and § 525 on double consonants which are simplified in Rom.
We should also note *brammōn > bramar according to Holthausen (GEW, p. 17).

c) Goth. /m/ corresponds to Sp. /m/ in consonantal clusters: Pos.: hilms > OSp. elmo, Sp. yelmo; Prob.: *brēpms > brētema.

The cluster /tm/ was not tolerated here in IbVLat. and is avoided by svarabhakti. The reasons for this are unclear, since /tm/ was otherwise a tolerable sequence in IbVLat..¹⁰⁶ Poss.: *krampa > grampa; *kramp > calambre; *hrampō > ramplón; stampjan > estamar.

Prob. *hramnila > rámila shows the deletion of /n/ in the cluster /mn/, which, however, seems to have been possible in IbVLat..

4.1.4.2 Gothic /n/

a) There is no documented case of Goth. /n/ in the environment #_ in Sp. loanwords.

b) Intervocalic /n/ does not occur.

c) Goth. /n/ in clusters usually corresponds to Sp. /n/. This is testified in the following loanwords: Pos.: bandwö > banda II; *gans > ganso; skankja > escanciano; *hrings > renco; *harihrings > arengo. Undoubtedly /n/ was realized as [ŋ] in clusters before velars such as /k/, /g/. This sound feature, which was consequently allophonic in Goth., seems to have been rendered parallel to Gk. spelling in

Wulfila's orthography, which otherwise was phonemically oriented.\textsuperscript{107} Prob.: \textit{*anga} > \textit{angazo}; \textit{*brukeins} > \textit{brozno}; Poss.: \textit{*alisna} > \textit{lesna}; \textit{*blanks} > \textit{blanca}; \textit{*blunds} > \textit{blondo}; \textit{fani} > \textit{fango}; \textit{*hanka} > \textit{anca}; \textit{*kundjan} > \textit{cundir}; \textit{*linda} > \textit{lendo}; \textit{manwjan} > \textit{manir}; \textit{mundilôfa} > \textit{manopla}; \textit{randa} > \textit{randa}; \textit{*skaîrnjan} > \textit{escarnecer}; \textit{strings} > \textit{estringar}.

In one case we seem to encounter an assimilation [n] > [m] in the environment _b_, after the assumed loss of intervening /å/ in a heavy cluster: \textit{andbahtí} > \textit{embajada}.

In another case a Goth. \textit{/n/} preserved in final position seems to have been due in part to a folk etymological connection with Lat. \textit{donum}: \textit{*wipralaun} > \textit{galardón}.

4.1.5 Liquids

4.1.5.1 Gothic /r/

Goth. /r/ often corresponds to Sp. /r/, sometimes to /l/.

a) Goth. /r/ corresponds to Sp. /r/ in the environment #. Poss.: \textit{*raupa} > \textit{ropa}; \textit{*rëps} > (ar)\textit{rear}; \textit{reiks} > \textit{rico}; Prob.: \textit{ribjô} > \textit{ripia}; \textit{raudå} > \textit{roano}; Poss.: \textit{*rakan} > \textit{raque}; \textit{*randa} > \textit{randa}; \textit{*reirán} > \textit{rehilar}.

b) Goth. /r/ corresponds to Sp. /r/ or /l/ in the environment V_V. Poss.: \textit{*haribaírgo} > \textit{albergue}; \textit{*skaîrán} > \textit{esquilar}; \textit{*spaúra} > \textit{espuela}.

In all these cases we find some reason to assume that Goth. /r/ was originally transferred into IbVLat. as /r/, but then replaced by /l/ for some secondary reason; albergue can occur optionally either with /l/ or with /r/, cf. OSp. arvergeria. Perhaps the replacement of /r/ and /l/ was due to a dissimilation in this case. Similarly, the Sp. form espuela, corresponding to Goth. spaúra, is to be found in earlier Sp. also as espuera, which again seems to indicate an original optionality of the two liquids in this replacement. In the case of esquilar one is tempted to assume an influence of Sp. esquila (from Goth. *skilla), which belongs in the same semantic field (pastoral terms) and thus may have motivated a folk etymological connection. This is also suggested by the vocalism, in this case; Sp. esquila does not show the expected /e/ as a reflex of Goth. /i/.

Pos.: *harihreng > arenga; Prob.: *walbapair(s) > guadapero; warjan > guarecer; Poss.: *reiran > rehilar.

c) In clusters, Goth. /r/ > Sp. /r/. Pos.: *bramōn > bramar; brikan > bregar; *brut > brote; *(hari) baírgō > (al)bergue; *hrapón > (ar)rapar; triggwa > tregua; briscan > triscar; *brid > brete; *(hari)hrings > arenga; *hrings > renco; ingrimjis > íngrimo; *grimms > grima; *sahr(s) > sera; wardja > guardia; Prob.: *brebms > brétema; *brukeine > brozno; *hrammila > rámla; Poss.: *brukja > broza; *brusti > broza, bruza; *harpa > arpa; *harpōn > arpar; *hraustjo > rezón; hrampō > ramplón; *krampō > grampa;
*krappa > grappa; *kramp > calambre; *kreitan > gritar;
*krukkja > croza; maúrhwallus > morilla; *skáirnjan > escarnecer
strings > estringer; striup > estribo; *braúhs > troj.

Metathesis is probably responsible for the development
of galardón, which possibly goes back to Goth. *wibralaun.

We may also find evidence for the following occasional
assimilations: /dr/ > /rr/, in Goth. fōdr-, corresponding to
Sp. forrar. Goth. marzjan could be the basis for ÖSp.
amarrido, which would show that /rz/ > /rr/. 108

An interchange of /r/ and /l/ also turns up occasionally
in personal names. Wrede109 quotes a form Blandila, for
Brandila in ÖGoth., going back to Gmc. *brand 'sword'.

4.1.5.2 Gothic /l/

Goth. /l/ corresponds to the IbVLat. phoneme /l/, but
in some cases it is also represented by /r/.

a) Initial /l/: Pos.: lōfa > lúa; laistjan > lasta;
lewjan > aleve; Prob.: *laittug > látigo; *laigōn > lagotero;
Poss.: *laskō > laska; *leista > lista; *linda > lendo.

b) Intervocalic /l/: Pos.: *spōla > espolín; *aliza >
aliso; Prob.: *gabila > gavilán; *hramnila > rámila; Poss.: *alisna > lesna.

108 On the question of rhotacism, see § 4.1.6.2.
c) Intervocalic /l/ is represented by Sp. /l/: Pos.:
*skilla > esquila; Poss.: *usquillan > escullirse; maúrhwallus
> morilla.

d) In most cases, /l/ is preserved in clusters: Pos.:
hilms > OSp. elmo, Sp. yelmo; miltja (*smalt) > esmaltar;
Poss.: *blanks > blanca; *blunds > blondo; *walda > gualda.

The case of Sp. frasco, OSp. flasco, would suggest
that the variation between /r/ and /l/ in loanwords (which
is also attested elsewhere in the history of Sp.) is an
IbVLat. development rather than a special feature of the
transfer from Goth. to Sp..

In the highly questionable case of Sp. pantano, a Sp.
/n/ may possibly be the reflex of Goth. /l/: *palb-.

In one case Goth. /l/ seems to have been lost early,
cf. *walpapaírs > guadapero, as suggested by the fact that
Goth. /p/ turns up as Sp. /d/, which is possible in the
environment V_V. (cf. § 4.1.2.3). A somewhat later loss of
/l/ in the cluster /ln/ (which seems to have been especially
susceptible to sound change) apparently took place after the
syncope of Goth. /ei/ in the case of Sp. ana, which is still
attested as alna in some dialects. This suggests a development
aleina > *alina > alna > ana. Cor. (I, p. 197) points out
that the rarity of this cluster in Spanish might explain the
loss of /l/ in /ln/.

Goth. /l/ corresponding to Sp. /d/:
Although a development of /l/ to /d/ seems to be a possibility for some Gmc. names such as Dudo (for Ludo)\textsuperscript{110} and is also attested in Goth. Dudila\textsuperscript{111}, the establishment of such a sound substitution for Goth. loanwords seems to be out of the question, since in the case of Sp. galardón from Goth. *wipralaun, -don for -laun can be explained far more simply as a folk etymology on the basis of Lat. donum.\textsuperscript{112} In any case the phonological form of this word in Sp. causes problems in the etymological treatment of both parts of the compound.

4.1.6 Sibilants
4.1.6.1 Gothic /s/

a) Goth. /s/ was undoubtedly a sibilant in WGoth., which in intervocalic position was the voiceless counterpart of WGoth. /z/.\textsuperscript{113} This sound probably came very close to the realization of the IbVLat. phoneme /s/, which preserved Lat. /s/ in initial position as a voiceless sibilant.

The following loanwords testify to the assumption that Goth. /s/ corresponded to Sp. /s/ in the environment#: 

\textsuperscript{110}Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{111}According to Kremer, "Behandlung", p. 428.
\textsuperscript{112}As already mentioned by Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{113}Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 40.
b) For the development of intervocalic Goth. /s/ in Sp., our loanword evidence does not allow any conclusion at all. The question as to whether the "z" for /s/ (especially in final position) in the Goth. Bible can be interpreted as an indication for voicing in the dialect of the OGoth. scribes must be left open.\(^{114}\) It should be noted, however, that no traces of rhotacism can be found in VGoth. names\(^{115}\) or OGoth. names\(^{116}\) in early medieval documents. The same seems to be true for other EGmc. languages, such as Vand.\(^{117}\) and Burg., where a name Aisaberga obviously still shows intervocalic "s" (probably [z], phonetically), coming from *aiza-.\(^{118}\) Aisaberga is mentioned by Goldschmidt.\(^{119}\)

Although we can safely assume that the Goth. sibilant was already voiced in intervocalic position, we must conclude that such an allophonic variation left no trace in

\(^{115}\) Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 57 f.
\(^{116}\) Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172.
\(^{117}\) Cf. Wrede, Wandalen, p. 105.
\(^{119}\) Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 58. The earliest evidence for a development /s/> /r/ in WGmc. turns up in the 6th c. A.D.; Walthemath, *Die fränkischen Elemente* (p. 79) quotes evidence for Franc.. A Franc. coin from Speyer (Germany) shows the only remnant of /s/ in this position for Franc.. *Gaiso*, from Gmc. *gais* (cf. Walthemath, *Die fränkischen Elemente*, p. 57.)
IbVLat., since the few existing Goth. loanwords in Sp. which show /s/ in intervocalic position, indicate that IbVLat. did not possess a voiced /s/ between vowels. Cf. the following examples:

Pos.: *gasali, gasalja > agasajar, OSp. gasaja; Poss.: *alisa > aliso.

If Goth. /s/ had a voiced allophone between vowels, this would expectedly merge with /z/, which had a defective distribution in Goth., since it could not occur in several positions, e.g. initially and in certain clusters. Thus, we cannot decide on phonological grounds, whether Sp. aliso is derived from a Goth. *alisa or aliza, since the Sp. reflex must have been the same.

c) Goth. /s/ in consonantal clusters is preserved as Sp. /s/.

In the position #_sC(r)V, however, Goth. /s/ took the same development as Lat. initial clusters beginning with /s/, i.e., an epenthetic vowel /e/ was developed.

As Valencia demonstrates\(^{120}\), in a context such as CVC#sC(r)V a non-etymological vowel /e/ was introduced before the cluster after #: the string was changed to the form CVC#esC(r)V. This change had a twofold effect on the structure of IbVLat.: not only the cluster sC(r) was avoided, which was intolerable after a pause in IbVLat. generally, but also the syllabification of such strings was changed entirely.

\(^{120}\) Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 46 f.
Thus, the development of epenthetic /e/ seems to go back to two different working tendencies in the development of Rom. in general and IbVLat. especially.

According to Valencia, the general tendency towards opening the syllable, which is found in the development of IbVLat., shows that the syllable boundary /-/ tends to cut the string of phonetic segments in the following way: the first of two successive syllables is either open or has a light coda, whereas the second syllable is allowed to begin with the heaviest onset cluster permissible after pause in the phonotactic structure of the language.

In the case of the above mentioned string, CVC#sC(r)V, the resulting syllable structure according to this tendency towards an opening of syllables in IbVLat. would have been #- CVC - sC(r)V - , even as such a succession of syllables would have contained an otherwise untolerated onset cluster, i.e., sC(r).

Valencia says further that "the need to adapt a non-permissible initial cluster to the structure of the language is stronger than the tendency towards open syllabicity"\textsuperscript{121} in IbVLat.. Thus by introducing an epenthetic vowel /e/ the string is changed to CVC#esC(r)V, which according to the phonotactic principles of IbVLat., had the following syllable structure: - CV - Ces - C(r)V -. This represents the optimal condition so far as IbVLat. syllabification is

\textsuperscript{121}Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 47.
concerned. Note that the syllable boundary in this case interferes with the morpheme (or word) boundary\#, which was normal in Rom. languages. On the other hand, the onset elements resulting from this syllabification, C and Cr were tolerated initials in IbVLat.. In Gmc. (Goth.) loanwords in Sp., we find phonemes such as /p/, /t/, /k/ and /m/ after /s/, also /pr/, /tr/ and /kr/. Other combinations are not attested in the materials inspected in this study. In intervocalic clusters we also find one (doubtful) case of /sn/: *aliska > lesna.

The following loanwords in Sp. demonstrate the developments discussed here:

#sp- : Pos.: *spínha > espía; *spúra > espuela;
*spitus > espeto, espetón; *spola > espolín.

#st- : Pos.: *stakka > estaca.

#sk- : Pos.: *skáiran > esquilar; skankja > escanciano; *skilla > esquilla; Poss.: *skauts > escotar;
*skárnjan > escarnecer; skattjan, skatts > escatimar;
*skiuhs, *skiuhjan > esquivo.

#str- : Pos.: strings > estringar; striup > estribo.

#sr- : Pos.: *smalt > esmaltar.

Goth. medial /sp/ corresponds to Sp. /sp/ in the environment V-V: Pos.: *haspa > aspa.

Goth. medial /sk/ corresponds to Sp. /sk/ in the environment V-V: Pos.: briskan > triscar; Prob.: *flaskō > OSp.

flasco, Sp. frasco; Poss.: *laaska > lasca. (Doubtful is *usquillan > escullirse, which would presuppose a development of Goth. medial /skw/ to Sp. /sk/. This is not predictable from the phonotactic structure of IbVLat., since /skw/ seems to have been an acceptable combination in IbVLat.)

Goth. medial /st/ corresponds to /st/ in Sp.: Pos.: laistjan > lastar.

Goth. medial /sn/ seems to correspond to Sp. /sn/ in one somewhat doubtful etymology: Poss.: *alisna > lesna. Note, however, that /s/ would appear in a voiced environment in this case, although it appears to be represented by Sp. voiceless /s/. (cf. § 4.1.6.1b).

d) Final /s/ seems to have been lost in the nominative singular in names. 123 This seems to have been true also for /s/ in loanwords in the environment _#; although we cannot give direct proof of this, since Goth. endings, such as -s in *gans, are often augmented by IbVLat. endings, such as -o# in Sp. ganso, which created a different situation. However, a number of words, such as reiks, corresponding to Sp. rico, indicates that the rule of the disappearance of /s/ before a pause applies to VGoth. loanwords also.

e) Interesting is also the development of the Gmc. (Goth.) cluster /sl/ in the environment V_V to IbVLat. /skl/, a change which seems to have been limited to names. This development is attested in Burg., Vand. and Goth., also in

123 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 176, and also p. 4 f.
Franc. names, where especially the form -geils very often appears as -gisclus in Lat. transcription. Dietrich mentions the frequency of names such as Goth. Froisclus (589 A.D.) which he derives from Froagisil, via Froagisclus. He quotes Nidigisclus, Witigisclus (both Goth.) and stresses the fact that this seems to be a very early change. He mentions the oppositon "Theudegisilus seu Theudisclus", which he finds in Gregory of Tours. The first member of this pair is interesting since it shows an alternate form with some sort of svarabhakti-vowel. Similarly the Gk. writer Procopius has Oulisgisalos, for Goth. Wiligisclus, as attested elsewhere.

Perhaps this phenomenon, which is obviously not restricted to Lat. transcriptions in Spain, can be explained by reference to principles of syllabification. Perhaps the syllable division for Gmc. -gisls was gī - slus, which might have necessitated a change to gīs - clus, thus avoiding the onset cluster /sl/, which was tolerable in Gmc. languages, but not in VLat., and replacing it by the more familiar and very frequent syllable-initial cluster /k/. The alternative development of svarabhakti indicates that a non-tolerated cluster must have been involved here.

124 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 38 f.
125 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 65.
126 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 74.
127 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 175 and p. 52.
The Sp. word *esclavo*, which Goldschmidt\textsuperscript{128} mentions, does not seem to belong in this context, since it is highly probable that this word was taken from Gk. rather than a Gmc. dialect. The word is probably of Byzantine Gk. origin.\textsuperscript{129}

4.1.6.2 Gothic /z/

There is no positively attested Sp. reflex of intervocalic Goth. /z/. However, the etymon Sp. *alisa*, has sometimes been assumed to go back to a Goth. *aliza* rather than *alisa*, even as this questions cannot be resolved for the phonological reasons stated above in § 4.1.6.1 b).

Other doubtful, but a least possible cases which might be mentioned here are: OSp. *amarillo* from the Goth. form *marzjan*, which would indicate the possibility of an assimilation /zr/ > /rr/ in the environment V_V. Since the phonemic contrast between intervocalic /r/ and /rr/ is kept as a relevant distinction in Sp. (cf. Sp. *pero* vs. *perro*), this change may well go back to a VGoth. development. But without supporting evidence this must remain merely a speculation based only on one (doubtful) case. Sp. *ascua* is probably a reflex of Goth. *azgo*, in which the intervocalic cluster /zg/ seems to have been replaced by the possible IbVLat. cluster/*sk*/;


\textsuperscript{129} Cf. Corominas II, p. 349; also Kluge, *EWDS*, p. 711 f. and *ML* (*REW*), 8023.
The fact that /s/ and /z/ were confused in the manuscripts of the WGoth. Bible has been taken to indicate a late (i.e., OGoth.) merger of these two sounds in the phoneme /s/. Support for this assumption might be seen in the fact that Goth. personal names such as Gesila, Usda, Rosemud, Cessa invariably show "s" in Lat. graphic representation, which of course could also indicate a sound substitution.

Sp. lozano 'cheerful, lively', related to loza 'earthenware, delft, porcelain' and a few other forms, can hardly have anything to do with Gmc. (Goth.? laus- (or lauz-?) 'empty', as claimed by Goldschmidt and others. A derivation from such a Gmc. stem would not only encounter semantic problems but would be questionable also on phonological grounds, since Sp. /z/ in this case is the typical result of a palatalization (cf. /tʃ/ perhaps). Meyer-Lübke points out the semantic difficulties of Goldschmidt's assumption. Corominas follows Meyer-Lübke in postulating a Lat. form lautia 'hospitality, comfort' which is much more satisfactory, so far as sound change is concerned. The question of this etymology, however, is still not settled,

---

130 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172, especially n. 5.
131 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 172.
133 Cf. ML (REW), 4949.
as recent publications indicate. It is interesting in our
text that Malkiel\textsuperscript{135} has tried to develop Sp. \textit{lozano},
lozania from Goth. \textit{flaut(jan)}. The development of /fl/
/l/ in the environment \# is attested in the Asturian
dialect, where place names such as Laviana can be derived
from (Villa) Flaviana.\textsuperscript{136} Alvar\textsuperscript{137} also agrees with Malkiel.
However, this is strongly opposed by more recent research\textsuperscript{138}
which tries to reconstruct an IbVLat. form *lautianus,
derived from Lat. \textit{lautus}.

4.1.7 Semivowels
4.1.7.1 Gothic /w/

Gothic /w/ appears to have been a voiced bilabial.

\textsuperscript{135} Cf. Yakov Malkiel, \textit{Three Hispanic Word Studies}.
University of California Publications in Linguistics I,
no. 7, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1947.

\textsuperscript{136} Cf. Joseph M. Piel, "Beiträge zur nordwest-hispan-
ischen Toponomastik", \textit{Romanische Forschungen} LXIV (1952),
pp. 241-262.

\textsuperscript{137} Cf. Manual Alvar, review of Yakov Malkiel, \textit{Three
Hispanic Word Studies}, \textit{Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie}
LXXI (1955), pp. 303-312.

\textsuperscript{138} Cf. Harri Meier, "Esp. loza, lozano, loco; Port. loíca -
louça, loução, louco, tolo", \textit{Revista de Filologia Española}
XXXIV (1950), pp. 184-194; Heinrich Lausberg, review of Garcia
de Diego, Vincente, \textit{Gramática histórica Española}, \textit{Romanische
Forschungen} LV (1954), pp. 171-172; John M. Hill, \textit{Voces
germanescas}. Indiana University Publications. Humanities
Series, No. 21, Bloomington, Indiana 1949; Max L. Wagner,
"Etymologische Randbemerkungen zu neueren iberoromanischen
Dialektarbeiten und Wörterbüchern", \textit{Zeitschrift für romanische
Philologie} LXIX (1953), pp. 347-391; C.J. Crowley, "On Spanish
The IbVLat. initial /v/, which was phonetically [v], developed from a voiced bilabial sound [w] in earlier CLat., which became an unrounded bilabial [β] in the last century A.D. and later developed into a labial-dental [v].\textsuperscript{139} This seems to have been the phonetic value /v/ in IbVLat. at the time concerned. This sound was probably phonetically distinct from the Goth. phoneme /w/, and therefore not suitable for substitution.

This inadequacy must have been reinforced by the fact that the earlier bilabial rounded spirant Lat. [ɥ] (cf. quadrum, lingua) had been preserved as such in IbVLat. This indicates that the speaker of IbVLat. may have sensed the fact that Goth. /w/ was not identical with the phonetic representation of Lat. /v/. However, for historical reasons, this IbVLat. [ɥ] which Valencia obviously identifies as an allophone of the phoneme /u/, had a rather restricted distribution: [ɥ] could appear only in the positions k_V (written "qu-") and g_V, never in the position #_\textsuperscript{140}

Further, there was an assymmetrical distribution of the clusters [kɥ] and [gɥ]: [gɥ] could never occur after a pause. These facts no doubt influenced the interpretation of Gmc. #w_ as IbVLat. gɥ_, a phenomenon generally to be found in Rom..

\textsuperscript{139}Cf. Lausberg, \textit{Rom. Sprachw.}, § 297.

\textsuperscript{140}It should be noted that Goth. "q" appears to be equivalent to the combination /kw/, i.e., phonemically it is a cluster. Cf. also Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, p. 71.
The distributional fact introduced into IbVLat. by the Gmc. (Goth.) loanwords is then that both [ku] and [gu] can occur in word-initial as well as in syllable-initial position, as the following examples show:

\textit{cin-que: quadro; lin-gua: guardia} (of Goth. origin)

Thus it seems possible to establish a phonemic substitution process: Goth. \[w\] \(\rightarrow\) IbVLat. \([gu]\) for the environment \(\#_{-}\). This assumption seems preferable to certain unfounded speculations about a possible Gmc. (Goth.?) sound-change \(\#w \rightarrow \#gw\)\(^{141}\) or J. Schwarz's theory of a later Lat. sound-change \(\#w \rightarrow \# gw\)\(^{142}\), which was adopted by Brüch in his studies of the Gmc. influence on VLat. and Rom..\(^{143}\) The assumption of a Gmc. sound-change is not only unfounded, but also contradicted by the fact that Gmc. (i.e. Franc.) initial \(/w/\) is preserved in some dialects in the north and northeast of France as \([w]\).\(^{144}\) Brüch\(^{145}\) postulates a special case of preservation of \([w]\) within Gmc.. \([w]\) is of course still present in some Germ. dialects.

For Brüch, the apparent lack of older evidence for the substitution \(/w/ \rightarrow [gu]\) and the rendering of Gmc. \(/w/\) by


\(^{142}\)Cf. Josef Schwarz, "Übergang von germ. u zu rom. gu", \textit{Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie} 
XXVI (1912), pp. 236-240.


\(^{144}\)Cf. Lausberg, \textit{Rom. Sprachw.}, § 303.

\(^{145}\)Cf. Brüch, "Forschung", p. 65.
Lat. /b/ and /v/ in names of Gmc. persons and tribes mentioned by earlier Lat. writers, contradicts the possibility of a substitution. However, sound correspondences in names are not reliable evidence, since they show considerable variance and can also be influenced by other factors, such as folk etymology. Above all the older Lat. /v/ seems to have been a bilabial rather than a labio-dental, which tended to merge with /b/. The result of this merger in spoken Latin probably had the feature of bilabial articulation for some time in common with Gmc. /w/, although the feature of rounding must have been lacking. In any case, this phoneme must have been considered the closest approximation of Gmc. /w/. Thus a tradition in the spelling of Gmc. names developed which was continued even later, when the two phonemes, Lat. /b/ (or /v/) on the one hand, and Gmc. /w/ on the other, had taken divergent developments.

The assumed variation in the transfer of names from one language into the other may have been of an even wider range, if Kremer is right in interpreting Quinigia as Gmc. *winiganja, and Oscandus as Gmc. *wunskjands.

---

146 Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 300.
147 Cf. Brüch, "Forschung", p. 65, also refers to other sound changes of the type w > gw in Welsh. and Arm., as well as to Goth. Verschärfung, but the general phonetic plausibility and actual occurrence of a certain type of sound change adds little to the proof of this particular instance.
This would establish occasional correspondences w: qu, w:∅.
Unfortunately these are questionable etymologies. Goldschmidt\textsuperscript{150} also mentions Quindolphus (850 A. D.), perhaps
from Gmc. *winda-, and quaiaca (5th or 6th c.), perhaps from
Gmc. *waihja. The correspondence w:∅ seems improbable in the
name of the province of Andalucia, although Goldschmidt would
like to derive it directly from the name of the Vandals.\textsuperscript{151}

The following Spanish words could be considered evidence
in support of the claim of a sound substitution Goth. /w/>
Sp. [gu] in the environment #_: Pos.: wai > guay; wardja >
> guardia; Prob.: *walpapairs > guadapero; warjan > guarecer;
*widan > guiar; *wipralaun > OSp. gualardon, Sp. galardón;
Poss.: *waibó, *waibjan > guadano, guadañar; walda > gualda.

The development of Goth. /w/ in contexts like C_V, V_C
is unclear, since so little material is attested. However,
when /w/ followed a consonant and immediately preceded the
end of a word, it seems to have disappeared in Spanish, as
indicated by the following words: Pos.: bandwó > banda II;
Poss.: mapwa > mata (perhaps also manwjan > manir).

In some other, less reliable cases, however, we find
Sp. /u/ as the reflex of Goth. /w/:
Poss.: *falwiska, falw > falúa; (*bwahljó > OSp.
tovalla, Sp. toalla is questionable, since it may well derive
from Franc. via Fr. touaille).

\textsuperscript{150} Cf. Goldschmidt, \textit{Kritik}, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{151} Cf. Brüch, "Forschung", p. 72 ff., on this difficult
etymology.
In Goth. names, especially in the morpheme *swinp, /w/ has a tendency to disappear in the Sp. reflex.\textsuperscript{152} The name Mathasuenta (6th c.) < *maba-swinba\textsuperscript{153} contrasts with Rudesind (9th - 10th c.) from Goth. *hröba-swinps. Sometimes /w/ disappears in the cluster /kw/ in the transcription of Goth. names.\textsuperscript{154}

A different treatment of the cluster (sw/ in names supports the assumption that Goth. /w/ had a rounded bilabial articulation and was in fact a semi-vowel. Cassiodorus writes Amalasuntha (for *swinba).\textsuperscript{155} As Wrede\textsuperscript{156} points out, the Gk. transcription Matasuntha ("ou" usually for Gmc. /w/) also belongs in this context. Wrede\textsuperscript{157} also mentions an occasional Lat. "o" for OGoth. /w/ in a cluster /dw/: (cf. Odoin). According to Dietrich\textsuperscript{158}, there was a difference between WGoth. initial and medial /w/, as evident from Lat. transcriptions. Intervocalic /w/ seems to have been closer to [v], as evident from the spelling Lat. "v", whereas initial /w/ must have been [w], which is supported by the fact that Cassiodorus carefully distinguishes this sound by using graphs

\textsuperscript{152}Cf. Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{154}Cf. Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{155}Cf. Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{156}Cf. Wrede, \textit{Ostgoten}, p. 168.
\textsuperscript{157}Cf. Wrede, \textit{Ostgoten}, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{158}Cf. Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, pp. 77-80.
such as "uv", "uu" (cf. Goth. *wilja in Uviliae. Gk. writers used "ß" for want of a better graph).

Dietrich\textsuperscript{159} also mentions the so-called Goth. "Abwerfung" i.e., the shortening of (u)\textsuperscript{u} > u, and also (u)\textsuperscript{wi} > u.\textsuperscript{160} It is difficult to draw any systematic conclusions on the basis of this, except for the single fact that they support the assumption that Goth. /w/ was apparently pronounced as [w], at least in initial position. There is unfortunately no evidence for the development of Gothic intervocalic /w/ in Sp..

An interesting case, however, is the Sp. loan tregua, which has been derived from Goth. \textit{triggwa}, since this ety mon tells us something about Gmc. Verschärfung. In dealing with /gw/, Gamillscheg\textsuperscript{161} proposes a general sound-change Gmc. w > Rom. gw, in order to account for initial as well as intervocalic occurrence of Gmc. /w/. Although this change is stated as an unconditioned phonological rule here, in other places, Gamillscheg seems to have a conditioning of some sort in mind\textsuperscript{162}, without making clear, however, what is involved in this development. His rule has to be restricted in intervocalic position to two Goth.

\textsuperscript{159} Cf. Dietrich, \textit{Aussprache}, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{160} Cf. the spelling of the name \textit{Wulfilas} in Gk. \textit{Ulfilas}, and also the name of a VGoth. bishop \textit{Uldila} (588 A. D.).
\textsuperscript{161} Cf. Gamillscheg, \textit{RG} II, pp. 286–287.
\textsuperscript{162} Cf. Gamillscheg, \textit{RG} II, p. 50.
roots, *briuwan, *brewan 'to boil, brew' and *bawiba, *bawjan 'to till', which can be postulated for existent forms in languages such as Ital. and Prov., apart from our etymon Sp. tregua. As has been pointed out by Brosman 163 these roots would have to show the Goth. result of Verschärfung which is "gww" in Wulfilas's graphic representation. The forms to be assumed here are *briggw- (parallel to Goth. bliggwan 'to strike') and *baggw- (parallel to Goth. glaggwo 'exactly').

These assumptions are clearly backed up by Corominas's historical and etymological discussion of Sp. tregua, Port. tregoa, Cat. Prov. trega, Ital. tregua, which according to him point back to Goth. triggwa, whereas OFr. trieve, Cat. Prov. treva are to be derived from a Franc. *treuwa (parallel to OHG triuwa) with a diphthongal development of Verschärfung, as typical for ÆGmc. languages. Meyer-Lübke 164 cites both etyma, Goth. triggwa and Franc. *treuwa, simply saying that Rom. [gy] could go back to both forms.

Gamillscheg 165 derives Ital. tregua from *treuwa, thus having to postulate that the sound-substitution Gmc. /w/> Rom. [gy], which is otherwise attested only in initial positions, took place also in intervocalic position. But it should be borne in mind that of all the corresponding

\[164\] Cf. ML (REW), 8927.
\[165\] Cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 369.
etyma listed in ML (REW), intervocalic Gmc. /w/ always becomes a Rom. labial spirant (cf. Fr. treve), in no case Rom. [gu].

Instead of postulating an ad hoc sound-change, "gu" in Sp. tregua can be considered as the direct reflex of Verschärfung in Goth. Corominas' assumptions are also in agreement with the geographic distribution of the influence of WGmc. and EGmc. dialects (cf. the list of Rom. words cognate with Sp. tregua above), as noted by Brosman.

Consequently, we must state: Goth. /ggw/ > IbVLat. /gu/, which thus has to be distinguished historically from the initial cluster /gu/ in Goth. loanwords like guardia. The assumption, that "ggw" is to be taken as a geminate /g/ plus /w/ is supported by comparative evidence, (cf. ON forms like brugg, 'brewing', brogga 'to brew', bruginn 'brewed' and OSwed. bryggia 'to brew'). If the value of Goth. "gg" was phonemically that of a geminate, it was of course treated like a single phoneme /g/ in IbVLat., parallel to /tt/, /pp/, /kk/, /mm/, /ll/, which agrees with our assumptions.

A further argument in favor of the assumption that Sp. /gu/ has to be viewed as the reflex of Goth. Verschärfung in Sp. tregua can be derived from an inspection of Goth. names containing the stemm triggwa in Lat. documentation. 166

166Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, especially the chapter on "Triggwa, Triggwila", pp. 78-80.
The following forms are attested:

Ennodius (504-508 A.D.): Triggua;¹⁶⁷ Boethius (524 A.D.): Trigguilla.¹⁶⁸

These forms seem to be identical to the following:

Anonymus Valesii (mid-6th c.): Triuuane; Cassiodorus (6th c.): in one reading: Triuuila.¹⁶⁹

The variation between "ggu" and "uu" raises a question, if both varieties are to be considered cognates of Goth. triggw-. It is explained as follows by Wrede,¹⁷⁰ who proves that the postulation that there is an alternation ("Grammatischer Wechsel") between Goth. *Triwa and Triggwa (parallel to ON trún and tryggr) is impossible. The Lat. graph for Goth. /w/ in the environment V-V was regularly "u", not "uu" ("uu" appears initially). Especially Cassiodorus, who carefully maintains this distinction, would have rendered a Goth. *Triwila as "Triuila", not "Triuuila". The assumption of a Gmc. /eu/ is also very unlikely, because this is usually transcribed "eu" for EGoth., not "uu".

Furthermore, as Wrede shows, one cannot assume that "uu" reflects an earlier [ww], and "ggu" reflects the

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 22.
¹⁶⁸ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 23.
¹⁶⁹ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 29.
¹⁷⁰ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 78.
specific Goth. development, i. e. [ggw], since Wulfila
(4th c.) already shows regularly "ggw", without any varia-
tion. Wrede also mentions Sp. tregua, Port. tregoa in
support of this argument, which is interesting in the
context of our discussion. Wrede concludes that the
variation may be only a graphic one. He notes, however,
that a folk-etymological blend of the stems trigw- and
triu 'tree' might be involved, and he compares the alleged
form *Triwila to an attested Lat. nomen propium Arbuscula
(suggesting arbor 'tree').

Wrede tries to back up his assumption of a mere
graphic variation by pointing out that Goth. /g/ in the
cluster /ggw/ must have been a stop, as in the position
(Goth. /g/ in the position V_V, on the other hand, was a
fricative of some sort, according to him). He says that
Gothic initials /g/ was written "g", but also often "c"
in Lat., in order to distinguish it from the fricative
allophone in medial position. Correspondingly, the
stop [g] in Goth. /ggw/ was unusual and might similarly
have called for a deviant transcription.

---

171 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 79, n.3.
172 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 65.
173 Somewhat inconsistently, Wrede goes on to say that
Gk. sagma 'pack-saddle' was rendered by Lat. sauma, Gk.
pegma 'scaffold' by Lat. peuma. But if this were really a
parallel to the Goth. /g/ corresponding to Lat. "u", it
would contradict Wrede's thesis, that we are dealing here
with a mere graphic variation. On the other hand, the
theory of graphic variation is also supported by Wrede's
observation that Gaulish leuga 'mile' is rendered by Lat.
leuua in most of the manuscripts of Jornandes (cf. Wrede,
Ostgoten, p. 80).
4.1.7.2 Gothic /j/

Because of the limited scope of our loanword evidence there is not much to say about the role of Goth. /j/ in the transfer from Goth. to Sp.. However, a few observations can be made.

Since the phonemic system of IbVLat. at one stage possessed a phoneme /j/ which can be assumed to have been similar to Goth. /j/ in phonetic value as well as in distribution, we may expect that Goth. /j/ was interpreted as IbVLat. /i/. This identification becomes clear in some cases of palatalization, where the sequence /kj/ developed into a single palatal phoneme /c/ in IbVLat.. The same development appears in the sequence /kj/ in some Goth. loanwords.

According to Valencia, this process was due to the fact that early Lat. /e/ and /i/, as in *vinea, alium*, were both reduced to the semivowel /i/ around the 3rd. c. A.D., and thereafter could no longer function as the nucleus of a syllable.

Following Valencia, we may assume a change in the syllabic structure:

/wi - ne - a/ /vi - nia/
/a - li - um/ /a - lime/

This /j/ became closely attached to the preceding consonant, which was then partially assimilated. To take

---

an example, the following process took place in the case of /ki/:

\[(1) \quad [\text{ki}] > (2) [\text{k}'\text{i}] > (3) \quad [\text{k}']\]

When /\text{i}/ became closely attached to /k/ (1), /k/ developed a palatalized allophone \([\text{k}']\) in the environment \(\text{-i}\) (2). After a (possible) reduction or loss of /\text{i}/, the feature of palatal articulation became phonemically relevant in \([\text{k}']\), i.e. \([\text{k}']\) functioned as a separate phoneme /\text{e}/ (3). This process is extremely common in the development of languages which have a palatal phoneme series, such as Russian and Irish. Palatalization is clearly attested only for Goth. /k/ in loanwords, as has been discussed in 4.1.3.1.\(^\text{175}\)

Another specific development which /\text{j}/ undergoes in Goth. loanwords in Sp. is seen in the correspondence of Goth. *\text{sagjis}, *\text{sagja} and *\text{hagja} to Sp. \text{sayón} and \text{aya}, respectively, i.e. Goth. /\text{gj}/ Sp. /\text{y}/ (cf. 4.1.3.2. b).

Goth. /\text{j}/ is preserved as Sp. /\text{y}/ in certain endings as in the following examples: Pos.: \text{skankja} > \text{escanciano}; \text{taujan} > \text{ataviar} (cf. also 4.1.7.1.): \text{wardja} > \text{guardia}; Prob.: *\text{ribjo} > \text{ripia}.

Loss of Goth. /\text{j}/ in a parallel situation might perhaps be seen in Sp. \text{sera}, which is the assumed reflex of Goth. *\text{sahrja}. An even less certain case is the correspondence of Goth. *\text{gasali}, *\text{gasalja} to OSp. \text{gasaja}, Sp. \text{agasajar}.

\(^\text{175}\)Cf. § 4.1.2.1 d and also § 4.3. for a more detailed discussion.
Other sets of correspondences involving /j/ can be explained as morphemic rather than phonemic substitution: Pos.: laistjan > lastar; Prob.: warjan > guarecer; *waibanjan > guadañar; Poss.: stampjan > estampar; Poss.: *kundjan > cundir; manwjan > manir.

In these words, the Goth. morpheme /-jan/ was replaced by common IbVLat. endings of verbs, such as /-are/, /-ire/, etc..

4.2. The Vowels.
4.2.1. Single Vocalic Phonemes
4.2.1.1. Gothic /ei/

The only word of which we can be sure is Goth. reiks > Sp. rico. Other possible ones are: *kreitan > OSp. cridar, Sp. gritar; leista > Sp. lista. Goldschmidt's 176 Sp. giga and gris are improbable. Sp. giga 'a stringed instrument' is derived from OFr. gigue by Corominas. 177 The OFr. form derives from OHG giga, cf. NHG Geige. According to Corominas, 178 gris in Sp. as in Port. is a word imported from France via commerce in furs and goes back to Franc. *gris.

177 Cf. Corominas II, p. 726.
4.2.1.2. Gothic /i/

Following Marchand \(^{179}\) we assume that the Gothic phoneme /i/ was realized as a sound which was lower than the one represented by the Gothic graph "ei" and higher than that represented by "e".

In Goth. loanwords in Sp., Goth. /i/ is replaced by the Sp. phoneme /e/, which developed from IbVLat. /e/, corresponding to CLat. /ë/. After the replacement of distinctive length in Lat. by the formerly redundant feature of closeness in VLat., \(^{180}\) the assumed IbVLat. phoneme /e/ had the realization which was the closest in the system to Gothic /i/. Thus the majority of our findings shows a substitution of IbVLat. /e/, (Sp./e/) for Gothic /i/. Expectedly, no instance of a Goth. word displays a substitution of /i/ by IbVLat. /e/ (corresponding to CLat. /ë/, /æ/) which later developed into the Sp. diphthong /ie/. Gamillscheg \(^{181}\) compares this substitution to the sound change Lat. /i/>VLat. /e/ (cf. Lat. mittere to VLat. mettere).

Goth. loanword examples are: Pos.: brikan > bregar; *spitus > OSp. espeto, Sp. espetón; triggwa > tragua; *brid > brete;

\(^{179}\)Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 35.


\(^{181}\)Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 253.
harihrings > arenga; *hrings > renco; hilms > OSp. elmo, Sp. yelmo; Poss.: *alisna > lesna; linda > lendo. Much closer than IbVLat. /ɛ/ was IbVLat. /i/ to Goth. /i/. There are a few Goth. loanwords showing this substitution: Pos.: *skilla > esquila; priscan > triscar. (Sp. esquila is apparently borrowed via OProv; in OSp. we find the expected form esquella, which was later abandoned). In the case of Sp. espetón we find also espita. This interchange between /i/ and /e/ is probably due to two separate borrowings at different times. The same might be true for triscar, where we would expect *trescar. Pos.: *alisa > aliso; *ingrimjis > ingrimo; grimms > grima;182 Prob. *ribjɔ > ripia; *widan > guiar; Poss.: strings > estringar; the correspondence miltja > esmaltar poses a special problem; the vowel /a/ is probably due to a confusion with Goth *smalt-. The correspondence between wipralaun and Sp. galardón is highly irregular and cannot lead to any generalization whatsoever.

Interesting is also the following correspondence: Goth. hilms > OSp. elmo, Sp. yelmo. The OSp. form elmo shows the expected reflex of Goth.hilms, whereas Sp. yelmo (with the phoneme /ie/, from an earlier /e/) seems to go back to a form borrowed from OFr..

The Sp. development /ɛ/ > /ie/, a diphthongization, apparently began in Castile during the last period of the

Goth. reign on the Iberian Peninsula, although the first evidence appears as late as 804 A.D. in Burgos.\textsuperscript{183} This change is parallel to the development /o/ $>$ /ue/, which, however, started somewhat later (cf. § 4.3.).

4.2.1.3. Gothic /e/

Examples of etyma showing Goth. /e/ are rare; however, the following correspondences can be shown: Pos.: *rēbs $>$ arrear, adrede; lēwjan $>$ alev; Prob.: *brebms $>$ brētema.

The sound represented by Goth. "e" (corresponding to WGmc, ā), was probably relatively higher than that represented by "i" and of course more front than "o" and "au".\textsuperscript{184} The later development to [i] (cf. CGoth. mīne, schlīpen, mīcha, corresponding to Wulfilian Goth. mēna, slēpan, mēki) also seems to indicate that the Goth. phoneme /e/ had a close rather than an open quality. Wrede\textsuperscript{185} points out that the close pronunciation of Goth. /e/ is suggested by the fact that /e/ in Gk. transcription is rendered by "ei". Wrede\textsuperscript{186} states that Goth. /e/ and /ei/ came close together, but did not merge. The assumption that Gothic /e/ was a close vowel agrees with the fact that Wulfila used his sign for /e/ to render Gk. eta in Biblical names, which

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. Baldinger, Sprachräume, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{184} Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 35.
\textsuperscript{185} Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{186} Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 161.
was higher than the phoneme represented by "ατ" and "ε".

The Sp. phoneme /e/, which corresponds to Goth. /e/ in our loanwords, developed from the IbVLat. phoneme /œ/, a merger of the CLat. phonemes /i/ and /e/.\(^{187}\) This phoneme had a close realization.\(^{188}\) Thus we must conclude that IbVLat. /œ/ was similar enough to Goth. /e/ to substitute for it in loanwords.

The established correspondence Goth /e/ > Sp. /e/ is based only on scant evidence so far as loanwords are concerned, but as Goldschmidt\(^{189}\) points out, the forms of Gothic personal names in early Sp. documents testify for this substitution as well. Goldschmidt gives Sp. Vermudo, Port. Vermuiz, earlier Vermudus, Veremodus, Beremodus, showing the stem wera (cf. OHG wēra). However, the phonological evidence of the names is not wholly conclusive; Goldschmidt\(^{190}\) also lists several forms showing /a/ and also the tendency to replace Goth. /e/ by /i/ in certain elements of names, such as -red, -mer, which he interprets as indications for a close articulation of Gothic /e/.

A replacement of Goth. /e/ by /i/ is not attested in Sp. loanwords, however, except by sitio, which is considered


\(^{188}\) Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 34.


\(^{190}\) Cf. Goldschmidt, *Kritik*, p. 22.

\(^{191}\) Cf. also Brüch, *Einfluß*, p. 41, on this point.
to be the reflex of Goth. *sēti 'seat' by only some etymologists. According to others, it may not be a Goth. loanword at all.\textsuperscript{192}

Meyer-Lübke\textsuperscript{193} observes that Goth. /e/ is sometimes replaced by Sp. /i/ in place names, although hardly ever in loanwords (cf. above). Meyer-Lübke goes so far as to postulate a regular sound change of late Goth. /e/ > /ɪ/, with the exception that /e/ was preserved before /r/. However, Gamillscheg notes that such a hypothesis cannot hold without assuming too many exceptions. He tries to show that /e/ and /i/ stand in a variation which is conditioned by accent. According to Gamillscheg\textsuperscript{194} there existed a general pattern of qualitative variation in late VGoth. which was very similar to what is called ablaut in IE phonology (cf. § 4.3).

In compounds, Goth. /e/ developed into [ɪ] in accented position, but into [ɪ] in unaccented position. Goth. [ɪ] was then substituted by IbVLat. /ɛ/ for lack of a more direct

\textsuperscript{192}The expected form with /e/ is found in Cat. Prov. seti. Sp. sitio is not, however, to be considered evidence in favor of the attempt made by Gamillscheg (cf. our remarks in § 4.3) to analyze Sp. /i/ as a reflex of Goth. /e/ under certain accentual conditions. Sp. /i/ in sitio appears to be a secondary Sp. development, which is probably due to the following palatal element. A similar observation was made by Gamillscheg himself (cf. RG II, p. 31). Corominas (IV, p. 241) points out that sitio is probably not of Goth. origin.


\textsuperscript{194}Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31 ff. and RFE XIX p. 249 ff.
correspondence, but Goth [ɪ] corresponded to IbVLat. /i/ and was substituted by this phoneme. Since this hypothesis tries to explain variations not only of allophones of Goth. /e/, but also of the Goth. vocalic phonemes in general, it will be discussed and evaluated more fully in the concluding paragraph of this chapter.¹⁹⁵

4.2.1.4. Gothic /a/

Lat. /ā/ and /ā/ merge in VLat. /a/, which in turn is preserved as /a/ in Sp.¹⁹⁶ under primary stress, and usually also under secondary stress and even in unstressed position.¹⁹⁷

Goth. /a/ shows the same development. Consequently we may assume that, as the only central vowel phoneme of Goth.¹⁹⁸ it had a phonetic value which came close to that of the corresponding IbVLat. phoneme /a/.

Goth. loanwords showing the correspondence of Goth. /a/ to Sp. /a/ are: Pos.: aleina > ana; bandwō > banda II; *bramōn > bramar; *gans > ganso; *haribaírgō > albergue; *haspa > aspa; *hrapōn > arrapar; *sagjis > sayón; skankjā > escanciano; taujan > (a)taviar; *alisa > aliso; *ganan > ganar; *hagja > aya; *harihrings > arenga; marbus > marta; *stakka > estaca; *bahuks > tasugo; wardja > guardia;

¹⁹⁵Cf. § 4.3 for a more detailed discussion.
Prob.: andbahti > embajada; ange > angazo; azgō > ascuia; *flskō > frasco; *gabila > gavilán; *hramnila > rámila; sakan > sacar; warjan > guarecer; Poss.: *blanka > blanca; *brasa > brasa; *falwiska > falúa; fani > fango; *fato > hato; *hanka > anca; harpa > arpa; *harpón > arpar; *krampa > grampa; *krappa > grappa; *kramp > calambre; *hrampō > ramplón; *kats > casta; *laska > lasca; magan > amagar; manwjan > manir; marzjan > OSp. amarrido; mabwa > mata; *palb > pantano; *rakan > raque; *randa > randa; *skattjan, skatts > escatimar; stampjan > estampar; *tappa > tapa; (perhaps *pwahljō > toalla, OSp. tovalla); *walda > gualda. Traces of Gmc. umlaut, which established itself in OHG around 750, are evidenced in Goth. as early as in the 7th c. Goldschmidt lists a number of Goth. names which seem to show the result of the palatalization in question, although the etymologies of these are by no means certain:

Egila (7th c.) from Agila (6th c.)
Ega, Egired from *agja
Epika from *apika
Belesar from *valisa-harjis
Eigcani from Egicani from *agika

200 Note that umlaut can be a criterion for distinction between words of different origin: e.g. Fr. heberger 'to lodge, to shelter' betrays Franc. origin (Franc. *heribergon) by its umlaut, whereas Port. alberç, Sp. albergue, preserve the non-umlauted vowel, which testifies to their Goth. origin.
201 Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 12 f.
All these names are later 7th c. forms. More doubtful forms like Eila, Ella (from the 6th c.) might indicate an even earlier development if they really correspond to Agila (cf. above), as tentatively assumed by Goldschmidt.

However, these observations are not borne out by the evidence of Goth. loanwords in Sp., in which we find no trace of the preservation of a Goth. umlaut. This is shown by the following examples for a possible palatization of Goth. /a/ in loanwords, which, however, consistently reveal /a/ in Sp.: Pos.: gasali, *gasalja > OSp. gasaja, Sp. agasajar; *haribaírgō > alberge; *sagjis (*sagja) > sayón; skankja > escanciano (cf. NHG Mundschenk); *aliza > aliso (cf. NHG Else); *harihrings > arenga; wardja > guardia; Prob.: *gabila > gavilán; warjan > guarecer (cf. OHG werren, weren, NHG wehren); Poss.: fani > fango (cf. OHG fenna, fenni, NHG Fenn); stampjan > estampar (cf. OE stempan). This does not exclude the possibility that Goth. may have possessed palatalized vocalic allophones in the environment of umlauting elements, but, if so, the speakers of IbVLat. interpreted them as nondistinctive phonemic variants. One might speculate towards a reinforcement of this interpretation on the basis of the fact that there was a somewhat similar tendenca to develop Lat. /i̯a/ > VLat. /ie/: cf. iactare > *iectare; januariu > ienuariu. This assimilation was subphonemic until the divergent development

and final loss of /i/ (cf. Sp. echar, enero) began.

If we follow Goldschmidt in assuming that Gothic had umlaut near the end of the 7th c., we may subsequently conclude that the corresponding Goth. loanwords were taken over into IbVLat. prior to this time. Thus we would have an approximate terminus ante quem.\(^{204}\)

4.2.1.5. Gothic /o/

The development of Goth. /o/ is exactly parallel to that of Goth. /e/ (cf. § 4.2.1.3.). Goth. /o/ was probably a long close vowel, which corresponded directly to IbVLat. /o/, which developed into modern Sp. /o/.

This development can be observed in the following loanwords: Pos.: *spōla > espolín; Poss.: födr > forrar.

Although there is no extensive loanword evidence available, this development can be safely assumed on the basis of the parallel development of /e/ and on the basis of place names,\(^{205}\) e.g., Goth. *hrōps in Roris, *mōps in Mosende.

Occasionally, Goth. /o/ appears to be reflexed by Sp. /u/, especially in place names. Gamillscheg\(^{206}\) tries to establish a pattern parallel to Goth. /e/;\(^{207}\) assuming that Goth. /o/ developed into [u] under primary accent, but into [u] under

\(^{204}\)Cf. also Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 161 and p. 30 ff..

\(^{205}\)Cf. Sachs, Ortsnamen, p. 15.

\(^{206}\)Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 250 f..

\(^{207}\)Cf. § 4.2.1.3. and § 4.3.
secondary accent. Goth. [ʊ] then developed into Sp. /o/, i.e., was substituted by IbVLat. /ɣ/, which corresponded more closely to it than IbVLat. /u/; but Goth. [ʊ] was substituted by IbVLat. /u/, which developed into Sp. /u/. This would explain the dual reflex of Goth. /o/. This theory is briefly discussed in § 4.3.

Although Gamillscheg generally assumes that loanwords show the development of /o/ under strong accent, there is one case where Goth. /o/ corresponds to Sp. /u/: Goth. lōfa > Sp. lúa. However, parallel to an occasional reflex of Goth. /i/ as /i/ in Sp., we might assume that the Goth. word lōfa was borrowed at a later time when IbVLat. /o/ was already on its way to becoming a more open vowel. If such were the case, IbVLat. /u/ would have been a better correspondence for the very close Goth. /o/.208

4.2.1.6. Gothic /u/

Parallel to Goth. /i/, which developed into IbVLat. /e/, Sp. /e/, Goth. /u/ developed into IbVLat. /o/, Sp. /o/. This substitution can be explained by the probability that Goth. /u/ was a short open vowel which could not be substituted by the close vowel IbVLat. /u/. Thus the nearest correspondence for Goth. [ʊ] was IbVLat. /ɣ/, a very close o-sound, rather than IbVLat. /u/. Quantity was of course no longer phonemic at this time in VLat.. The following loanwords show this

---

substitution: Pos.: *brut > brote; Prob.: *brukeins > brozno; Poss.: *blunds > blondo; *brukja > brozno; *krukkja > croza.

On the other hand, in some loanwords, Goth. /u/ seems to correspond to Sp. /u/: ufjo > ufano; *kundjan > cundir. The evidence is of course insufficient to establish any regular development, but perhaps we can assume with Gamillscheg that Goth. /u/ was realized as [ʊ] before a following palatal element, in which case it would have corresponded directly to IbVLat. /u/, but not to IbVLat. /ø/ as in the above cases.\(^{209}\) A similar situation is suggested by the case of Sp. tasugo, which seems to correspond to Goth. *pahsuks. In this case, Goth. /u/ is substituted by Sp. /u/. Such a development would correspond to Gamillscheg's assumption that Goth. open vowels had close variants under secondary accent.\(^{211}\) (Cf. § 4.1.3.1 above).\(^{212}\)

In endings, Goth. /u/ shows a different development: the IbVLat. ending seems to have replaced the Goth. one as a whole: Pos.: marbus > marta (-us to -a); Prob.: laittug > látigo (-igo as a suffix); Poss.: maúrhwallus > morilla (-us to -a).

---

\(^{209}\) Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 32.

\(^{210}\) This assumption would appear to be contradicted, however, by the possible Goth. etymon *krukkja > Sp. croza.

\(^{211}\) Cf. § 4.3 for further discussion.

\(^{212}\) Cf. § 4.1.3.1. for a review of recent publications on this problem.
Sp. *ruca cannot go back to Goth. *rʊka; *ruca presupposes *rʊkka, which cannot be Goth., since Goth would show a /u/.

4.2.1.7 Gothic /ʊ/

Although Goth. may well have possessed the phoneme /ʊ/ which was distinguished from Goth. /u/ by the feature of length, there is no certain evidence for Goth. /ʊ/ to be found in Span. loanwords. Goldschmidt lists Sp. adrunar, arrufar, bruno, buco, trabuco, escuma, giving Gmc. rūna, *rū-, brūn, *būk and Goth. skūma respectively as the sources. However, since none of these Sp. words, not even skūma, can be proven to be of Goth. origin, we must conclude that Goth. /ʊ/ is not attested in Sp..

4.2.2. "Diphthongs"

4.2.2.1 Gothic "ái"-"ai"

The evidence for Goth. "ái" and "ai" in Sp. seems to indicate that the Goth. digraph "ai" represented two different sounds.  

---


214 Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 27.

215 Cf. our etymological discussion of these words in Chapter Three.

216 Cf. Marchand, "Sounds", p. 33 f..
a) The question as to whether the normal reflex of Goth. "áí" in Sp. was /a/ or /ai/ is not easy to answer. A conditioning of these two reflexes by stress (i.e.: stressed "áí" > [ai], unstressed "áí" > [a], as has been assumed by Goldschmidt, 217 cannot be maintained in the face of our evidence. The following Sp. words show /a/ as a reflex of Goth. "áí": Pos.: laistjan > lastar; taikn > tacca; gainon > ganar; Prob.: *laittug > látigo; *laigón > lagotear; Poss. *waipó, *waipanjn > guadaño, guadañar. Evidence for Sp. [ai] corresponding to Goth "áí": Pos.: wai > guay; Prob.: gaites > gaita. Thus the regular reflex of Goth. "áí" in Sp. was apparently /a/, as assumed by Gamillscheg, 218 who states that this correspondence must go back to a substitution process; V Goth. "áí" must have had a quality which was closer to IbVL at. /a/ (the only central vowel in the system) than to any other phoneme. One might guess that it was a diphthong like [æi] or perhaps also a very open [æ], which was closer to IbVL at. [a] than to [ɛ].

This leaves us, however, with the question as to how Sp. gaita and guay are to be explained since these two diphthongs seem to have been preserved in Sp.; these

217 Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 28.
218 Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 252.
obviously merged with the result of the palatalization of /agj/, as in aya < Goth. *hagja and sayón < Goth. *sagja. These forms must have entered the Sp. language at a stage where the secondary Sp. /ai/ which later became /e/ was already at least [ei]. Thus Goth. "ái" in these cases might not have joined Sp. [ei] (or [e]) but have been kept as [ai], as one might expect. But, this assumption presents difficulties, since we cannot expect that VGoth. "ái" was still [aj] at that time. The correspondence Goth."ái" to Rom. /a/ exists also in Ital...220 Wrede,221 however, finds evidence for an OGoth. development ái > e in general. Elsewhere he notes that Vand. developed ái > ei in stem syllables, ái > e in inflectional syllables.222 He quotes Vand. armes, corresponding to Goth. armais. This OGoth. development of "ái" > [e] is supposed to be parallel to "áu" > [u]. This new [e] as a reflex of earlier "ái" was open and contrasted with older closed [e].223 However, he makes it clear that most of the sources he gives are etymologically questionable and he argues in favor of the assumed change ái > e by pointing out that no reflex showing ái could still be found.

219Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 28, where Sp. freznedo > fraxinetum is mentioned.
221Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 176.
222Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 92.
223Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 165.
Wrede's theory that in OGoth. (and perhaps in Goth. in general) "ái" later developed into [ə] must be rejected, if we agree with the observations made by Gamillscheg. This becomes clear if we inspect not only names, as Wrede has done primarily, but also loanwords. Gamillscheg states "daß sämtliche gotischen Sachnamen mit der alten Lautung ai romanisiert wurden."²²⁴ At another point he notes that there exists a parallel in the reflexes of Franc. in Gallorom.²²⁵ where Franc. /ai/ is substituted by /a/ in Gallorom. in general. He observes that Goth. aiskōn, gainōn, laistōn, taikn were Romanized as ascare, garare, lastare, taccum.²²⁶

Only in later times Goth."ái" is taken over as /ai/ in Sp. (cf. gaits > gaita). This was possible since Rom. (i.e., IbVLat.) had developed a secondary /ai/ from other sources. Similarly, Goth./agj/ was developed into a secondary [ai], which was taken over as /ay/ in Sp. (cf. *sagja > sayón, hagja > aya).²²⁷

Again there exists a parallel in Gallorom.; especially in northern Fr.,²²⁸ but also in southern Fr. where some

²²⁶Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 34.
²²⁷Cf. my discussion of this in § 4.1.3.2 b) and § 4.1.7.2.
place names show /ai/ for Gmc. /ai/: Goth. *braida 'the plain' (related to Goth. *braips 'broad, wide' (cf. Gmc. *brait, Engl. broad) turns up as Fr. Braide as a place name. In Portugal there is also a personal name Braida, which seems to evidence the same etymon. But in personal names Goth. "ái" obviously developed into [ei] in several forms, depending upon the accent, which could be replaced by Rom. /e/ or /i/.

This variation of [ai] and [ei] in Goth., according to Gamillscheg, was conditioned by accent. "ái" developed into [ai] under the accent /ˈ/, but into [ei] under the accent /ˈ/, although the validity of this hypothesis is somewhat questionable.

Dietrich, on the other hand concludes that Goth. "ái" must have still been [aj] at the time of Jornandes after inspecting the names given by this author.

b) Goth. "ái" presumably shows three different reflexes in Sp.: /e/, /i/, and /a/. Goth. "ái" corresponds to Sp. /e/ in *haribaírga > albergue and probably also in Sp. guadapero, which seems to be derived from walpapaires. Evidence for Sp. /a/ is to be found only in Sp. escarnecer, which possibly

---

229 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 34.
230 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 35.
231 Cf. § 4.3. for a discussion of Gamillscheg's theory.
232 Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 47.
goes back to Goth. *skaírnjan. This is a doubtful etymology, however. Sp. /i/ is evidenced in Sp. espía, from Goth. *spaiha, and Sp. esquilar from Goth. *skaíran.

Although the /i/ in Sp. esquilar could be due to a folk-etymological association of this word with Sp. esquila from Goth. *skilla, we are still faced with espía, which is positively a Goth. loanword. Perhaps it can be assumed that the change of [i] > [e] before /r/ was a development which had not taken place in all Goth. dialects? An example of /i/ as a reflex of "ai" is that of tirar < taíran. On the other hand, OGoth. words showing "ai" before /r/ (cf. names ending in -berga) are always rendered by "e" in Latin, hardly ever by "i".233 Dietrich,234 however, points out a name Irmenerit (6th c.), beside Ermanaricus in Lat. documents. On the basis of these two distinct possibilities, we can only tentatively decide in favor of [e].

4.2.2.2 Gothic "áu" - "aú"

Despite the fact that the theory according to which the Gothic digraph "au" represented two sounds has often been rejected by more recent research,235 our evidence seems to indicate that Goth. "au" must indeed have had two different values.

233 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 9.
a) Goth. "áu" seems to correspond to Sp. /o/: Pos.: *raupa > ropa; Poss.: *bautan > botar; *skauts > escotar.

Wrede has assumed that Goth. "áu" had already developed into [ɔ] by the time of the OGoth. domination of Italy, since spellings are usually with "o" (never with "u") in Lat. documents. This "o" seems to have represented an open quality, according to Wrede, who notes that Asuin is occasionally written for Oswin. Thus OGoth. [ɔ] as the result of older "áu" seems to have been an open vowel which was kept separate from the older Goth. /o/, which was a close vowel. Wrede also notes that the name of the king Aoric seems to represent a possible intervening step [ao] for the development from [au] to [ɔ]. Earlier in the 4th c., Austrogothi, Grauthungi still show "áu".

On the other hand, Lat. /au/ seems to have been a diphthong of some kind which was rendered "aw", (cf. kawtsjo) by the Goth. transcriber in the document of Naples. Obviously Lat. /au/ was different from the OGoth. reflex of older [au] at that time; therefore the "aw"-sign was used as a transcription for the already unfamiliar diphthong Lat. [au]. The transcription of the Biblical

---

236 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 165.
238 Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 166.
Goth. Pawlos for Gk. Paulos\(^{239}\) is for Wrede evidence in favor of his assumption.\(^{240}\)

Our evidence might be taken to support the alternative view for VGoth. according to which "áu" was still a diphthong in VGoth. It is perhaps unnecessary to assume this in order to explain Prov. /au/ as corresponding to VGoth. "áu" e.g., Goth. galaubei > Prov. galaubir, Goth. laus > Prov. laus.\(^{241}\) According to Gamillscheg, the evidence of place names on the Iberian Peninsula presupposes [ou] (or even [ɔ]) as the phonetic value of VGoth. "áu".

The precise phonetic value of "áu" in VGoth. during the period of borrowing can only be guessed at. However, it should be noted that VGoth. "áu" must have been closer to IvVLat. /ɔ/ than to IvVLat. /ɔ/, which speaks against the assumption of an open vowel phoneme. IvVLat. /ɔ/ then developed into Sp. /o/, whereas IvVLat. /ɔ/ developed into Sp. /ue/.

Sp. ataviar is the assumed reflex of Goth. taujan, with the addition of the Lat. prefix ad- and a subsequent assimilation, resulting in Goth. *attaujan.\(^{242}\) Sp. /av/ is

---


\(^{240}\) Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 166, especially n. 3.

\(^{241}\) Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 259.

probably not the direct reflex of Goth. "áu", rather that of a morphophonemic variant /aw/ as seen in WGoth. tawida. Perhaps we can assume that /v/ was the regular Sp. reflex of intervocalic Goth. /w/ on the basis of this example (cf. § 4.1.7.1 ).

Sp. rezón might be derived from Goth. *hraustjo, though this is a questionable etymology and cannot be explained phonologically in terms of any regular development.

According to Gamillscheg,²⁴³ parallel to the development of "ái" in IbVLat., we would expect a development of Goth. "áu" into [ou] or also the preservation of [au], which is found especially in names. Wrede,²⁴⁴ however, speculates that Goth. "áu" developed into [ɔ] in OGoth. and perhaps in Goth. in general.

Gamillscheg's hypothesis is, however, difficult to validate. In IbVLat. there was indeed a parallel development of Lat. [au] > [ou] > [ɔ], at least in some parts of the Iberian area (cf. Goth. mauka 'belly' > Prov. mauca, Cat. moca.²⁴⁵ Similarly we might have OGoth. gauma 'craw', late Goth. *gouma. That this development took place in

²⁴³ Cf. Gamillscheg RG II, p. 35.
²⁴⁴ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 165.
Goth. is supported by evidence from Ital. forms. The evidence in names is somewhat more difficult to evaluate. Gamillscheg concludes in any case that Goth. "áu" was still [au] or [ou] in VGoth. on the Iberian Peninsula. Also in the south of France we find evidence for Goth. [au]: Aukisa (a place name, from Goth. aukan 'to augment, increase' turns out to be Aucazein in the French place name; Goth. bauga similarly is evidenced in French Bausens, a place name in the Dordogne.

Perhaps we should assume a variation of [au] - [ou] (depending on the accent, with Goth. "áu" represented by [au] under the accent /'a/, but into [ou] under the accent /'au/).

Gamillscheg also says that Pre-Rom. [ou] is attested in some cases and developed into Rom. /au/ (cf. Gaulish louk 'shine, gleam' > Prov. eslaus 'lightning'). This shows that IbVLat. /au/ could be substituted for Goth. [ou] and subsequently developed into /o/, as in Sp. Cat., or could be preserved as /au/ as in Prov. Thus the assumption that Goth. "áu" was [ou] in VGoth. is compatible with other evidence concerning the development of Rom. especially Sp.

---

246 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 387.
247 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 35.
249 Cf. § 4.3, where this hypothesis is further discussed.
250 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 36.
Other examples which give proof of the existence at that time of Goth. "áu" as [au] are Goth. galaubei 'splendor', (cf. WGoth. galaufs 'precious') in Prov. galaubia, galaubier and Goth. laus 'empty', in Prov. laus.\(^{251}\)

b) Goth. "áu" seems to have been distinct from "áu" as we can assume on the basis of Sp. espuela, espuera derived from Goth. *spaúra. In this case an open [ɔ] is suggested as the sound value of Goth. "áu" at the time of the borrowing, since the corresponding Goth. phoneme merged with IbVLat. /ɔ/, which later developed into Sp. /ue/.\(^{252}\)

Sp. morilla could have derived from Goth. maúrhwallus, Sp. trój from Goth. *braúhs, although both etymologies are somewhat doubtful. The correspondences between Goth. "áu" and Sp. /ɔ/, which would be established by these two etyma, cannot be the normal development. It should in any case be noted that both words present difficulties so far as phonological derivation is concerned, especially where the consonants are concerned.

4.2.2.3 Gothic /iu/

Evidence for the treatment of the sound corresponding to the Goth. digraph "iu" in Sp. is practically non-existent; two etyma, however, must at least be mentioned in this context:

\(^{251}\)Cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 380.

\(^{252}\) Probably this process began already during the period of the VGoth. reign on the Peninsula, although evidence does not turn up until 824 A.D.. Cf. Baldinger, Sprachräume, p. 9 f. and p. 39.
Sp. esquivo probably goes back to Goth. *skiuhs, skiuhjan, although the correspondence /iu/ <- /iu(h)/ can hardly be set up on the basis of a single word. It would also be impossible to further back up such a correspondence with the help of Sp. estribo, a possible reflex of Goth. striup(s), the etymology of which is, however, uncertain.

Whereas we can conclude nothing definitive concerning a possible reflex of Goth. /iu/ in Sp. on the basis of loanwords,²⁵³ as Wrede²⁵⁴ points out, the evidence for the development of /iu/ in later OGoth. points towards the fact that it developed into [eu]. Wrede seems to think of a biphonemic interpretation of this diphthong (consisting of the two phonemes Goth. /e/ and /w/) pointing out that a variation between "e" and "i" appears to be present here too.²⁵⁵

The representation of VGoth. names in Sp. medieval documents seems to have been somewhat similar to that stated by Wrede: in some names, WGoth. /iu/ appears as VGoth. "iu", in most cases as "eu", however.²⁵⁶ Gamillscheg²⁵⁷ mentions that Burg. had also preserved Gmc. /eu/ as /eu/, which indicates that the same could apply to VGoth. He mentions

²⁵³ Cf. also Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 32 ff. on this point.
²⁵⁵ Cf. Wrede, Ostgoten, p. 51 ff.
²⁵⁶ Cf. Dietrich, Aussprache, p. 68 ff.
²⁵⁷ Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 252 f.
the name *Leudhard, which appears as Leutardo (928 A.D.).
The "eo" in VGoth. names seems to be limited to the morphemes
*biuda and *liuba (i.e., *Theoda-, *Leova-), where a folk-etymo-
logical connection with Gk. theós- and Lat. leo- is likely. 258

4.3 Summarizing Remarks and Further Comments
The phonological correspondences between Gothic and
Spanish in Gothic loanwords may be summarized as follows:

a) Vowels and Diphthongs:
IbVLat. had the following phonemic pattern during the
period with which this study concerns itself: 259

\[
\begin{array}{c}
| i & u |
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
| e & o |
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
| ë & ò |
\end{array}
\]
\[
| a |
\]

Gothic /ei/ was probably a long close vowel which
corresponded directly to IbVLat. /i/, also a close vowel. 260

CLat. /i/ had merged earlier with /ë/ into
IbVLat. /ê/. Thus Goth. /i/ had no direct correspondence
in IbVLat. and was substituted by IbVLat. /ê/.

\[258\] Cf. Goldschmidt, Kritik, p. 33.
\[259\] According to Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 32.
The Goth. phoneme /a/ offers no problem, since it corresponded to IbVLat. /a/. Perhaps the Goth. /a/ had a palatal allophone in the environments which later show the effect of vowel mutation (umlaut). But if such a sound existed, it must still have been closer to /a/ than to /ə/ in IbVLat.

Contrary to "aǐ", which is substituted by the corresponding close vowel phoneme in IbVLat., Goth. "aǔ" is replaced by the open vowel /ʊ/ in IbVLat., as discussed above.

Goth /ʊ/ which has no real evidence, probably corresponded to IbVLat. /u/, with both phonemes realized as close back vowels. Goth. /ʊ/, however, is a questionable case as such. \[261\]

Goth. /u/ is better attested. Goth. /u/ was a short open vowel which had no direct correspondence in the IbVLat. sound system (parallel to Goth. short /i/), \[262\] since in earlier CLat. /ʊ/ had merged with /o/. In some cases Goth. /o/ corresponds to Spanish /u/. Perhaps this substitution was possible at a later time, when IbVLat. /ʊ/ began to develop into the diphthong /ue/, and IbVLat. /ʊ/ developed into an open ʊ-sound. \[263\]


\[262\] Cf. Lausberg, Rom. Sprachw., § 145.

\[263\] But cf. below for a different explanation on the basis of accentual patterns, which goes back to Gamillscheg's proposals.
Goth. "aí", which was the result of breaking, was probably pronounced as a rather open ɛ-sound, parallel to Goth. "au", which was probably pronounced as [ɛ]. However, it is interesting to note that, whereas Goth. "au" is substituted by IbVLat. /q/, Goth. "aí" is substituted by IbVLat. /ɛ/ or even by /i/, which would presuppose a Goth. sound like [ɛ], rather than [ɛ]. Thus the Sp. reflex of Goth."au" is Sp. /ue/, but the reflex of Goth. "aí" is usually Sp. /e/, never /ie/.

Perhaps this asymmetrical development can be explained if we assume that that of IbVLat. /ɛ/ into the diphthong /ie/ began somewhat earlier than that of IbVLat. /q/ into /ue/. As pointed out in § 4.2.1.2, the diphthongization of IbVLat. /ɛ/ began already during the last period of the VGoth. reign in Spain, although the first evidence for this development appears as late as 804 A.D.. The evidence for the diphthongization of /q/ dates from the time of the Moorish conquest. This could indicate that IbVLat. /ɛ/ already had a phonetic quality during the time when Goth. words were borrowed into IbVLat., which made it inadequate for the substitution of Goth. "aí". Thus Goth. "aí" was substituted by IbVLat. /ɛ/ rather than /q/. IbVLat. /q/, on the other hand, was still an open vowel [o], which could substitute for Goth. "au". Obviously, the evidence available from Goth. loanwords in Sp. cannot independently confirm this tentative assumption.
On the basis of these observations we may say that the substitution pattern of Gothic loanwords in Sp. shows that the distinction between long and short vowel phonemes corresponded to a distinction in quality (close versus open), which resulted in relatively simple substitutions.

Similar substitutions occur among the Goth. diphthongs. Goth. "ái" had no direct correspondence in the IbVIat. phonemic system and was replaced in cases of substitution by a monophthong, IbVIat. /a/, at one stage of the development. This substitution seems to indicate that Goth. "ái" was still realized phonetically as a diphthong (perhaps [ai], or [æi]?) in Visigothic at the time of the borrowing. This would indicate that Wrede's assumption that OGoth. "ái" was realized as [ɛi] in Italy cannot be maintained for VGoth., as concluded also by Gamillscheg.⁴⁴

We may conclude that the WGoth. graph "ai" was indeed the representation of two different sounds, i.e., an ë-sound "aî" and a diphthong "ái", parallel to the dual function of the graph "au".

Our findings support this hypothesis rather than the one supported by recent scholars such as Marchand,⁵ Penzl and others, who claim that the digraphs in question must have represented two quantitatively different sounds, both monophthongs. Although the

⁴⁴Cf. Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 251 f.
⁵Cf. Marchand, "Sounds".
⁶Cf. Penzl, Orthography".
diphthongal interpretations [ai] of "ái" and [au] of "áu" might be questioned, since the Spanish reflexes could also go back to monophthongs such as [æ] and [ʊ] in most cases, it must be maintained that at least the reflexes of Goth. "ái" and "áu" on the one hand, and Go. àn. "ai" and "au" on the other are clearly distinct in the Goth loanwords in Sp. In some later borrowings, IbVLat. seems to have had a newly developed diphthong [ai], which corresponded directly to Goth "ái". Thus, Sp. guay (from Goth. wai) appears to be a diphthongal reflex of Goth. "ái".

The development of Goth. "áu" and "au" in Sp. is only a partial parallel to that of Goth. "ái" and "ai". Goth. "au" is only rarely attested but seems to be represented by IbVLat. /ʊ/, which developed into Spanish /ue/ in the 8th century or perhaps somewhat later.

Goth. "áu" appears as Sp. /o/. This could indicate, of course, that both "áu" and "au" were realized as u-sounds, which then took a divergent development in Sp. This is probably not true, however, since we know that /au/ develops into /o/ in IbVLat. as late as the 10th century.

Sachs\(^{267}\) lists the following series of names which demonstrates that Goth "áu" was still a diphthong (either [au] or [ou]) at the time of the borrowings, since the Goth. etyma in these place names took part in the Sp. monophthongization:

\(^{267}\)Cf. Sachs, Ortsnamen, p. 16.
943 villa de Aurbaldo (Burgos);
1059 villa Onegildi (Portugal);
1074 villa Onemar (León).

On the other hand, occasional forms of names such as Astromil, Estromil (with Goth. *austr-; cf. Gamilscheg, RG II, p. 36) show quite clearly that Goth. "áu" cannot have been realized as [ɔ]. Thus we would agree with Gamilscheg's assumption that Goth. "áu" was [ɔu] in VGoth., which was very similar to Lat. [ɔu] (or [au] perhaps) at that time.

The phonetic value of Goth. /iu/ cannot be made clear in the absence of reliable loanword evidence.

Several problems are connected with the substitution involved in the case of the Goth. phoneme /e/. Goth. /e/ seems to correspond regularly to Sp. /e/, but in some cases also to Sp. /i/, especially in names. Correspondingly, Goth. /o/ appears as Sp. /u/. 269

Gamilscheg 270 makes an interesting attempt to correlate these two different reflexes of Goth. /e/ and /o/ with the location of the accent, especially in compounds. If his assumptions are true, we may establish a pattern of vowel alternations similar to the so-called ablaut for Goth..

---

268 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 36.
269 Cf. the loanword Sp. lúa, from OSp. luva, Goth. *lofa.
270 Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31 ff., and also RPE XIX, p. 249 ff.
The difference seems relatively clear in the case of the Goth. form *meri(s)* in compound names, which is attested in Sp. as either *mer(is)*, or *mir(is)*. According to Gamillscheg, Goth. [e] developed into [i] in late VGoth., which was represented as an open [i] under primary accent, but as a close [i], if the syllable was not accented.

Example:

Goth. *mēri* - *fūns* vs. *gūntp* - *mērs*;
Late VGoth. *mīr* vs. *mērs*;

In sound substitution, late VGoth. [i] corresponded to IbVLat. /i/ (parallel to Goth. /ei/), but late VGoth. [i] had no direct correspondence, since there was no IbVLat. open [i] to be identified with it; consequently, late Visigothic [i] was substituted by IbVLat. /e/ (parallel to the short Goth. /i/, phonetically [i] as in *hilms* > *elmo*).

Similarly, Gamillscheg proposed that Goth. /o/ developed into [u] under primary accent, but to [u] under secondary or a weaker accent. Parallel to the situation found in the case of Goth. /e/, late VGoth. [u], according to Gamillscheg, was substituted by IbVLat. /u/, but late VGoth. [u] by IbVLat. /o/.

In addition he indicates a similar situation in the Spanish substitution of Goth. diphthongs, postulating the alternations [ai] - [ei], and [au] - [ou] in order to explain certain variations which occur in some place names. Gamillscheg also postulates

---

an alternation \([\ddot{\text{i}}] - [\dddot{\text{i}}]\) in the case of short vowels, which supposedly explains the occasional Sp. /i/ for Goth /i/, instead of the more regular Sp. /e/.\(^{272}\)

The best established alternation is undoubtedly that of /e/ and /i/, which Gamillscheg shows on the basis of the different forms of Goth. *meri(s) in place names of the Iberian Peninsula, where the required distribution relative to accent could indeed exist.\(^{273}\) For other forms such as Goth. *reps, however, which do not follow this pattern, Gamillscheg has to postulate analogical processes, since forms with /e/ as well as with /i/ occur in accented as well as unaccented position. Following Meyer-Lübke,\(^{274}\) Gamillscheg tries to explain the /e/ for Goth *reps (which never turns up as *rid) by analogy and assumes an influence of Goth. *fribu, which is always reflexed as fredu in names in Iberian Romance.\(^{275}\) The other alternations are also assumed to be analogical, since an independent motivation in each case appears to be impossible.

Although Gamillscheg's hypothesis would be attractive as a possible explanation of variant forms, we must admit that the evidence in place names is neither certain nor sufficient to support any far-reaching conclusions. This

\(^{272}\) Cf. also Gamillscheg, RFE XIX, p. 253.
\(^{273}\) Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31 f..
\(^{275}\) Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 32.
is especially true where our loanwords are concerned, in which the substitution of /i/ for Goth. /e/ does not occur.\textsuperscript{276}

Sp. /u/ as a reflex of Goth. /o/, on the other hand, is attested only in Sp. lúa, which can be explained as a later borrowing. Gamillscheg tries to avoid these difficulties by assuming that loanwords regularly developed the accented variant exclusively.\textsuperscript{277}

b) Consonants:

IbVLat. had the following phonemic pattern by the time it developed into Ibero-Romance:\textsuperscript{278}

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
p & t & č & k \\
b & d & ž & g \\
f & s & y \\
v & l & ų \\
r & m & n & ñ \\
\end{array}
\]

The development of the loanwords in Spanish, however, gives evidence for earlier stages.

\textsuperscript{276}Cf. § 4.2.1.2. Sp. sitio < Goth. seti can be explained as an internal Sp. vowel-mutation; the expected form with /e/ turns up in Prov. Cat. seti. Cf. also Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31, on this point.

\textsuperscript{277}Cf. Gamillscheg, RG II, p. 31.

Goth. /p/, /t/, /k/ are preserved in all positions as IbVLat. /p/, /t/, /k/. In intervocalic position the voiceless stops joined the development of the Lat. (and Goth.) geminate consonants, /pp/, /tt/, /kk/, which develop into single consonants /p/, /t/, /k/ in Sp.. Lat. geminate consonants were probably already reduced to single consonants, by the time the Goth. loanwords were borrowed into IbVLat.. Thus, Goth. geminates could be substituted as single consonants.

This development contrasts with that of the Lat. single consonants in IbVLat., which (in the process of so-called sonorization) became voiced in intervocalic position. This shows quite clearly that the voicing of Lat. consonants in IbVLat. between vowels must have been completed by the time of the borrowing, i.e., probably as early as the 6th century, since the influence of the Goth. language on IbVLat. was reduced during the 6th century and died out in the 7th century, as the Goths became increasingly Romanized. Thus, Goth. consonants such as /t/ between vowels were substituted by IbVLat. stops such as /tt/, from an earlier Lat. /tt/ (cf. Lat. mittere > mettere > meter), but they were kept distinct from the voiced IbVLat. stops which developed from earlier voiceless stops, e.g. fata, which became hada in Sp..

It is interesting to note that Sp. loanwords into Arab., which were borrowed from Sp. following the Arab. invasion, do not show the effect of sonorization. But this does not

necessarily mean that IbVLat. sonorization was generally still incomplete by the time of the Arab. invasion. Such an assumption would be incompatible with the phonological evidence of our loanwords. Perhaps Gamilscheg\textsuperscript{280} is right in suggesting that the IbVLat. territory may have been divided into two larger dialect areas at that time: "Hispania citerior" (where /p/, /t/, /k/ > /b/, /d/, /g/ in the environment V-\_\_V) and "Hispania ulterior", where no such change took place, and that the Arabs probably borrowed from the southern variant (without voicing), whereas the Goth. loanwords were preserved in the northern variant, where sonorization had been completed by that time. This, of course, is only an unconfirmed hypothesis, but it might well explain the existing variations, if we could support it with additional evidence.

So far as Goth. intervocalic stops are concerned, the situation appears to be quite clear:

Goth. /b/, /d/, /g/ took the same development as Lat. /b/, /d/, /g/. The development of intervocalic voiced stops into fricatives must have been an independent change in Goth., since the parallel development in Sp., especially the merger of /v/ and /b/ in this position, had long been completed by the time the Goth. language exerted an influence on IbVLat..

Goth. initial /p/, on the other hand, did not have a direct correspondence in the IbVLat. system, which had no voiceless dental fricative. By sound substitution, Goth. /p/ was replaced by IbVLat. /t/ in initial position.
The intervocalic allophone was probably voiced and thus merged with the corresponding allophone of Goth. /d/. The loanword evidence is, however, insufficient in this case to allow more than a tentative conclusion.

Goth. /f/ was possibly a bilabial spirant which was replaced by (a labiodental) IbVLat. /f/ in initial position, whereas in intervocalic position it was voiced and developed parallel to Latin /b/ between vowels, which seems to have been a bilabial fricative for some time.281 This sonorization of /f/ between vowels was, however, probably a Sp. rather than a Goth. development, as pointed out by Gamillscheg. Menéndez Pidal has shown that the evidence for the sonorization of fricatives in Sp. occurs later than that for stops; the first evidence for the change in fricatives was 685 A.D.282

Goth. /h/ was undoubtedly a voiceless spirant in initial position; there is no evidence for the intervocalic development. This sound disappeared in Sp.

In contrast to the sonorization of stops in intervocalic position, which seems to have been a earlier development already near its completion by the time the Goth. loanwords

282 Cf. Menéndez Pidal, Manual, especially § 47.
were borrowed into IbVLat., palatalization appears to be a change which occurred much later in Sp. Goth. loanwords into Sp. evidence this development.

So far as Goth. /k/ is concerned, Goth. *brukkja develops to Sp. broza, Goth. skankja to Sp. escanciano, etc.. In all cases the Goth. /k/ before a palatal element seems to have had a slightly palatalized allophone, which was close enough to the corresponding IbVLat. sound, such as /ć/ in placitum or glacia, to be replaced by it. Thus, the Goth. words took the same development as the corresponding Lat. ones and Goth. as well as Lat. /k/ in this environment became palatalized.

This development is also attested in place names, where Goth. forms occur with palatalization as well as without. This shows that the process of palatalization must have been going on during the time of the Goth. influence on IbVLat., and that we must presuppose two different stages: in the first stage Goth. /k/ in /ke/, /ki/ was identified with the already slightly palatalized IbVLat. /k/ in the corresponding position in IbVLat.; in the second stage, however, the earlier IbVLat. /k/ in /ke/, /ki/ had developed into the new sound /ć/, which was a new phoneme in IbVLat., whereas the Goth. phoneme /k/ was preserved as /k/ in all environments, also before palatal elements. Therefore when Goth. names were again used to designate places in the second stage, Goth. /k/ was substituted by IbVLat. /k/ in all positions, but it was kept
distinct from the IbVLat. phoneme /ć/. Since both palatalized as well as non-palatalized Goth. forms occur side by side in the northern provinces, we must conclude that stage I and stage II existed in several dialects simultaneously for some time. These observations support the assumption that IbVLat. palatalization took place in the second half of the period of Goth. influence in the Iberian Peninsula.

The development of the other Goth. sounds in IbVLat. shows no interesting features, with the exception of Goth. /w/ in initial position, which developed into a cluster /gw/. But this is a general process in Romance, which was probably due to the repatterning of clusters and syllabification.\textsuperscript{283}

Intervocalic [gũ] in Sp. seems to continue Goth. /ggw/ (Verschärfung) in the case of Sp. \textit{tregua}.

Goth. /s/ in initial position before certain consonants developed the epenthetic vowel /e/, parallel to Lat. /s/ in the same environment. This fact is taken as an indication that the epenthetic /e/ was a later development.

Other Goth. consonants, such as /r/, /l/, /m/, /n/, seem to have corresponded closely to IbVLat. /r/, /l/, /m/, /n/, and show the same development.

\textsuperscript{283}Cf. my previous discussion in § 4.1.7.1.
c) Clusters:

In the section to follow I shall summarize in brief what has been presented concerning the phonotactic processes involved in the transfer of Goth. words into IbVLat. in the phonological chapter. Unfortunately the evidence is too limited to allow any definite conclusions, but several interesting observations can be made.

1. Postpausal clusters consisting of two consonants:

According to Valencia, IbVLat. possessed initial clusters consisting of stops (or /f/) plus /r/ or /l/. /l/ was excluded, however, from appearing after dentals. In the later development of Sp., /l/ displays a certain tendency to be replaced by /r/ or to be eliminated in certain clusters.

According to Valencia, IbVLat. had the following biphonemic clusters after ə in words inherited from Lat.: /pr/, /pl/, /br/, /bl/, /fr/, /fl/, /tr/, /dr/, /kr/, /kl/, /gr/, /gl/.

The Goth. phonological system includes all these possibilities. There is no evidence for: /pr/, /pl/, /fr/, /dr/, /kl/ and /gl/, but for the rest of these clusters, the evidence seems to

---

indicate that the Goth. words could be taken over with no special adaptations:

Goth. /br/ = Sp. /br/: cf. brikan > bregar; *brut > brote.

The cluster /fl/ requires a special comment. Since /fl/ was a possible combination after pause in IbVLat., (fl/ in such a word as Goth *flasko was probably taken over as /fl/). This is attested by the occurrence of flasco in OSp.. However, due to the rarity of this cluster in OSp., /fl/ was replaced by the more common /fr/. Thus, the modern form is Sp. frasco. Since the representation of /r/ in IbVLat. and OSp. was probably very weak, /r/ and /l/ are quite often exchanged in the course of the development.

In addition, Goth. also had a possible cluster /pr/, which had no parallel in IbVLat. because of the nonexistence of /p/ in this system. However, as pointed out above, Goth. /p/ was regularly substituted by IbVLat. /t/, its nearest equivalent. Correspondingly, Goth. /pr/ is reflexed as Sp. /tr/. Cf. priskan > triscar.
Another Goth. initial cluster which had no correspondence in IbVLat. was /hr/. /h/ was probably generally weakened at this time and could be eliminated in the adaptation to the IbVLat. system. In agreement with the general replacement of /h/ by zero, we find Goth. /hr/ > Sp. /r/. Cf. *hrapón > rapar, arrapar; *hraustjo > rezón.

Goth. /pw/ corresponds to Sp. /t/. Cf. perhaps *pwahloj > toalla.

Goth. clusters of the type #sC; as pointed out above, join the change of inherited Lat. #sC-in developing an excrescent /e/ after pause. Cf. *spaíha > espía; *stakka > estaca; *skaíran > esquilar.

2. Intervocalic clusters consisting of two elements:

In one type of intervocalic cluster, we find a stop (or another phoneme) preceded by another element, such as a sibilant, nasal, liquid or fricative. Of these, the following Goth. clusters correspond directly to IbVLat. tolerated clusters:

Goth. /sk/ = Sp. /sk/: cf. priskan > triscar.

With the exception of Section 3. (cf. below) on intervocalic clusters with three elements, no mention is made of clusters containing /j/, since this type of phoneme combination is discussed under (b) in § 4.3.
Goth. /ng/ = Sp. /ng/: cf. *anga > angazo.


In the same group we can also list Goth. /sn/ = Sp. /sn/: cf. *alisna > lesna.

For one word, which is probably of Goth. origin and which shows /ht/, we find the following correspondence:

Goth. andbahti > Sp. embajada.

An occasional Goth. /zg/ is reflexed as Sp. /sk/.

It should be borne in mind that /zg/ was not a combinatorial possibility of IbVLat.. Thus, a word like Goth. azgō may have called for a change, especially since the voiceless counterpart /sk/ was a tolerated cluster in IbVLat.. We find Goth. azgō > Sp. ascua. In this case, the untolerated Goth. cluster was replaced by its voiceless counterpart in IbVLat..

Whereas the above clusters correspond to Sp. clusters in a rather simple manner, trouble arises with some other clusters involving liquids (i.e. /r/, but especially /l/) as the first element. /r/ is often reflexed as /l/ and vica-versa.

When Goth. *haribaírgs was assimilated to IbVLat., the /i/ was dropped between /r/ and /b/, thus leading to the development of a secondary cluster /rb/ in OSp.. This word occurs in OSp. occasionally as arvergueria and once in the

---

form of arbergada in the Poema de Alfonso XI (1298). However, /rb/ must have alternated with /lb/ in this case, since the modern form is albergue, which could go back to a dissimilation of the form VrbVrg > VlbVrg.

Goth. /lp/ was probably substituted by Sp. /ld/ (since Goth. /p/ must have had a voiced allophone in this voiced environment). However, it developed later into /d/ for secondary reasons. We find Goth. *waltapairos as guadapero.

Goth. *palp- may correspond to Sp. pantano, which would be, however, a highly irregular and questionable correspondence. A secondary cluster /ln/ seems to have developed in IbvLat. when Goth. aleina was taken over as *alna. But this form was then reduced to Sp. ana.

\[287\] Cf. Corominas, I, p. 86.

\[288\] Cf. Corominas, II, p. 404. Perhaps it should also be noted in this connection that there was probably a phonetic difference between the phonetic quality of IbvLat. /r/ and that of Goth. /r/ in that the latter was a retroflex, whereas the former came close to a fricative. This difference in pronunciation is also responsible for the development of Goth. *skairan into Sp. esquilar. However, it is not certain, whether this phonetic difference was really the cause for the occurrence of /i/ in the Sp. reflex under discussion, since the original presence of two r-clusters in OSp. arverguería shows that the assumption of a dissimilation offers a better explanation.
probably because of the rarity of this cluster in OSp.\footnote{Cf. Corominas, I, p. 197. Corominas also points out other similar developments in Sp., which seem to indicate that this cluster could not be tolerated in Sp.}

Goth. /mn/, which was a non-permitted sequence in IbVLat., was reduced to /m/ in one case: cf. *hramnila > rámila.

In one case, Goth. /lw/ could possibly have a reflex like /lu/ in Sp.: cf. *falwiska > falúa.

Goth. /hs/, which could not have been a possible cluster in IbVLat. since /h/ did not exist, was reduced to /s/ in one case: cf. *bahsuke > tasugo.

In one doubtful case, Goth /rz/> Sp. /rr/: cf. marzjan > OSp. amarrido.

In another type of cluster, which is not well-attested, we find a stop in the first position, and another element, such as a liquid or a semivowel, in the second position.

Goth. /pr/ seems to have been substituted by IbVLat. /dr/, due to the fact that /p/ probably had a voiced allophone in intervocalic position; in one word, however, it appears to be reduced to /d/ for secondary reasons:

Goth. *wibralaun seems to have developed via *gwedralaun into *gwedarlaun, the latter showing the transposition of /r/ occurring in Castilian: CrV > CVr. By metathesis *gwedarlaun developed into *gwelardon (OSp. gualardon), Sp. galardón, where the vocalism of the second element in this compound probably testifies to the influence of Lat. donum.
In one case we find Goth. /dr/ > Sp. /rr/: cf. fōdr > forrar.

Goth. /hr/ > Sp. /r/: cf. *harihrings > arenga. However, in this case, Goth. /hr/ could also be considered morpheme initial, i.e., postpausal.

Goth. /pw/ > Sp. /t/: cf. mapwa > mata.

A third type of cluster, Goth. geminates, shows a very regular development in Sp., following the rule CC > C.

According to Valencia, "... original geminates and possible geminates arising from syncope are reduced to a single consonant". Valencia quotes the following evidence: pittaciu > pitaciu > pedaco; ecclesia > eclesia (4th c.) > eglesia (7th c.). These examples show that the resulting single consonants join the original singles in the case of stops, and then both undergo sonorization in the course of the later development.

The latter, however, is not true for Goth. geminates; these combinations are reduced to single phonemes at a time when the sonorization of single intervocalic voiceless stops was already completed. Thus, Goth. geminated stops are reflexed as single voiceless stops in Sp..


\(^{290}\text{Cf. Valencia, "Syllabic Structure", p. 41.}\)
So far as geminate liquids and nasals are concerned, the opposition of inherited geminate phonemes versus single phonemes is preserved in later stages of the development of IbVLat. as a qualitative opposition.  

The development of original clusters is the following:
/rr/ > /ř/, /ll/ > /ž/, /nn/ > /ň/.

In two very doubtful cases we may find that a Goth. word has followed this line of development: Goth. *
mařhwallus > Sp. morilla; Goth. *
usquillan > Sp. escullirse. However, a much better established etymology points in a different direction, as we would expect: Goth. /ll/ > Sp. /l/: cf. *
skilla > esquila.

Similarly we find Goth. /mm/ > Sp. /m/: cf. *
grimms > grima.

3. Intervocalic clusters consisting of three elements:

Goth. andbahti, which probably underlies Sp. embajada, is an interesting case: here the reduction Goth. /ndb/ > Sp. /nb/ was necessary because /ndb/ was not tolerated in IbVLat.  

The sequence /nb/ was then probably assimilated to /mb/.

In a cluster in which the third element was Goth. /j/, the /j/ was sometimes simply deleted, as in Goth. /stj/ >

---

291 Cf. the statement made by Alarcos Llorach, who says: "... la diferencia cuantitativa se interpretó como cualitativa." (cf. Fonología Española, p. 248.)

Sp. /st/: cf. laistjan > lastar; but in another, if doubtful case we may also find palatalization: Goth. *hraustjo > Sp. rezón.

Goth. /rnj/ is reduced to Sp. /rn/: cf. *skaírnjan > escarnecer. But in this case, as also in the case of /stj/, a morpheme boundary intervenes, which suggests a morphemic substitution jan > ar(e), rather than a direct phonological adaptation.

Goth. /hlj/ is a sequence attested in Goth. *pwahljō, which seems to correspond to OSp. tovaja. The modern form, Sp. toalla, is due to the influence of Ital. tovaglia.²⁹³ Again, the Goth. sequence /hlj/ includes a morpheme boundary.

Similarly we find Goth. /nwj/ reduced to Sp. /n/, as possibly attested in manwjan > manir.

Goth. /skw/ seems to correspond to Sp. /sku/ in escullirse, which is possibly derived from Goth. *usquillan.

Goth. /ndw/ > Sp. /nd/: cf. bandwo > banda II.

If Sp. morilla really goes back to Goth. maúrhwallus, then it shows a reduction Goth. /rhw/ > Sp. /r/. Such a reduction would be a likely one since /h/ usually disappears, as well as /w/ in some cases.

4. Prepausal clusters:

A number of prepausal clusters ending in /s/ shows a development following the general rule that the cluster is reduced by the /s/, which probably had to be dropped because

²⁹³Cf. Corominas, IV, p. 466.
it was important as a plural marker for many other words
in IbVLat.. Most of the clusters involved in the phonolog-
ical adaptation of Goth. words in Sp. show specific environ-
ments in which this happened:

Goth. /ngs/: cf. *hrings > renco; *harihrings > arenga.
Goth. /ks/: cf. *bahsuks (a diminutive of Goth. bahnus
'badger')²⁹⁴ > tásugo.
Goth. /hs/: cf. *briuhs > troj.
Goth. /sts/: cf. *kasts > casta.
Goth. /rgs/: cf. *haribárks > albergue.
Goth. /hrs/: cf. *sahrs > sera.
Goth. /pms/: cf. *brepms > brétema. In this case an in-
tolerable sequence, i.e. /tm/, was dissolved by svarabhakti.

Whereas in the above examples Goth. final /s/ is deleted
and a Sp. ending added to the rest of the cluster, in Goth.
*gans the final /s/ is probably preserved by attaching the
Sp. ending /-o/ to it; cf. *gans > ganso.

Two other developments may be evidenced in Sp. tacca,
from Goth. taikn, where the intolerable prepausal sequence
/kn/ is changed to /k/ plus vocalic ending, and in Sp. grampa,
calambre, which might show a similar development for Goth. /mp/.

²⁹⁴Cf. Gamillscheg, RG I, p. 344.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The concerns of the preceding study were 1) assembling a list of Goth. reflexes in Spanish for analysis; 2) summarizing previous, unfortunately contradictory and inconclusive etymological research concerning the Goth. origin of these reflexes; and 3) analyzing in detail the phonological and phonetic processes involved in the adaptation of these Goth. forms to the phonemic and phonotactic structure of Sp. as it developed from IbVLat. during the Visigothic Period.

The analysis of the adaptations and substitutions of single phonemes and sounds, diphthongs and clusters in the transfer of Goth. lexical items into Sp. resulted in some definite and some only tentative conclusions, which may ultimately be summarized as follows:

On the basis of our loanword evidence we conclude that the sonorization of medial stops must have been completed somewhat prior to the time of the borrowings from Goth., since Goth. loanwords do not show the effects of this change. Palatalization, on the other hand, seems to have been completed relatively later, since at least /k/ is palatalized in Goth. loanwords. This conclusion is supported by the fact that palatalized and non-palatalized forms occur in the northern provinces, where place names show traces of Goth. refugees
following the Arab invasion. The development of the epenthetic vowel is probably also a later development, since, without exception, the Goth. loanwords in Sp. evidence this change.

Apart from conclusions concerning the relative chronology of sound changes, substitutions such as that of IbVLat. /t/ for Goth. /p/ in initial position and of IbVLat. /d/ for Goth. /p/ in intervocalic position provide information concerning the allophonic patterning of certain phonemes in VGoth. as well as IbVLat.

The substitution pattern of Goth. loanwords in Sp. shows that the distinction between long and short vowel phonemes corresponded to a distinction in quality (close versus open) which resulted in relatively simple substitutions. The substitution pattern of the single consonant phonemes shows that the Goth. consonant phonemes corresponded rather closely to those of IbVLat. with the exceptions of Goth. /p/, which had no phonemic correspondence in IbVLat., and Goth. /w/, which is reflexed as initial Sp. /gu/ with a very defective distribution in Sp. So far as clusters are concerned, a number of Goth. clusters could be taken over directly into IbVLat. since they were tolerated by the system of the language. In other cases we find a variety of adaptations, some of which follow general rules, parallel to the development of corresponding single consonant phonemes. The evidence provided by most clusters supports the assumptions made on the basis of single phonemes concerning the phonological processes involved in the transfer of Goth. forms into Sp.
It may be concluded that late VGoth. was phonemically as well as phonetically similar to the Goth. dialect attested in the OGoth. manuscripts of Wulfila's Bible translation. Perhaps our most significant finding is that the substitution pattern of Goth. loanwords in Sp. supports the hypothesis that, during the period of the borrowings, the WGoth. "ai" probably represented two different sounds, partially parallel to the dual function of the graph "au" (contrary to the suppositions of Marchand and Penzl among others, who claim that the digraphs in question must have represented one sound each).
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