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0. Introduction

The so-called ‘Crimean Gothic’ (hereafter CG) vocabulary was recorded in Constantinople during the period 1560-62 by Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, a Flemish nobleman who was serving Ferdinand I of Austria as Imperial Ambassador to the Ottoman Porte. This vocabulary, which Busbecq includes in a report in the last of his four ‘Turkish letters’, consists of two lists of words and phrases glossed in Latin, eighteen cardinal numbers, and the unglossed, three-line beginning of a song, the cantilena, all told a mere 101 separate forms. These meager data are the only traces of a Germanic language once spoken in the Crimea, but extinct since the end of the 18th century.

The circumstances of the recording of the CG data and of their transmission to us make their analysis problematic. Busbecq’s Crimean informant was not a native speaker of CG, and thus the forms he provided were sometimes faulty, influenced by his native language, a dialect of Greek. In such a way, informant distortion has veiled the shape of some of the underlying forms in Native CG (hereafter NCG). Busbecq, the ‘linguistic fieldworker’, recorded the CG vocabulary in an inconsistent, ambiguous transcription: This makes an interpretation of the informant’s pronunciation of the CG words difficult, sometimes uncertain. The most authoritative extant version of Busbecq’s report is its first unauthorized publication, a Paris printing of 1589. It is apparent that a number of the CG forms here had been miscopied in the printer’s Vorlage, or were misset by the compositor, so that Busbecq’s transcription has been garbled, and the shape of the underlying NCG forms further obscured.

Part I of this study surveys the various reports surrounding CG, examines the circumstances of Busbecq’s recording of the CG vocabulary and of its transmission to us, reviews the pertinent previous scholarship, and offers a linguistic analysis of the data. It is shown that CG cannot have descended from the Bible Gothic of Wulfila (hereafter BG), but that it developed as a separate East Germanic dialect from an early date. Part II provides a phonological interpretation and etymological discussion of the individual CG forms.
1. Reports of the Language of the Crimean Goths

1.0 Introductory

The Goths had migrated to the western shores of the Black Sea and into the Tauric Chersonese (the Crimea) by the middle of the third century A.D. (cf. Vasiliev 1936:3). Since that time the Goths of the Crimea are frequently mentioned. The discussion which follows is limited to those reports which make reference to the language of these Goths. The only report which provides CG linguistic data is the 16th century account of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, Imperial Ambassador to the Ottoman Porte. However, several references to CG precede and follow Busbecq’s report.

1.1 Reports Preceding Busbecq’s

Cyril [c. 850]

The first reference to the language of the Goths of the Crimea appears in the *Vita* of Saint Cyril, Apostle to the Slavs (Constantine the Philosopher), who came to the Crimea in the middle of the ninth century to preach the gospel to the Khazars. Here the Goths are listed among those peoples who read books and who praise God, each in its own language. It is assumed that this reference is to the Goths Cyril had known in the Crimea (cf. Loewe 1896:114; Vasiliev 1936:114). This is one of only two reports which suggest that the Goths of the Crimea may have read the scriptures in their own language. Was this written language that of Wulfila’s Bible translation? Liewehr (1952:287-88) believes that a Crimean Goth acquainted Cyril with this translation.

Das Annolied [c. 1080]

An intriguing, possible reference to Germanic-speaking peoples in the Crimea area is found in the Early Middle High German *Annolied* (c. 1080). Verses 310-18 say of the Bavarians:

```
Dere geseleht quam wilin ère,
Von Armènie der hérin,
Dâ Nô èz der arkin ging,
Dûr diz oltzû von der tàvin infieng.
Irí ceichin noch du archa havit
Úf den bergin Arrarát.
Man sagit daž dâr in halvin noch sîn
Die dir Diutschien sprechen
Ingegin Indiâ vili verro.
```

Massmann (1841:352) associates this reference with the Goths of the Crimea (cf. also Stutz 1966:82, Hâst 1971:73-74), whereas Loewe (1896:78) links it to the ‘Kaukasusgermanen’. In any case it is ‘die erste dunkle Kunde in Deutschland von der Existenz deutscher Sprache am schwarzen Meere’ (Loewe 1896:78).

Ruysbroek [1253]

Wilhelm Ruysbroek (Ruysbroeck, Rubruk, Rubriquis), a Flemish Franciscan missionary, visited the Crimean Peninsula in 1253 during a mission to the Orient. In his *Itinerarium*, he reports the presence of Goths in the Crimea, and here for the first time we are told of the Germanic character of their language. I cite here the pertinent text following Beazley (1903:146-47):

```
& sunt quadraginta castella inter Kersouam & Soldiaum, quorum quodlibet fere habet proprium idiomata: inter quos erant multi Goti, quorum idiomata est Teutonicum.
```

Pachymeres [c. 1290]

The 13th century historian Georgios Pachymeres (c. 1242-1310) tells us in his *History* that the Alans, the Zikhi, the (Crimean) Goths, and the Russians, as well

---

1. The history of the Goths in the Crimea has been treated by Tomascheck (1881), Braun (1890), Loewe (1896), Vasiliev (1936), Schwarz (1953), and recently by Hâst (1971).
2. Loewe (1896:111) points out that the name ‘Goths’ was applied by the Greeks to all Germanic peoples in the Black Sea area.
3. The reports of the language of the Crimean Goths are discussed by Tomascheck (1881:26-68), Braun (1890:52-69), Loewe (1896:113-79), Hâst (1971:72-87).
4. The pertinent section is found in Chapter XVI of the *Vita* of Saint Cyril and is cited here from the edition by Dümmler and Miklosich (1870:227): *My že naradû mnogo znajemû knigy umêjuje i boh slaavu vûdajûje, kûzdo svoûmû jazykomû. Javè že sutû si: Arûmeni, Perûssi, Avazûgi, Iveri, Sûgûdi, Gotîbi, Òevi, Turûssi, Kozari, Aravliane, Jegupûiti i Suri i ini mnogo.* (“We know many peoples who understand books, and who praise God, each in its own language. Such, clearly, are these: the Armenians, the Persians, the Abasgians, the Iberians, the Sogdians, the Goths, the Avars, the Turks, the Khazars, the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Syrians and many others”) (emphasis mine). The 1851 edition by Šafaïk is cited by Braun (1890:52-63 fn. 1).
5. Beazley follows the first edition (1598) by Richard Hakluyt.
7. I cite here the pertinent passage (Pachymeres 1835:345); ἦν δὲ χρῶν υἱοβονθῶν, ἐπιγνώτες σφήνων ὀργὰ, δὲ τοις μεγάλοις κατεργήται, ἰλανοὶ κέραν, Ζιζίκεοι καὶ Γόπλα, Ρώματος καὶ τὸ πρωτοκόλλωτα τῶν διάφορα γένη, ἱδὼ τε τὰ δύοκεα μανθάνομεν καὶ γνώτεν τὰ τῆς μεταλαμβάνοντα καὶ στόλα, καὶ εἰς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν γίνοντα. Vasiliev (1936:172) provides the following translation: “In the course of time the peoples dwelling in the inland parts of the Peninsula and neighboring countries, I mean the Alans, Zikhi, Goths, Russians and other different neighboring peoples, mixed
as other peoples in the area of the Crimea, were adopting the language and customs of the Tartars. From this we can assume that each of these peoples originally had its own language (cf. Loewe 1896:114).  

Schiltberger [c. 1410]

The Bavarian soldier of fortune Johannes Schiltberger (Schilpeterger, Schillerger) of Munich spent the years 1394-1427 wandering in the East in Turkish captivity, during which time he visited many countries, including the Crimea. A reference by Schiltberger to a Crimean language may be to that of the Crimean Goths. In his Reisebuch he provides the following geographic description (Schiltberger 1885:63): *Iten ein stat haist Karkery und hatt ein guts landt und haist Sutti und die haiden heyssent Thatt; und sein Christen darinn in chirichismus gualben und hatt gut weinwachs und ligt poy dem schwartzem mer.* The form Sutti is assumed by Tomaschek (1881:48), Braun (1890:53), and Vasiliyev (1936:193) to be distorted for *Kuthi (Guti)*, i.e. Gothia, the mountain region of the Crimea where Karkory is located. That appears to correspond to *tat*, the term used by Turkish tribes for 'a foreign, subjugated people' (cf. Braun 1890:54). The word *that* occurs again when Schiltberger tallies the languages of those peoples who worship according to the Greek faith. In the Heidelberg manuscript of his Reisebuch the seventh language is listed as follows: *die siben Kuthia sprach vnd die heiden heissent that.* The words *Kuthia sprach* would appear to be 'Gothic language'. A comparison of the manuscripts of Schiltberger's Reisebuch casts some doubt on this, however. Only the Heidelberg manuscript has the form *Kuthia* here, while the Nürnberg manuscript shows *Churin*, and the Donaueschingen manuscript *Ruthia* (cf. Schiltberger 1885:97, 140).

Barbaro [c. 1450]

The Venetian businessman and traveler Iosaphat (Josafat, Giosafat) Barbaro was based in Tana on the Sea of Azov at the mouth of the Don from 1436 to 1452. During this period he visited the Crimea. He tells us in Viaggio alla Tana that on the *insula di Capba* (the Crimea) the Goths speak 'German.' He surmised this because his servant, who was a German, was able to communicate with them much the same as a Friulian and a citizen of Florence would understand one another. I cite here the pertinent text following Skržinskič (1971:131). *Gothi parlano in with them (the Noghai-Tartars); they adopted their customs, assumed their tongue and clothes, and became their allies*. [emphasis mine.]

The adoption of the Tartar language by the Crimean Goths at this early date was of course on a limited basis, as later reports of the survival of CG bear out. We must assume that Pachymeres' account refers to a demise of CG in some areas of the Crimea, or, more probably, to the use of Tartar as a second language among the Goths.

* Cited here after Loewe (1896:114-15), who has used the edition of the Heidelberg manuscript by Karl Friedrich Neumann, Munich 1859.


todesco; so questo perché, havendo un fameglio todesco con me, parlavano insieme et intendevansi assai rasonevolmente, cusi como se intenderea un furlano con un fiorentino. It is significant that Barbaro compares the mutual understanding between his German-speaking servant and the Crimean Goths to that existing between speakers of divergent Italian dialects. While emphasizing the similarity between German and CG, he at once draws our attention to the fact that certain differences separated these two Germanic dialects.

In the 16th century the presence of Goths in the Crimea became known to European scholars, as did the Germanic character of their language. Travelers to the Crimea, such as Barbaro in the 15th century, returned to Europe bringing this information with them. However, Barbaro's first-hand account was not published until 1543. There were obviously other 15th and 16th century travelers who brought back similar stories from the Crimea, but whose names are not mentioned where these accounts appear in print. Here one must attempt to determine which of these references to CG can be considered original, i.e. based on original accounts other than those discussed above.

Pirckheimer [c. 1500]

The most romantic account associated with CG is somewhat dubious and may not refer to the Goths of the Crimea at all. It appears in Joachimus Cureus' (Curæus; 1542-1573) Gentis Silesiae Annales (Witebergæ 1571) and is noted in the margin as 'Historia de reliquis Gothorum in Taurica Chersoneso' (cf. Loewe 1896:117). Cureus tells us that a certain D. Philippus, who is assumed to be Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560), often related a story told to him by Willibald Pirckheimer (Pirchamerus; 1470-1530) of Nürnberg. A company of Nürnberg merchants and Venetians, so the story goes, had set sail for Crete and Cyprus, but was forced to shore by a storm in the Aegean near the Bosphorus. There, to their astonishment, they happened upon a young man singing a song in which he used "German words" ('verba Germanica'). When they asked him where he was from, he answered that his home was nearby and that his people were Goths.
Reports of the Language of the Crimean Goths

multa milia patrum foris Graeca et Tartarica lingua, domi Germana utuntur. While Pachymeres had already reported the use of Tartar by the Goths (see above), here we learn that they used Greek as well.

According to Loewe (1901:566-67), Ziegler’s report is probably based on the eyewitness account of a Hungarian German who had visited the Crimea. Ziegler could have heard (or read) this account while living in Hungary during a period prior to 1521.

Torquatus [c. 1560]

A report which is more or less contemporary with Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter (1562) is that of the German historian and theologian, Georgius Torquatus (1513-1575). It appears in his Annales Lipsiae et quilinburgi, which he compiled in 1561-1574 (cf. Vasiliev 1936:174 fn. 3). This account tells us that Goths in the Crimea and elsewhere, while preserving their native, Germanic language for use among themselves, use Greek, Tartar, or Hungarian when dealing with outsiders. The text is cited here after Loewe (1896:47): Horum Gothorum religiae in Transylvania. In montanis Tauricis Chersonesii ad Bosphorus non procuc a Constantinopoli et in Asia versus septentrionalem prope Armeniam domi inter se generillia h. e. Germanica, Saxoniis idiomati fere simili: foris autem et ad alios vel graecas vel Tartaricam [sic] sive Ungarica utuntur lingua, ut ex historia Friderici Barbarossae et ex quadam Pirckeimeri Norimburgensis narratione manifestum est.

Although Torquatus mentions Pirkheimer (and the history of Barbarossa), Loewe (1896:47ff) is convinced that the content of this report is based on another, original account by someone who probably spent considerable time in the Crimea. New information here includes the description of CG not only as a Germanic language, but as being similar to the Saxon language, i.e. Low German. Here we also learn for the first time of the use of Hungarian (cf. fn. 19) by the Goths. The adoption of second languages by the Goths of the Crimea, already noted by Pachymeres in the 13th century, ultimately led to the extinction of CG.

1.2 Busbecq’s Report: The Crimean Gothic Corpus

We come now to the most interesting and most important report. It appears in the fourth ‘Turkish letter’ of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, dated 1562 and first published in 1589 (cf. 4.). Busbecq, a Flemish nobleman, spent the years 1555-1562...
in the service of Ferdinand I of Austria as Imperial Ambassador to the Ottoman Porte. Sometime during the period 1560–1562 Busbecq met in Constantinople with two envoys from the Crimea, one of whom was able to speak CG. In his fourth Turkish letter Busbecq records a number of the linguistic data provided by this Crimean. These data, a total of 101 separate forms, not counting repeats, consist of two lists of CG vocabulary (including five short phrases) glossed in Latin, eighteen cardinal numbers, and the unglossed, three-line beginning of a song, the cantilena. This is the entire corpus of CG.

Facsimiles of the first edition of Busbecq’s report (Busbequius 1589) are shown by Plates I–VI (pp. 21–26).19 I cite here Busbecq’s report in its entirety (Busbequius 1589:135–37). I have normalized the orthography of the Latin text21 (cf. Plates II–VI) as was also done by Loewe (1896:127-30)24 and others.

Non possum hoc loco praeteriere, quae de gente accipi, quae etiamnum incolit Tauricam Chersonesum, quam saepe audieram sermone, moribus, ore denique ipso et corporis habitu, originem Germanicam referre. Itaque me diu cupiditas tenui videndi ab ea gente at quem, et si fieri posset inde eruendi aliquid quod ea lingua scriptum esset sed hoc consequi non potui. Casus tamen utunque desiderio meo satisfecit. Cum essent duo hue illinc delegati, qui nescio quas quereolas nomine eius gentis ad principem deferrent, meique interpretes in eos incidissent, memores quid eis mandasse si id usum veniret, ad prandium illos ad me adduxere-unt. Alter erat procierer, toto ore ingenuam quandam simplicitatem praeferebat, ut Flander videretur aut Batavus: alter erat brevier, compactio corpore, colore fuscio, ortu et sermone Graecus, sed qui frequenti commercio non contemnedium eius linguae usum haberet, nam superior vicinitate, et frequenti Graecorum consuetudine sic eorum sermonem imbibaret, ut populares sui esset oblivitus. interrogatus de natura et moribus illorum populi, congruentia respondebat. Aiebat gentem esse ballicasam, quae complures pagos hodie incolerex, ex quibus Tartarorum regulus, cum expidere, octingentes pedites scelptarii scriberet, praecepitum suarium copiare armamentum: primarias eorum urbes, alteram Mancup vocari, alteram Sciaurin. Ad haec multa de Tartarorum eorumque barbarie: in quibus tamen singulari sapientia non paucos reperiri memorabat. Nam de rebus gravissimis interrogatos, breviter atque apposite respondere. Ea de causse non temere dicitare Turcas, reliquis quidem nationes scriptam in libris

19 These plates have been prepared from photostats obtained from the Houghton Library, Harvard University.

21 No normalization of the CG forms (or their glosses) has been undertaken here except in the case of the orthographic symbols (f) and (v), both of which are rendered here as e.g., CG Fisc ‘fish’, sevne ‘seven’ for Fisc, sevne, in the first edition (cf. Plates IV and V). Capitalization of CG forms as they appear in the first edition is retained throughout this study.

24 In addition to the normalizations I have undertaken (cf. fn. 21), Loewe (1896:128-29) has normalized initial CG (VV) as W, e.g. Wagenh ‘wagon’ for CG Waghen, and CG (u) as u in the form sevne ‘seven’ for CG Sevne. Note also CG Galtzow, an unglossed form in the cantilena: Loewe (1896:129) and most others show this form as Galitzow (cf. 10. fn. 1).
language, customs and even in their facial features and bodily appearance. I had long hoped to meet one of these people and, if possible, obtain from him something written in their language, but I had been unable to do so. Finally, however, chance satisfied my wishes to a certain degree. It so happened that two envoys from that area had come here to lay some kind of complaints or other before the sultan in the name of that people. My interpreters met them and, remembering what I had instructed them to do in such a case, brought them to my residence to dinner.

One of them was taller and displayed in his countenance a certain ingenuous simplicity, so that he looked like a Fleming or a Dutchman. The other was shorter, more compactly built, and swarthily of complexion. He was a Greek by birth and by language, but through his frequent dealings with those people he had acquired a fair acquaintance with their language. The first named, however, had lived and associated with the Greeks for so long that he had adopted their language and forgotten his own.

When I asked him about the nature and customs of these people he responded appropriately. He said that they are a warlike people, who to this day inhabit numerous villages, from which the chief of the Tartars, when necessary, can enlist eight hundred infantrymen armed with firearms, the mainstay of his forces. Their most important communities are Mancup and Scivarin.

He also told me many things about the Tartars and their barbaric ways. He pointed out, however, that among them there are quite a few men of remarkable intelligence, who, when asked about serious matters, answer concisely and to the point. Therefore the Turks say with good cause that, while other nations have their wisdom written down in books, the Tartars have devoured their books and thus have their wisdom stored in their breasts and can bring it forth when needed and speak like men inspired. They are very unclean in their habits. When soup is placed on the table they do not ask for spoons, but drink it rather with the palm of their hand. They eat the flesh of slaughtered horses without cooking it. They merely place pieces of it under the saddles of their horses, and when it has been warmed by the heat of the horse’s body, they eat it as though it had been prepared in the most delicate fashion. The chief of these people eats off a silver table. The head of a horse is served for the first and last course, just as butter is honored among us as the first and last dish of a meal.

I will now write down a few of the many German words he repeated for me; for there were just as many words completely different in form from our own, whether this was due to the nature of the language, or because his memory failed him, and he substituted foreign words for native ones. Before all words he used the article tho or the. Those words which were like ours or only a little different were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broe</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oegehne</td>
<td>eyes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certainly the article was used not before all words, but rather before all nouns.
German,\textsuperscript{48} are in the habit of heaping praise upon yourselves for this, while making fun of us for what you consider to be our atrocious pronunciation of the word which you pronounce Seuen. He continued: Ate, nyne, thiine, thiniuta, thunetua, thunetria, etc. For 'twenty' he said stega, 'thirty' was treithyen, 'forty' furdeithien, 'a hundred' sada, 'a thousand' hazer. He also recited a song in that language, which began as follows:

\begin{quote}
VWara vvara ingdolou
Sca te gira Galzou
Hamsiclep dorbicza ea.
\end{quote}

I cannot decide whether these people are Goths or Saxons. If they are Saxons, I think they were moved there during the time of Charlamagne, who scattered people over various regions of the world. As testimony to this are the cities in Transylvania, which to this day are inhabited by Saxons.\textsuperscript{37} Perhaps he decided to remove the fiercest of them even farther, namely to the Crimea, where in the midst of enemies they still retain their Christianity. But if they are Goths, I believe they have occupied those regions neighboring the Getae\textsuperscript{48} from ancient times. One would probably not be mistaken in thinking that the greater part of that territory lying between the island of Gotland and what is now called Perekop was once inhabited by Goths. It was from here that the various Gothic tribes came, the West Goths and the Ostrogoths; from here they carried out their world conquests; this was the breeding ground of those barbarian hordes.

There you have what I learned about the Crimea from these men from Perekop.

\textbf{1.3 Reports following Busbecq's}

With the publication of Busbecq’s account in 1589, we might expect numerous, more detailed reports of the language of the Crimean Goths to have followed. Such was not the case. Only five subsequent references attest to the continuing survival of CG. All but the last of these are sketchy, second-hand reports.

Scaliger [1606]

The first report to follow Busbecq’s is an unlikely one. Joseph-Juste Scaliger (1540-1609) tells us in his Isagogicum chronologiae canonum libri tres (1606)
that the Goths of the Crimea read both the Old and New Testaments written in the letters of Vulfla’s alphabet. I give here the pertinent text, following Massmann (1841:355): *Gotthos etiamnunc in issem regionibus (der Krimm) degere sub Praeexpensi Tatarorum dynastia et utrumque Testamentum iisdem literis, quas excogitavit Vulfla, conscriptum et eadem lingua, qua tempore Ovidii (Getae) utebantur, interpretatum legere.

This is the first report since that in the Vita of Saint Cyril (c. 850) to suggest that the Crimean Goths might have had a written language of their own. Nowhere else is there any indication that CG existed as a written language in the 16th and 17th centuries. Furthermore, Scaliger fails to give the source of this account. For these reasons it is rightly discounted by Loewe (1896:197). (But cf. Scardigli 1964:294 and fn. 1; 1973:251 and fn. 35.)

Spaharius [1685]

The next report to follow Busbecq’s appears in Johannes Peringsköld’s (1654-1720) annotations to his 1699 edition of Johannes Coehleus’ (1479-1552) *Vita Theodorici regis Ostrogotorum et Italie.* This is the account of Nicholau Spatharius, a Moldo-Walachian, who had been at the Ottoman Port as an interpreter. Spatharius’s report was relayed to Peringsköld by the Swedish scholar Johan Sparvenfeldt (Sparvenfeldt; 1655-1720), who vouched for its credibility.28

In 1685 Sparvenfeldt met Spatharius and recorded his account. He reported that there were some 300 villages in the Crimea whose inhabitants were of Gothic descent. They were Christians and had a Gothic bishop and used a peculiar “Teutonic” (“Theutonica”) language, which they called Gothic (cf. Loewe 1896:187-92).29

Kämpfer [c. 1690]

A very questionable report of the survival of CG is that of the 17th century traveler and historian, Englebert Kämpfer (Kempher, Kaempfer; 1631-1716). Kämpfer makes reference to the language of the Crimean Goths in *The History of Japan* (Vol. I, book I, ch. VI), which he compiled in 1690-92 during his journey to

30 Loewe (1896:187-92) and Hest (1971:86) contest the accuracy of the particulars in Spaharius’s report.

and sojourn in the Far East.32 This work was first published in English (London 1727), as translated by Johannes Casparus Scheuchzer from the original German manuscript. I cite here Kämpfer’s report from a later edition of this work (Kaempfer 1906:134): *The language spoke in the Peninsula Crimea, or Taurica Chersonesus, in Asia, still retains many German words, brought thither, as is supposed by a colony of Goths, who went to settle there about 850 years after the Deluge. The late Mr. Busbeq, who had been Imperial Ambassador at the Ottoman Port, collected and published a great number of these words in his fourth letter; and in my own travels through that Country I took notice of many more.*

Stimulated by this claim, the German scholar Friedrich Kluge spent “ganze tage” during the period 1883-1885 searching through Kämpfer’s papers in the Sloane Collection of the British Museum.33 Unfortunately, Kluge was unable to find any CG linguistic data among these papers.34 Moreover, he determined that Kämpfer had never visited the Crimea, and thus his report of the continued existence of “German words” in a language of the Crimea was apparently based on second-hand accounts. If Kämpfer was nonetheless able to collect CG linguistic data on the basis of such accounts, these records were apparently destroyed by sea water during a voyage to China (cf. fn. 34).35

Mondorf [1760]

The eminent German geographer Anton Friedrich Büsching (1724-1793) includes in his *Erdbeschreibung* a report of the use of a Germanic language in the Black Sea area. Büsching obtained this report in 1760 from the Viennese Jesuit Mondorf, who had visited Constantinople, but not the Crimea (cf. Hest 1971:65-
The text of this report is given here following Loewe (1896:52), who cites Büsching, *Erdbeschreibung*, Dritter Theil, Schaffhausen 1766, p. 97: *Unter denselben [i.e. the Tartars], und zwar an den Küsten des Schwarzen Meeres von der Donau an bis zum asowschen Meere, ja auf der asiatischen Seite des Schwarzen Meeres, wohnet ein heidnisches Volk, ohne besonderen Namen, dessen Sprache mit der deutschen verwandt ist. (In dieser Gegend haben die Gothen vor Alters gewohnt, von welchen diese Nation vielleicht ein Ueberbleibsel ist, bei welchem die christliche Lehre wieder untergegangen.) Der gelehrte und erfahrene Jesuit Mondorf, von welchem ich diese merkwürdigen Nachrichten habe, hat einen Rudersclaven von dieser Nation, den er auf einer türkischen Galere angetroffen, getauft, und von denselben erfahren, dass ihr ganz Gottesdienst in der Verehrung eines uralten Baumes bestehe.*

This report would seem to support the continued existence of a Germanic language in the Crimea. However, the assertion that a Germanic language was spoken as late as the 18th century throughout the widespread area Büsching describes diminishes the credibility of the entire account. Büsching also relates the reports of Barbaro and Busbecq along with that of Mondorf (cf. Loewe 1896:52). Did he perhaps confuse Mondorf’s account with these and/or earlier reports? In any case, he dropped this account in the 8th edition of his *Erdbeschreibung* (1787), probably because he had come to doubt its accuracy. Büsching’s apparent doubts are not shared by Loewe, however, for he takes this dubious account at face value (cf. Loewe 1896:52-70).

**Siestreńczewicz** [c. 1780]

The last report indicating the survival of CG is that of Stanisław Siestreńczewicz-Bohusz (Stanisława Sistreniczewicz de Bohusz, Sestrenewitzsch-Bogusch; 1731-1826), Archbishop of Mohilev and Metropolitan of the Roman Catholic churches of Russia. Siestreńczewicz, who visited the Crimea at the end of the 18th century (cf. Vasiliev 1936:273), makes reference in his *History* of that region to a people living there whose language differed greatly from that of its neighbors, and whose physical appearance convinced him they were descendants of the Goths. His reply to an inquiry regarding the Crimean Goths made by...

---

26 According to Loewe (1896:200), Siestreńczewicz’ visit to the Crimea may have taken place before 1783, the year in which the Crimea passed into Russian possession.


28 The pertinent section of Siestreńczewicz’ *History* is cited by Loewe (1896:197) from the Brunswick edition of 1800, Vol. I, pp. 252f, as follows: *J’ai vu cette ville de Mangout judaït ville capitale des Goths, et résidence de leurs anciens rois, dont les noms sont ignorés. Au bord de la rivière de Kabarda qui serpente au milieu d’une immense campagne, s’élève majestueusement la haute montagne dont le plateau est couvert de quelques vieilles masures habitées par des indigènes. Ils descendent d’un ancien peuple suivant toute les apparences qui résultent du local, et de leur traits particuliers, et de leur dialecte absolument différent de celui de tous leurs voisins. On dirait qu’ils sont fixés sur cette côte pour animer les ruines silencieuses d’un vaste monument qui évoque sans doute le palais de leurs souverains. La physionomie des vieillards nichés dans ces décombres me garantit que la main du temps a respecté quelques restes de ces anciens Goths. Quelques familles pauvres, isolées, à peine connues, veillent tout ce qui subsiste aujourd’hui de cette nation qui a parcouru l’Europe en dictant des lois aux peuples vaincus, de cette nation qui a fait trembler l’empire d’Orient, renversé celui d’Occident etc.* (cf. fn. 41).

29 I was also able to use the English translation: *Travels through the Southern Provinces of the Russian Empire in the Years 1793 and 1794*, London 1803. Here the pertinent text occurs on pp. 358-59.

It is possible that a few surviving speakers of CG, living perhaps in the mountains of the Crimea, had escaped Pallas’ attention. It is also possible that some CG-speakers were among the Christians who in the year 1778 emigrated from the Crimea to new settlements in Russian territory on the shores of the Azov (cf. 5.3.1), so that CG may have survived in Pallas’ time outside the Crimea. Be that as it may, Pallas’ report points to the passing of CG by the close of the 18th century.

De la Motraye had also suggested that Busbeeg’s Crimean Goths were German captives (cf. Loewe 1896:193, 203).

Siesarzeniewicz, who claims to have understood spoken CG in Mankup, includes in the 1824 edition of his History (cf. ins. 37, 38) a significant emendation. He now reports that the remnants of the Goths he had met in Mankup had since been evacuated to Chaufut-Kalé, formerly Kerkay (Kyrkore, Qirq-je) (cf. Tomasek 1881:43; Vasiiev 1936:193), in the mountain region of the Crimea (cf. Loewe 1896:197): Ce [sic] restes mêmes n’y sont plus. Ils se sont transportés à Tschefout-Kalé. Elle n’existe plus aujourd’hui cette nation qui a parcouru [sic] l’Europe.

Plate I
Facsimile of Busbeegius 1589: title page.
By permission of the Huntington Library, Harvard University.
EPISTOLA QUARTA.  

Christiani principes arma coniungant, et simul ei bellum interant, non floccis faciant, ac facilem vii nostram de suis reportet. Quo diuo in cubicula超出atus se recepit, facile in suo oratore. Non possum hoc loco præterire quod de gente accepto, quæ etiamum incolit Tauricam Chersonesum, quam sepe audire tam fermon, moribus, ore denique ipso & corporis habitu, originem Germanicam referre. Itaque me diu cupidis tenuit videndi ab ea gente aliquaem, et si fieri posset inde esse aliquid quod ea lingua scriptum effet, sed hoc confequi non potui. Causa tamen vtcunque defiderio meo satisfecit. Cum effert duo haec illinc delegati, qui necio quas vel relatas nomine eius gentis ad principem deferrent, meique interpretes in eos incidisset, memorare quid eis mandassim liid vi venire, ad prandum illos ad me adduxerunt. Alter erat proconsul, tetro ore ingenuum quumdam simplicitatem praebens, et Flandrem vidiret utara Batavum: alter erat breviore, compediore corpore, colore fulvo, ortu & fermon Græcus, id quod frequenti commercio nou conscientem dum eius linguae videm habemur. Nam superior vicinitate & frequenti Graecorum confluendum sit eorum fermonem imbibere, ut popularis fuit effec obitus. Interrogatus de natura et moribus illorum populorum, congruentia respondebat. Atibus gentem esse bellicosam, quæ complures pagos hodieque incoleret, ex
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articulum quo aut aut nostratio aut parum differentia hæc erant

Brev. Panis.
Plut. Sanyawi.
Simpl. Lecia.
Hue. Dominii.
Vind. Vitius.
Seyben. Flavia.
Bruder. Frater.
Schmeler. Servus.
Alt. Senex.
Vintch. Venen.
Sulai. Argentum.
Golz. Auran.
Kot. Trisum.
Sels. Sol.
Brie. Pervi.
Roof. Capit.
Thur. Porta.
Stein. Stella.
STr. Sol.
Mere. Lanius.

Koscen tag erat illi Bonus dieus. Nauem bo-
num dicebat, & præaque alia cum nostra lin-
gua non fatis congruentia viserbat, et
iel. Vita sine sanitas. 
Col. Roma.
Vilc. Viuns sine sanis. 
Iel. ubatur. Sis fames. 
Schn. Spina. 
Stuc. Terra. 
Lilla. Parmus. 

AVGERII BUSBEQUII
Ada. Omm.
Ado. Galina.
Felix. Stulm.
Stap. Capra.
Gadelia. Falebrum.
Aschita. Malum.
VHidestum. Album.
Mycha. Entis.

Iulius ita numerabat. Ita, tua, tria syder, fyns, 
seis, feuene, profulus, ut nos Flandri. Nam vos 
Brabantii, qui vos Germanicis loco facit, hic 
magnificet vos efferre, & vos soletis habere de 
ritui, & sic etiam vocem pronunciemus rancio-
dius, quam vos Seuen effertis. Profequebatur 
deinde Athen, viune, thine, thunia, thunetta, 
&e. Viginti diebus flega, triginta 
reithyen, quadrangita furthesten, centem 
vida, hazer mille. Quinetiam cantilenam eius 
linguæ recitabat, cuius initium erat huif-
modi.

V'ara vuara ingolus 
Steute gera Galli.
Hemeilep derbi ca.

Hi Gotthe an Saxones sint, non possum diuide 
care. Si Saxones, arbitrator eor deducet tempe-
rate Caroli magni, qui eam gentem per varias 
orbis terrarum regiones dilipait. Cui re 
 testimonia sunt visus Transilvaniae hodieque 
Saxonibus incolumi habitata. Atque ex eis fero-
cifimos fustes longius etiam summouati 
placuit in Tauricum vique Chersonenum, ubi 
quidem
2. A Chronological Survey of Crimean Gothic Studies

Busbecq’s CG material has been the subject of numerous studies since it was first published in 1589. Included in this survey are the earliest attempts to deal with this material as well as the more important later treatments of CG.

2.1 16th Century

1597 Bonaventura Vulcanius, De litteris et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum (Lugduni Batavorum 1597). Vulcanius provides an extract of Busbecq’s report (pp. 51-53). This earliest attempt at analysis takes the form of textual criticism: Vulcanius’ extract shows several emendations of the CG forms. Here, for example, we find Korn, Stern, Crīten in place of CG Kor ‘grain’, Stein ‘star’, Erīten ‘to cry’ found in the first edition (Paris 1589).

2.2 17th Century


1612 Abraham Milius, Lingua Belgica (Lugduni Batavorum 1612). Here an extract of the CG material is published together with a comparative treatment of the vocabulary and a translation into Dutch (cf. van de Velde 1965:66-71; 1966:99-104).

1669 A Swedish translation of the CG cantilenä was provided by Johannes Peringsköld in his 1669 edition of Johannes Cochleus’ Vita Theodorici regis Ostrogothorum et Italiae. The translation is reprinted by Mannhardt (1856:167).

2.3 18th Century

1758 Franz Anton (Franciscus Antonius) Knittel, Codex carolinus (Brunswick 1758). Knittel deals with the CG vocabulary and attempts to reconstruct
and translate the cantilena (cf. van de Velde 1966:343 fn. 4). Mannhardt (1856:167) has reprinted the translation.

1758 The dissertation of Andreas A. Malmenius, Dissertatione philologica religia linguae Getice (Uppsala c. 1758) demonstrates the relationship of CG to BG (cf. van de Velde 1966:334-43).

1779 In this year F. de Nélis lectured on the topic ‘Mémoire sur les rapports de la langue flamande avec celle des habitants de la Crimée,’ dealing here with Busbecq’s report (cf. van de Velde 1966:331).

1781 Jan Steenwinkel’s ‘Taelkundige verhandeling over de overblijfels der Getische taal’ in his Taelkundige Mengelingen (Leiden 1781) shows emended CG forms and offers a comparative study of CG in relation to other Germanic languages. This study is essentially a translation of Malmenius’ dissertation, corrected and supplied with additional etymologies (cf. van de Velde 1966:334-43).

1787 Jan de Roches’ short exposition in Histoire ancienne des Pays-Bas Autrichiens (Antwerp 1787) shows emended CG forms. De Roches believed CG to be Tartar, a ‘Scythian’ dialect related to Dutch (cf. van de Velde 1966:332-33).

1796 F.D. Grätner’s article ‘Busbecks und anderer Nachrichten von den deutschen Gothen auf der Insel Krimm’ in Bragur (1796) provides a German translation of Busbecq’s report, but offers no interpretation of the data, except to compare CG Teilig ‘foolish’ with Low German tellen ‘irre reden’ (p. 129 fn.).

2.4 19th Century

The surge of interest in philology in the 19th century produced a remarkable amount of scholarship in the area of Indo-European and Germanic studies. The study of BG played an important role here, and a by-product was a number of studies dealing with CG.

1811 J.-J. Raepsaet, Mémoire sur l’origine des Belges (Gent 1811). This study contains an emended CG word list and provides a French translation of Busbecq’s report (cf. van de Velde 1966:333-34).

1841 H.F. Massmann, ‘Gothica Minora,’ Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, 1 (1841), 294-393. We are concerned with the chapter in this article entitled ‘Wie steht es um Augerius Ginslenius Busbecks Gothen in der Krimm?’ (pp. 345-66). Massmann provides a biographical sketch of

1 Mossé (1950) lists the chapters of Massmann’s (1841) article as separate entries in his ‘Bibliographia Gotica.’

Busbecq and discusses other reports about the Crimean Goths and their language as well. He includes Busbecq’s entire report, interspersed with comments, footnotes, and an interpretation of the data. Massmann questions whether the Germanic data collected represent genuine traces of Gothic.

1851 Lorenz Diefenbach, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gothischen Sprache, 2 vols. (Frankfurt 1851). This reference work includes all of Busbecq’s CG vocabulary except for the articles tho and the and the material in the cantilena. There is a register in each volume, where vocabulary is inconveniently arranged according to the Gothic alphabet. Here it is also possible to find many of the CG forms, but often one must locate them by looking under the corresponding BG entry: CG Tag ‘day’, for example, is not listed in the registers, but is treated under BG dogs, which appears in the register of the second volume.

1856 W. Mannhardt, ‘Über eine gothische mundart,’ Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen und Lateinischen, 5 (1856), 166-80. Mannhardt treats the unglossed CG cantilena, which he considers to be Germanic. He notes previous attempts at reconstruction and translation and then offers his own version.

1874 F. Brun, ‘Černomorskie Goty i sledy dolgoa ix prebyvanija v južnoj Rossii,’ Zapiski Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 24 (1874), 1-60. Brun lists the CG vocabulary and offers a brief discussion (pp. 46-50).

1874 A. Kunik, ‘O Zapiske Gotskago Toparxa,’ Zapiski Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 24 (1874), 61-160. Busbecq’s report is discussed here (pp. 141-42) by Brun’s colleague. Kunik believes that Busbecq questioned only the native Crimean Goth, not the Crimean Greek, to obtain the CG linguistic data.

1875 Ernst Förstemann, Geschichte des deutschen Sprachstammes, Vol. 2 (Nordhausen 1875). Here the reports of the language of the Crimean Goths previous to and following that of Busbecq are summarized, and the CG vocabulary is discussed (pp. 164-70). Förstemann offers a German translation of the cantilena (p. 167).

1880 Géza Kuun, Codex Cumanicus (Budapest 1880). Kuun reprints Busbecq’s report and discusses the CG forms, comparing them to BG (pp. 239-44, 392). It is here that the cantilena is first interpreted as being Turkish.

1881 Wilhelm Tomaschek, Die Goten in Taurien (Vienna 1881). While it is primarily an ethnological study, the author of this work devotes considerable attention to Busbecq’s report and to the CG word list (pp. 56-68). Tomaschek cites portions of the Latin text, lists all the CG words together with their Latin glosses and includes the numbers and the cantilena as well.
The CG data are compared with forms in other Germanic languages and the cantilena is discussed. Previous studies in CG (Massmann, Diefenbach, Forstemann) are summarized.

F. Braun, "Die letzten Schicksale der Krimgoten," Jahresbericht der Reformierten Kirchenschule für 1889/90 (St. Petersburg 1890), 1-88. The second chapter of this historical study is devoted to the language of the Crimean Goths (pp. 52-63). Braun relates the early reports of the language of the Goths in the Crimea by Cyril, Rubruk, Schiltberger, and Barbaro. He then goes into Busbecq’s material, listing all the CG vocabulary and providing forms from BG and occasionally from other languages for comparison. He decides with Kuun (1880) that the cantilena is Turkish and attempts to make some improvements on Kuun’s interpretation. On the basis of the CG reflexes of Proto-Germanic short *e and *u, Braun concludes that CG cannot have descended from BG.

Richard Loewe, Die Reste der Germanen am schwarzen Meere: Eine ethnologische Untersuchung (Halle 1896). This ethnological study devotes more than half of its 257 pages to the Goths of the Crimea. It is the best known, most thorough treatment of CG. We are concerned with chapter two, "Die Sprache der Krimgoten" (pp. 113-210). Loewe details the reports of the language of the Goths of the Crimea which preceded and followed Busbecq’s and reprints the Flemish diplomat’s entire report (pp. 127-30). He then offers a complete analysis of the material. The various editions of Busbecq’s report, the misprints and later emendations are discussed. Loewe tabulates the CG reflexes of Proto-Germanic vowels and consonants, deals with some aspects of Busbecq’s system of transcription and expresses a good deal of confidence in that system. He then goes on to describe the features CG shares with BG and those which it shares with other Germanic languages. Here Loewe stresses with Braun (1890) that the distinctions maintained in CG reflexes of Germanic short *i and *e and Germanic short *u and *o prove that CG cannot be a descendant of BG (pp. 157-59). Loewe describes CG as the language of the Herules, a West Germanic dialect influenced by Gothic (p. 165). He then treats the development of CG phonology and morphology from Proto-Germanic and deals with the etymology of the vocabulary in Busbecq’s lists. The cantilena is designated as Turkish (p. 179).

Theodor von Grienberger, Review of Die Reste der Germanen am schwarzen Meere: Eine ethnologische Untersuchung, by Richard Loewe, Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 30 (1898), 123-36. This vehemently negative review criticizes Loewe for his failure to clarify the obscure CG vocabulary, for his overestimation of Busbecq’s transcription of the CG forms, and for his underestimation of the features CG shares with BG. Von Grienberger proceeds to illuminate his differences with Loewe’s conclusions by dealing with the CG vocabulary word by word, contesting and proposing improvements.

Rudolf Much, Review of Die Reste der Germanen am schwarzen Meere: Eine ethnologische Untersuchung, by Richard Loewe, Indogermanischer Anzeiger, 9 (1898), 193-209. Much likewise expresses disappointment in Loewe’s treatment of the CG material, asserting with von Grienberger (1898) that the author did not shed any light on the CG words of obscure origin. Much believes that Loewe was totally in error in assigning CG to West Germanic and in identifying it as the language of the Herules. He presents an analysis of the CG vocabulary and offers an ethnological explanation for designating the Crimean Goths as East Goths.

2.5 20th Century

Richard Loewe, "Die Krimgotenfrage," Indogermanische Forschungen, 13 (1902/03), 1-84. Here Loewe defends his theory that CG is West Germanic and re-affirms his interpretation of the data on the basis of linguistic and ethnological arguments.

Edward Schröder, "Busbecq’s krimgotisches Vokabular," Nachrichten der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften der Georg-Augusta Universität zu Göttingen (Philologisch-historische Klasse) (1910), 1-16. Here the printings of Busbecq’s work list are thoroughly researched. Schröder establishes that the Paris edition of 1598 was the direct or indirect Vorlage for all subsequent editions. He discusses the various aspects of the printing of the CG vocabulary, suggesting possible misprints and their causes. Schröder stresses that the distortions in the CG data must be attributed primarily to the typesetter.

Friedrich Kluge, Die Elemente des Gotischen: Eine erste Einführung in die deutsche Sprachwissenschaft (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, 1), 3rd ed. (Strassburg 1911). Here Kluge includes a discussion of the CG data (pp. 110-14). He lists the CG vocabulary and the Latin glosses as they appear in the first edition and discusses suspected printing errors. Kluge recognizes that the phonological and morphological structure of the material as it has come down to us is by no means trustworthy. He dismisses the cantilena, assuming with Kuun (1880:243) that it is Turkish. He then proceeds to analyze the remaining CG data phonologically and morphologically, noting the differences between CG and BG.

* Kluge had treated the CG data ten years earlier in the second edition of Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie, Vol. I, under the title "Geschichte der gotischen Sprache" (Kluge 1901:515-17).
1917 Sigmund Feist, "Die germanische und die hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung," *Neophilologus*, 2 (1917), 20-34. Feist maintains (pp. 21-22) that no development such as the High German Consonant Shift took place in CG. He explains that forms such as CG Tag (= BG *dags*) 'day' represent "phonetische Ungenaugkeiten" and a "mangelnde Orthographie" on the part of Busbecq, who was influenced not only by his native Flemish, but by High German as well.

1920 Wilhelm Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, 5th and 6th eds. (Heidelberg 1920). Streitberg reprints Busbecq’s report (pp. 280-82) following Loewe (1896:127-30) and notes here the printing errors which he believes have been definitely established. Streitberg describes CG as having unmistakable East Germanic features, but some non-Gothic characteristics as well. He suggests the possibility of foreign influence (§17).

1922 Theodor Siebs, "Krimgotisch kilemschkop," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 46 (1922), 170-72. Siebs focuses here on the etymology of the CG form *Kilemschkop* 'drink up your cup', but discusses other CG forms as well.

1923 Anton Gerardus van Hamel, *Gotisch handboek* (Udgermaansche Handboeken, 3) (Haarlem 1923; 2nd ed. 1931). Van Hamel reprints that part of Busbecq’s report containing the CG data (§10). He points out the affinities CG has to East Germanic, but notes also the divergences and assumes with Streitberg (1920:§17) the influence of other Germanic dialects.

1926 Max Hermann Jellinek, *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache* (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, 1/1) (Berlin 1926). Jellinek expresses skepticism in regard to the accuracy of the CG data, noting that the informant was a Greek, the translator a Netherlander, and the typesetter a Frenchman (§16). He compares CG with BG in various sections of this study (§§77, 109, 175, 192 Anm.).

1928 Ernst Kieckers, *Handbuch der verleichenden gotischen Grammatik*, (Munich 1928; 2nd ed. 1960). Kieckers discusses the CG vowels corresponding to BG *ai* (§23a) and *au* (§27a) and deals with the CG consonants (§68a). The development of Proto-Germanic vowels in CG is included in the section covering "Die Sonanten" (§§7-36). Kieckers notes the CG "strong" verbs (only infinitives are listed) and connects CG *Eriten* (for *Criter* 'to cry' with MNethl. *kriten* 'to shriek' (§152a).

1937 Robert J. Menner, "Crimean Gothic Cadariou (Cadariou), Latin *Centurio*, Greek κεντυρίου,", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 36 (1937), 168-75. In this very interesting article on CG Cadariou, Menner presents a detailed argument proposing Lat *centurio* as the source of this word, which he believes has probably been borrowed by way of Greek.

1939 Sigmund Feist, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache: mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen*, 3rd ed. (Leiden 1939). Here Feist treats all of the CG data except the words of the cantilena. Most of the CG forms are listed as separate entries and are alphabetically integrated with the other material. In telegram style Feist indicates the etymologies which have been proposed for the CG vocabulary. Here he comments, makes cross-references to corresponding BG forms, and provides bibliographical references to pertinent scholarship.

1946 Robert A. Fowkes, "Crimean Gothic cadariou 'miles, soldier',," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 45 (1946), 448-49. As its title indicates, this brief study is devoted to the etymology of CG Cadariou 'soldier', in which Fowkes sees a borrowing from Celtic.

1951 J. Dirichs, "Die einzig gotischen Verse," *Neophilologus*, 35 (1951), 145-51. Dirichs analyzes the text of the cantilena and concludes that these verses are indeed CG, i.e. Germanic, and that CG is indeed Gothic ("echt gotisch"). Dirichs’s analysis includes a proposed German translation of the cantilena.

1951 Ernst Schwarz, Goten, Nordgermanen, Angelsachsen: Studien zur Ausgliederung der germanischen Sprachen (Bern/Munich 1951). Schwarz, who proposes here the theory of Gothen-Nordic unity, includes in this study a linguistic analysis of the CG data (pp. 162-75). He concludes that the Crimean Goths were a North Germanic tribe and that their language was a North Germanic dialect influenced by East Gothic.

1953 Ernst Schwarz, "Die Krimgoten," *Saeculum*, 4 (1953), 156-64. Here Schwarz discusses the early reports of the Black Sea Goths and their language and offers a brief interpretation of Busbecq’s CG data.

1953 Wolfgang Krause, *Handbuch des Gotischen*, (Munich 1953; 3rd ed. 1968). Krause believes that once the sources of error have been accounted for, Busbecq’s material provides a relatively faithful representation of CG. He states that the affinities CG has to BG are clear, but he notes the distinct differences between the two and suggests the possibility of early West Germanic influence (§22).


1956 R. van der Meulen, "Twee onverklaarde woorden: Krimgotisch borrotsch, Oudpruisisch wissambas", *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Afd. Letterkunde), Nieuwe reeks, deel 19,
No. 10, 339-56. The first half of this brief study (pp. 339-47) is a discussion of CG Borrotsch, in which van der Meulen sees a loan word from Turkish bortsi or Tartar burotsj ‘debt, obligation’.


1964 Piergiuseppe Scardigli, Lingua e storia dei Goti (Florence 1964). Included in this work is the most comprehensive treatment of CG in recent years (pp. 288-311). Scardigli reprints the complete text of Busbecq’s report and discusses the CG vocabulary. He offers a reconstruction of the cantilena using BG vocabulary and provides an Italian translation (pp. 296-99). Scardigli’s book has recently appeared in German translation: Die Goten: Sprache und Kultur, translated by Benedikt Vollmann (Munich 1973). This edition includes a German translation of Busbecq’s report (pp. 246-50 fn. 31a).

1964 R. van de Velde, “Het Krimgotisch. Berichtgeving en Problematiek,” Leuvense Bijdragen, 53 (1964), 102-19. In this article van de Velde presents the subject by first relating the early reports about the Crimean Goths and their language. He discusses the various editions of Busbecq’s report, summarizing Schröder’s (1910) study. He then provides an analysis of the text which evaluates Busbecq’s system of transcription and indicates suspected printing errors. Van de Velde believes that Höfler (1956, 1957) has overestimated the reliability of the CG data. He questions to what extent 16th century CG data obtained from a nonnative (Greek) informant can be compared to South German (Old High German) dialects of the early middle ages (p. 118). Van de Velde considers CG to be East Germanic (p. 106) and believes with Dirichs (1951) that the cantilena is Gothic (p. 115 fn. 59).


1966 R. van de Velde, De studie van het Gotisch in de Nederlanden. Bijdrage tot een status questionnaire over de studie van het Gotisch en het Krimgotisch (Gent 1966). In this work van de Velde elaborates on his previous treatments (1964, 1965). In the chapter titled “De ontdekking van de codex argenteus en de eerste berichten over het Krimgotisch en het Gotisch” (pp. 15-23) he discusses the early reports concerning the Crimean Goths and their language. In “De eerste krimgotische woordenlijst” (pp. 57-65) he gives us a biographical sketch of Busbecq and outlines the circumstances of Busbecq’s trip to Turkey, the gathering of the CG data and their subsequent publication (pp. 57-59). A discussion of Busbecq’s system of transcription and the printing errors of the first edition follows (pp. 60-61). Busbecq’s ordering of the vocabulary is examined, and van de Velde concludes that this was accomplished subsequent to the time of the initial recording of the data (pp. 61-63). In the chapter “De studie van Busbeeks Krimgotisch” (pp. 97-104) van de Velde reviews the early interpretations of the CG material by Vulcanius and Milius. Finally, in “De belangstelling voor het Krimgotisch in de achttiende eeuw” (pp. 331-43) he discusses the CG studies by Malmenius, de Néelis, Steenwinkel, de Roches, and Raepsaet.

1967 Carlo Alberto Mastrelli, Grammatica gotica (Milan 1967; 2nd ed. 1975). Mastrelli devotes chapter VIII of this Gothic grammar to the language of the Crimean Goths: ‘Il gotico di Crimea’ (pp. 57-60). Here he outlines the most notable phonological features of CG, comparing its forms to those of BG.


1973 John R. Costello, “The Placement of Crimean Gothic by means of Ar- ridged Test Lists in Glottochronology,” Journal of Indo-European Studies, 1 (1973), 479-506. Test lists of ‘basic core vocabulary’, i.e. that portion of the lexicon which is subject to an average constant rate of replacement of 19.5% per millennium, “may be employed to determine the approximate minimum length of separation of two stages of one language, or of two languages which descended from a common ancestor”
On the basis of the 35 CG words (approximately 38% of the corpus, excluding the cantilena) whose meanings correspond to equivalents occurring in the ‘basic core vocabulary list’ of 200 lexical items devised by Morris Swadesh in 1952, Costello arrives at an abridged test list of 35 items. Using this abridged test list, he undertakes a glottochronological analysis of CG, contrasting its vocabulary to equivalents (i.e. words having the same meaning—not necessarily cognates) in five other Germanic languages: BG, Old Saxon, Old High German, Old Norse, Old Frisian. The results of Costello’s analysis show that CG cannot be a descendant of BG, but rather that it is a sister language which separated from the ancestor of BG c. 147 A.D. (p. 491).

MacDonald Stearns, “Busbecq’s Crimean Gothic Data: Distortion by the Nonnative Informant,” *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 64 (1975), 49-58. This article discusses instances of possible mother-tongue interference on the part of Busbecq’s Crimean Greek informant.

Maria Vittoria Molinari, “Considerazioni sul gotico di Crimea,” * Incontri Linguistici*, 2 (1975), 97-118. This interesting article on CG came to my attention just as the proofs for the present study were being prepared for press. Molinari reviews the essential facts of the data, articulates the difficulties inherent to research in CG, and comments briefly, but incisively on the directions, attainments, and shortcomings of previous scholarship. The core of this contribution is a graphemic analysis of Busbecq’s transcription of the CG vocabulary, on the basis of which Molinari proposes a phonological system for CG. She compares the phonology of CG to that of Proto-Germanic and discusses the developments which took place.

### 3. Problems and Procedures

#### 3.1 Problems

As seen above (1.), Busbecq’s report on the language of the Crimean Goths is the only one which provides CG linguistic data. Outside of Busbecq’s CG word lists there are but two forms which might be added to the CG corpus. One of these is the personal name *Harifdel* found in a 5th century Hebrew inscription on a gravestone in the Crimea, which has been suggested as possibly being CG (cf. Braun 1890:52; Loewe 1896:125-26). The other form is a possible CG loan word in Crimean Tartar. According to T.E. Karsten (1928:182), who has it on the account of J.J. Mikkola: “In der Bedeutung ‘Dachlatte’ lebt das gotische rasm [‘house’] auf der Krim als gotisch-tatarisches Lehwort fort.” Because it is by no means certain that these forms are CG, they have not been included in the present analysis.

Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter is, then, our only source for CG linguistic data and in all probability will remain so, as there is little likelihood that new material will come to light. The recent discovery of a manuscript page of the Codex Argenteus (cf. Stutz 1971; Szemerényi 1972; Scardigli 1973:302-80) is not likely to be matched by the uncovering of new CG material. BG is, of course, a well-attested written language, so that the appearance of additional BG data does not come as something totally unexpected. In the case of CG, on the other hand, which may never have been written by its own speakers, our best hope is that an unknown travel diary containing additional CG linguistic data may yet come to light, or that Busbecq’s original manuscript of the CG word lists might be

---

1 Crimean Tartar is the language of the Tartar peoples of the Crimea (the last of whom were evacuated from the Crimea by the Soviet government in 1945) and of the Tartar-speaking Christians who emigrated with the Crimean Greek Christians to Russian territory in 1778. Crimean Tartar, like Turkish, belongs to the western branch of the Turkic family of languages (cf. Wendi 1961:327-28), which in turn forms a branch of the Altaic family of languages (cf. Hazai in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica: Macropaedia* Vol. 1, 1976:635-39).

2 Stutz (1971:85) reports: “Völlig unerwartet ist in Speyer am Rhein ein Blatt der gotischen Bibel zum Vorschein gekommen ...”; and Szemerényi (1972:1) describes this discovery as “a very great surprise.”

3 Loewe (1896:125) believes it quite possible that the Crimean Goths never wrote anything in their own language, but instead used Greek for the purpose of writing.
recovered. There is little chance that excavations in and around Mankup (the old capital of the Crimean Goths), such as have been called for by Høst (1971:89-90), would yield CG inscriptions.

Schwarz (1953:164) wistfully laments: "Die Umsiedlung der Krimtaten durch die Russen nach dem Zweitem Weltkrieg macht es wohl unmöglich, dass auf der Krim noch Gotisch als versteckte Haussprache vorhanden sein könnte." If no traces of CG in the Crimean were reported since Siestrzeniewicz c. 1780 (cf. 1.), it is pure fantasy to suggest that it might have survived there as a "Haussprache" until 1945! Schwarz (1953:163-64) also suggests the more likely possibility that CG loan words or place names might be found in Crimean Tartar (cf. above the form razh 'Dachlatte' reported by Karsten). Perhaps some CG loan words are retained in the Tartar and/or Greek dialects of the Mariupol region on the Sea of Azov; these dialects are spoken by descendants of immigrants from the Crimea (cf. 5.3).

The data analyzed in the present study are thus necessarily confined to those found in Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter. These are quite limited: they consist of exactly 101 separate forms (including the articles, the numerals, and the unglossed forms of the cantilena, but not counting repeated words). This is a rather small corpus on which to base the analysis of a language. (Compare, in contrast, BG with its relatively large corpus.)

Another limitation of CG is that it is without recorded ancestor or descendant, in contrast to German, for example, which is recorded in several stages of development: Old High German, Middle High German, Early New High German, New High German. For this reason the historical development of 16th century NCG must be reconstructed on the basis of comparative evidence in other Germanic dialects.

The CG data consist overwhelmingly of unconnected words glossed in Latin and therefore provide very little in the way of morphological and syntactical information. Five short phrases are recorded, but the only connected text of more than two lexemes is the three-line, ten-word cantilena. Regrettably, Busbecq did not supply this little song with a translation, so that in spite of the attempts by several scholars to interpret them, these lines remain an unsolved mystery and thus offer little if anything for an analysis of CG.

By far the most difficult problems attending the analysis of CG are those posed by the dubious transmission of the data. CG was subject to distortion at several stages of its transmission to us, so that it is well-described by Hamp (1973:61), who calls the CG material "desperate." Unhappily, Busbecq’s Crimean informant was not a native speaker of CG, but was, rather, as Busbecq himself informs us, a Greek by birth and by language ("ortu et sermone Graecus"). This means that there are probably distortions in the CG data which originated with the informant. Nonnative speakers of any language, even those who have attained considerable proficiency, are prone to making phonological, morphological, and even lexical errors. The 'fieldworker', Busbecq, although a highly educated man familiar with several languages, was not a trained linguist in the modern sense. Busbecq’s native Flemish and a second language, namely German, may have influenced his perception of the CG vocabulary, especially in the case of those words he classifies as "nostriata aut parum differentia." His inconsistent, sometimes ambiguous transcription of CG shows both Netherlandic and German orthographic features. The CG data have not come down to us in Busbecq’s hand. Our most authoritative source for CG is the unauthorized first publication of his fourth Turkish letter, Paris 1589. It is quite possible, even probable, that the printer’s Vorlage was not Busbecq’s original manuscript, but rather a copy, which may already have contained errors in the CG vocabulary. The presumably French compositor can easily have misread and mistook the unfamiliar Germanic material in his Vorlage, as a number of obvious errors in the CG vocabulary suggest.

3.2 Procedures

Subject of the present study is the CG vocabulary in Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter. I do not discuss ethnological questions as has been done by Tomascek (1881), Braun (1890), Loewe (1896), and Schwarz (1951, 1953). My analysis is based on the linguistic data themselves and on the circumstances of their recording and transmission to us.

I make the following assumptions. There was a language now referred to as CG which was spoken on the Crimean Peninsula at least as late as the data of Busbecq’s mission to the court of Suleiman I, i.e. during the period 1555-1562. This is supported not only by Busbecq’s report, but by other reports as well (1.). Non-Germanic loan elements and indeterminable vocabulary notwithstanding, CG belongs to the Germanic branch of Indo-European. This is shown by the preponderance of Germanic vocabulary in its corpus and especially by the presence here of 'basic core vocabulary': e.g. CG Plut ‘blood’, Tag ‘day’, Oe gehene ‘eyes’, Fiscf ‘fish’, Handa ‘hand’, Alt ‘old’, Singhen ‘to sing’, Schlipen ‘to sleep’, Sune ‘sun’ (cf. Costello 1973, especially 486-87). Even more important in this regard are a number of Germanic morphological features in CG, sparse though they may be: e.g. the nom. sg. marker -sch, -s in the nouns CG V Winch (for *VWintsch), Rintsch, Fers; the neuter nominal ending -(a)ta, -tha in the adjectives CG Aotchia, WVichtaga, Gadeltha; the strong masc. acc. sg. ending -en in the

* It should be noted, however, that Busbecq reports his informant provided an equal amount of words which did not seem to be similar to Germanic: "... nam hau invent altum planum diversa nostris erat forma." But the reasons for this can be innovation in CG and informant distortion as well as the influence of foreign vocabulary, as Busbecq himself suggests: "sive quod eius linguae natura id ferat, sive quod cum fugiabat memoria et peregrina cum vernaculis (i.e. NCG) mutabat."
adjective CG *Knauen* (in *Knauen tag* 'good day'); the infinitive ending -en in the CG verbs, e.g. *Schlipen, Kommen, Lachen*.

A primary goal of this study was to propose the phonemic structure of the NCG forms underlying the CG vocabulary. (I use the term 'underlying' not in its usual linguistic sense, but rather to describe the presumed NCG models which the nonnative informant attempted to reproduce.) To this end, I have undertaken an analysis which examines and evaluates each of the three levels of distortion to which the CG vocabulary was subjected: mispronunciation by the nonnative informant (5.), Busbecq’s linguistic bias and inconsistent transcription (6.), errors by copyist and/or typesetter (4.). The phonological development of CG is traced from Proto-Germanic (7.), and CG morphology and syntax are discussed (8.). On the basis of phonological and morphological features, the position of CG in the family of Germanic languages is determined (9.). The unglossed *cantilena* has not been included as an integral part of this analysis, but is discussed in a separate chapter (10.).

Etymologies for the CG vocabulary are provided in Part II. Included here are notations of probable and possible misprints, phonetic interpretations of the CG forms as spoken by the informant, and phonemic reconstructions of the underlying NCG forms.

4. Textual Criticism

4.1 The Textual Tradition

Busbecq recorded the experiences of his diplomatic mission to the Ottoman Porte (cf. 6.) in his four 'Turkish letters'. These letters, written in elegant Latin prose, were addressed to his friend of student days, Nicolas Michault, Seigneur of Indeveldt, and were not intended for publication (cf. Forster and Daniell 1881:58). However, as was the custom of the day, handwritten copies of such letters were circulated in humanistic circles. In such a way, it is assumed, Busbecq’s letters came into the hands of Louis Cartron, who, without Busbecq’s authorization, published the first Turkish letter in 1581 and the first and second Turkish letters in 1582 (cf. Schröder 1910:3-4). Presumably, Cartron was also responsible for the 1589 Paris edition, Augerius Gislenius Busbequius, *D. legationis Turricae epistolae quatuor* . . . (cf. Schröder 1910:4-6). It is in this edition that the third Turkish letter and—of importance for this study—the fourth Turkish letter were first published.

Edward Schröder (1910:6-12) has established that all subsequent editions of the fourth Turkish letter (Frankfurt 1595, Frankfurt 1596 [German translation], Hanau 1605, Munich 1620, Hanau 1629, Leiden 1633, Amsterdam 1660, Oxford 1660, London 1660, Leipzig 1689, Basel 1740, and later editions) are derived directly or indirectly from the Paris edition of 1589 alone. He rejects the possibility of any reference to a manuscript copy for emendations of the CG data in these subsequent editions.

Van de Velde (1965:66; 1966-99) suggests that Bonaventura Vulcanius may have had at his disposal a handwritten copy of Busbecq’s CG word list (obtained from an interested associate) for the publication of his extract of Busbecq’s report (Vulcanius 1597:49-53). Van de Velde considers it unlikely that Vulcanius consulted either of the two Latin editions of the fourth Turkish letter already in print (Paris 1589 and Frankfurt 1595). A comparison of the 1589 Paris edition with Vulcanius’ extract reveals some striking differences in the CG forms. However, a form such as Vulcanius’ *Maen* for CG Mine ‘moon’ of the first edition hardly indicates that he might have referred to a manuscript of greater authority than the first printed edition. On the contrary, the presence of certain forms in Vulcanius’
extract which are identical to apparently misprinted forms in the first and second editions indicates that he consulted one of these: Schwaes ‘fiancée’, fyuf ‘five’, thunetuwa ‘twelve’ (cf. 4.2). Vulcanius’ Galtzou (an unglossed form in the cantilenata) shows he used the first edition (Paris 1589), which also has CG Galtzou, since the second edition (Frankfurt 1595) shows Galtzu. Therefore, it appears that the differences between the CG forms of the first (Paris 1589) edition and the forms in Vulcanius’ (1597) extract are the result of a conscious effort on his part to bring the CG forms of the first edition closer to Netherlandic (e.g. Vulcanius’ Maen for CG Mine ‘moon’, Son for CG Sune ‘sun’), to normalize the orthography (e.g. Vulcanius’ Oogen for CG Oeghene ‘eyes’), and to correct apparent misprints (e.g. Vulcanius’ Stern for CG Stein ‘star’).

None of Busbecq’s Turkish letters has come down to us in his own hand, nor do we have any of the handwritten copies which presumably circulated in 16th century humanistic circles, finding their way finally into print. Since all editions of Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter are derived directly or indirectly from the Paris edition of 1589, the primacy of this first printed edition is apparent (cf. Plates I-VI, pp. 21-26).

4.2 Errors by Copyist and Typesetter

Because the publication of the Turkish letters was undertaken without Busbecq’s authorization (cf. 4.1), it is most probable that the manuscript used for the printer’s Vorlage was not in Busbecq’s own hand (cf. Schröder 1910:15). It is likely that this manuscript was one of the copies of Busbecq’s Turkish letters which circulated in the humanistic circles of Paris (cf. Schröder 1910:13). It is possible, therefore, that the printer’s Vorlage was a copy of a copy. For these reasons we must admit the possibility of miscopying of the CG material resulting in a misrepresentation of some of the CG forms as originally transcribed by Busbecq. However, it cannot be established which of the suspected orthographic inaccuracies in the CG forms were present in the printer’s Vorlage, for any misreading a copyist might have made could also have been made by the compositor.

Schröder (1910:13) expresses a lack of confidence in the copyist, the typesetter, and the proofreader: ‘Bei dem krimtsgischen Glossar . . . könnte sowohl das Interesse des Kopisten wie die Aufmerksamkeit des Korrektors erlahmt sein—and auf den Pariser Setzer war hier erst recht kein Verlass.’ He believes that the majority of orthographic inaccuracies in the CG material are attributable to the compositor (Schröder 1910:13, 15).

A French copyist working with the Latin manuscript of Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter may easily have misread and miscopied the unfamiliar CG forms. The similarity of many of these forms to Netherlandic and/or German would have been of no help as a guide to copyist unfamiliar with these languages. The same difficulties would have befallen a French typesetter as well. He could, for example, easily have misread a hypothetical (n) in his Vorlage as (u), setting CG fyuf ‘five’ for *fyuf. Some misreadings by the copyist and/or the typesetter may have resulted from the use of a carelessly written Vorlage.

It is possible that the proofreader for Busbecq’s Turkish letters did not regularly refer to the manuscript to make corrections. His chief task was to correct misprints in the Latin text, which in most cases would not have required reference to the manuscript. Here it was a matter of Latin orthography. A French proofreader who was ignorant of any Germanic language would not have been struck by misprints in the unfamiliar CG data. CG Fisct ‘fish’ glossed as Latin ‘Piscis’, for example, would have seemed no more peculiar to him than a hypothetical manuscript form *Fisch. It is unfortunate that precisely in the case of the CG data the proofreader abandoned an otherwisemeticulous accuracy evident in the Turkish letters (cf. Schröder 1910:14) and permitted a number of misprinted CG forms to go uncorrected.

In some cases the inaccuracies in the CG data which have resulted from miscopying or missetting are obvious, although their proper corrections may not be. In other instances we suspect such inaccuracies only with uncertainty. Elsewhere in the CG data there may be additional errors of this sort, but such that they are in no way apparent to us, and which, therefore, cannot be determined.


The following CG forms have most frequently been suggested as being divergent from Busbecq’s original manuscript (cf. Schröder 1910:14-15): CG Eriteren ‘to cry’ for *Criteren; *Kriteren; CG Fisct ‘fish’ for *Fisc, *Fisch; CG fyuf ‘five’ for *fyuf; CG Hoeft ‘head’ for *Hoef; CG Schwaes ‘fiancée’ for *Schnos; CG Stein ‘star’ for *Stern; CG thunetuwa ‘twelve’ for *thnieta; CG thnieta ‘thirteen’ for *thinieta; CG VVinch ‘wind’ for *VVintsch.

Inaccuracies have also been suggested in the following CG forms: CG Ael ‘stone’ for *All (van de Velde 1946:112); CG Baar ‘boy’ for *Barn (Schröder 1910:14-15); CG Broe ‘bread’ for *Broet (Britten 1920:282); CG Kor ‘grain’ for *Korn (Schröder 1910:13-14); CG Menus ‘meat’ for *Memis (Schröder 1910:12), for *Memis or *Menss (Massmann 1881:362); CG Thurn ‘door’ for *Thur, *Thura (Schröder 1910:13-14 and fn.); CG VVichtgata ‘white’ for *Vivigata (Muck 1898:199).

Schröder (1910:14) suggests that during the setting of one of the columns of the CG word list, a number of letters may have fallen out, and that some of these were incorrectly reset. He proposes that the five-word sequence CG Kor, Salt, Fisct, Hoeft, Thurn was misset in this manner for *Korn, *Salt, *Fisc, *Hoeft, *Thur, whereby CG Thurn received the final (n) of *Korn, and CG Fisct, the final (i) from *Hoeft.
The following Latin glosses have been considered faulty: Ego dico 'I say' instead of Ego dixi 'I said' for CG Ich malthata (van de Velde 1964:111); Voluntas 'wish' instead of Voluptas 'pleasure' for CG Barrotsch (Schröder 1910:13).

On the basis of my analysis of CG, I believe that the following CG forms have probably been either miscopied at some point or mistyped during the first printing of Busbecq's report (Busbequius 1589) and can be emended as indicated. (Cf. also Part II for additional possible emendations.)

Bars 'beard' for *Bart
Broe 'bread' for *Broet
Eriten 'to cry' for *Criten, *Kriten or *Griten
Fisch 'fish' for *Fisch
Fyuf 'five' for *Fyuf
Hoeft 'head' for *Hoeft
Kor 'grain' for *Korn
Mennis 'meat' for *Menn(n)is (?) or *Menns (?)
Schuos 'fiancée' for *Schnos
Stein 'star' for *Stern
Thuneattria 'thirteen' for *Thieneatria
Thunetuau 'twelve' for *Thinetua
Varthata in Ies Varthata 'he made' for *VVarthata
Vburt in Iel Vburt 'may it be healthy, well' for *Vvurt
VVarthata in Tzo VVarthata 'you made' for *VvArtata
Vvichtgata 'white' for *VvItgata
Vvintch 'wind' for *Vvintsch

5. Busbecq's Informant

5.1 Nationality of the Informant

Busbecq tells us in his report (1.2) that he had often heard of a people living in the Crimea who showed traces of a 'German' origin in their language, customs, and appearance. He had for a long time wanted to meet one of these people and, if possible, obtain something written in their language. This latter wish remained unfulfilled, but he did meet two men from that area in Constantinople. He had instructed his interpreters to watch for such persons, and subsequently two representatives of that nation, who had come to the Porte to lay some complaints before the sultan, were brought to him. During his meeting with these two men Busbecq obtained cultural information about the Goths and the Tartars as well as the CG linguistic data.

Unfortunately, Busbecq does not make it entirely clear which of the two men provided the information in his report. He tells us that one of the two Crimeans was taller and had the appearance of a Fleming or a Dutchman ('Batavus'). This person was apparently a 'Goth' (cf. 1. fn. 2). The other man was shorter, darker, and more strongly built, a Greek by language and by birth. The Goth had forgotten his native (CG) language in favor of Greek, but the Greek through his frequent dealings with the Goths of the Crimea had acquired a considerable command of their language. That part of Busbecq's report which pertains here reads as follows: Alter erat procerior, toto ore ingenuam quandam simplicitatem praerens, ut Flander videratur aut Batavus: alter erat brevior, compactiore corpore, colore fusco, ortu et sermone Graecus, sed qui frequenti commercio non contemendum eius linguæ usum habet, nam superior vicinitate, et frequenti Graecorum consuetudine sic eorum sermonem imiberat, ut popularis sui esset obitus. Interrogatus de natura et moribus illorum populi, congruentia respondebat.

It is clear that the segment 'Alter . . . Batavus' refers to the Goth, the segment 'alter . . . habet' to the Greek, and the segment 'nam . . . obitus' to the

1 Perhaps Busbecq was familiar with the accounts of Barbaro and Pirckheimer (cf. 1.1). Barbaro's report was already in print: Viaggi fatti da Vinetia . . . (Venice 1543).
2 Van de Velde (1964:106) is mistaken in stating that Busbecq believed both men exhibited traces of Germanic ancestry in their language, habits, appearance, and build.
Goth again. But to which of the two men does the segment “interrogatus . . . respondebat” refer? From a grammatical standpoint this sentence seems to indicate that it was the Greek-speaking Goth who provided the cultural information about the Goths and the Tartars. But the lines which later introduce the CG linguistic data suggest that these were obtained from the same person who supplied the cultural information: Nunc adscribam paucâ vocabula de multis quae Germanicae reddetab. nam haud minus multorum plane diversa a nostris erat forma: sive quod eius linguae natura id ferat, sive quod eum fugiebat memoria et peregrina cum vernaculis mutabat: omnibus vero dictionibus praeponebat articulum quo aut the.

The internal evidence suggests that it was not the Goth, but rather the Greek who supplied the CG linguistic data: the Goth, after all, had forgotten his native tongue. But, if we assume that the Goth once spoke CG as a native language, it seems unlikely that he could have forgotten it completely, particularly since he had come to Constantinople in the name of that people, and must therefore have been in contact with native speakers of CG. It is possible that he simply did not want to serve as a linguistic informant and excused himself by claiming that he had forgotten his mother tongue. Might he nonetheless have confirmed the correctness of the CG forms provided by his more cooperative companion? Some scholars believe that the Goth had not forgotten his native language completely and assume in fact that it was he—and not the Crimean Greek—who provided the CG material. Indeed Busbeq’s remark “. . . sive quod eum fugiebat memoria . . . ” would be equally appropriate for the description of a nonnative speaker of a language, or of someone who no longer speaks his mother tongue fluently.

The fact is, however, that Busbeq tells us the Goth had forgotten his native language. If this Goth had nonetheless been able to provide the CG linguistic data in Busbeq’s report, it seems that Busbeq would have especially mentioned this.

Since he does not, we are left with the overall impression that the Crimean Greek, whose facility in the CG language Busbeq specifically describes, served as the sole informant for the CG linguistic data. Since Busbeq does not indicate that he used one informant for the cultural information about the Goths and the Tartars, and another informant for the linguistic data, I believe that the segment in the text, “nam superior . . . ” etc., should be interpreted as a parenthetical remark referring to the Greek-speaking Goth. This remark was apparently inserted to explain why the Greek was used as the informant for the CG linguistic data rather than the Goth. The segment which follows this parenthetical remark, and which introduces the cultural information ("interrogatus de natura et moribus illorum populorum . . . ”), refers then to the Greek, as does the section which introduces the linguistic data (“Nunc adscribam paucâ vocabula de multis quae Germanicae reddetab . . . ”). Thus it was the Greek who provided both the cultural information and the CG linguistic data.

5.2 Competence of the Informant

Busbeq tells us in his report that the Crimean Greek informant had a respectable command of CG (“non contemnedum eius linguæ usum habet”). It is not clear whether this was Busbeq’s own impression of the informant’s competence (a judgment which he was hardly qualified to make), a claim by the informant himself, or the opinion of the informant’s Greek-speaking Crimean Goth companion. Later in his report Busbeq expresses some doubt regarding the informant’s competence in the area of CG vocabulary. Busbeq questions whether those CG forms which, according to him, were dissimilar to German (i.e. Germanic) were so because of the nature of CG (“sive quod eius linguæ natura id feret . . . ”), or because these words were not NCG, but were, rather, from other languages, substituted (unconsciously) by the informant when his memory failed him (“. . . sive quod eum fugiebat memoria et peregrina cum vernaculis [i.e. NCG] mutabat”).

The Greek informant’s actual competence in CG must remain an unknown, for neither does Busbeq’s recording of the CG data clearly reflect the performance of the informant, nor, even if it did, are there any records of NCG against which these data might be checked. It is possible that the informant was able to reproduce CG speech with a proficiency approaching or even equaling that of a native speaker. 7 I think it unlikely that this was the case. The Greek informant probably provided at least some CG forms which deviated from the norm of native speech. In particular we need to consider how the informant’s pronunciation of the CG forms may have been affected by the sound system of his native language (5.4).

7 Dirichs (1951:151) expresses total confidence in Busbeq’s informant. He refers to him as “der mit den Krimoten und ihrer Sprache völlig vertraute Krigmierer.”
5.3 Native Language of the Informant

5.3.1 Identification

As shown above (5.1), we can assume that Busbecq’s informant for the CG data was the Greek ("ortu et sermone Graecus"). We can also assume that the Greek was a native of the Crimea, since Busbecq’s report suggests this (cf. the informant’s familiarity with the Goths and the Tartars of the Crimea and his status as a representative from that region). It follows that the informant’s native language was Crimean Greek (hereafter CGK).

Unfortunately, there is no source of information on 16th century CGK. However, Browning (1969:132-33) tells us that the “very strange” Greek of Mariupol (Zhdanov), a city in the southeast Ukraine on the Sea of Azov, is spoken by the descendants of settlers from the Crimea. During the 18th century the Christians of the Crimea were persecuted by the Tartars. In 1778 these Christians requested permission from the government of Catherine II to immigrate to Russian territory. The request was granted, and the Crimean Christians emigrated from the Crimea to their new home on the shores of the Azov in the same year. Greeks made up the majority of these Christians—there were also Armenians, Georgians, Wallachians—but many of those counted among the Greeks were Tartar-speaking.

It is clear that the 20th century Greek dialects of the Mariupol region are descended from CGK. A phonology of 16th century CGK can therefore be proposed on the basis of 20th century Mariupol Greek (hereafter MGK). In the absence of information on 16th century CGK I believe this procedure is justified.

5.3.2 Methodology of Reconstruction

M.V. Sergeievskij’s (1934) study of the modern Greek dialects of the Mariupol region describes the dialect of Sartana as an example typifying MGK phonology. This study, supplemented by Mirambel’s (1959) description of Modern Greek, may serve as the basis for proposing 16th century CGK phonemes and allophones. For the purposes of the present study the phonological systems of MGK and CGK are essentially identical. This seems a reasonable procedure, for, according to Browning (1969:96), “the main features of modern Greek had already taken shape before the 15th century.” If the development of MGK parallels that of other Greek dialects in this respect, little change in its phonological structure will have taken place since the 16th century.

A factor which should be considered in determining the status of 16th century CGK phonology is the phonetic structure of Tartar loan elements in MGK. Crimean Tartar (cf. 3. fn. 1) has influenced CGK/MGK in terms of both vocabulary and phonological structure. Nonetheless, MGK words of Greek origin generally preserve the phonological characteristics of a northern Greek dialect (cf. Sergeievskij 1934:535). Tartar loan words in MGK, on the other hand, do not show the same vocalic and consonantal developments as do MGK words of Greek origin. This suggests that the adoption of Tartar loans occurred after these developments had ceased to be operative. Sergeievskij (1934:586-87) believes that the adoption of Tartar vocabulary by MGK took place “most intensively during the last centuries of the Mariupol Greeks’ stay in the Crimea and most probably after their resettlement [in 1778] on the Sea of Azov as well.” Considering the proximity of the Greeks and the Tartars in the Crimea (cf. Busbecq’s informant’s familiarity with the customs of the Tartars), there certainly must have been Tartar loans in CGK by the 16th century. Therefore, I have assumed here that those vocalic and consonantal developments evident in MGK words of Greek origin but lacking in Tartar loans were complete by the time of Busbecq’s visit.

Browning (1969:120-21) outlines the phonological characteristics of northern Greek dialects as: the loss of unaccented /i/ and /u/, the merger of unaccented /e/ and /o/ with /i/ and /u/ respectively, the possibility for any consonant to stand in final position, and the occurrence of many consonantal combinations not possible in the southern Greek dialects or in Common Greek.

Some examples. MGK words of Greek origin show the loss of original unaccented /i/ and /u/ and the merger of original unaccented /e/ and /o/ with /i/ and /u/ respectively (cf. fn. 11): e.g. MGK paño ‘fish’, at’r ‘arm’, istor ‘time’, kúrios ‘cold’ = Mod.Gk pán, ayón, kýrios, kúrios, kúrios. MGK words of Tartar origin show all five MGK vowels /i/, /e/, /a/, /o/, /u/ in both stressed and unstressed syllables: e.g. MGK (Tartar loans) xaríthra ‘smart’ el’ebi ‘of course’, timízgu ‘silver’, xismé ‘fate’, túbi ‘brick’. MGK words of Greek origin show /i/ for original /e/ and /i/ for original /e/ where these sounds originally occurred before /i/ and /e/: e.g. MGK sél ‘lip’, sel’ ‘hand’, t’ima ‘wave’, t’iros ‘time’ = Mod.Gk sél, xémi, kýma, kúros. But MGK words of Tartar origin show phoneme sequences such as /i/ and /a/ cf. MGK (Tartar loans) xismé ‘fate’, nálib ‘vehicle’ (cf. Sergeievskij 1934:535f). Compare, however, MGK túb ‘gun, rifle’ (= Mod.Gk túb ‘gun, rifle, musket’), a loan from Turkish (cf. Mod. Türk núfek ‘rifle’), which shows /t/ for original Gk /k/.

One might argue, however, that the Tartar elements in 20th century MGK have been restructured, and that those vocalic and consonantal developments originally occurred in Tartar loans in CGK/MGK and were still a function of the phonological systems of CGK up to a time postdating Busbecq’s meeting in Constantiopile with the two envoys from the Crimea. The absence of such phonological developments in the Tartar loans of 20th century MGK might be attributable to the fact that the Tartar-speaking community remained in contact with the Greek-speaking community even after their resettlement to the shores of the Azov, which afforded an ever constant input of Tartar vocabulary into MGK. Because of this, Tartar loans in CGK/MGK could have been replaced by the same Tartar vocabulary, readopted at a time after the developments in question had ceased to occur. By the same rationale it could be argued that the adoption of certain Tartar consonant phonemes occurred at a date later than the 16th century (cf. 5.3.4.7).

The influence of the Tartar language in the Crimea had been reported already in the 13th century by Pachyaneres (cf. 1.1).

The CG data themselves lend support to the hypothesis that these developments (cf. fn. 11) were complete by Busbecq’s time. At least they provide some evidence that the informant was not compelled.
5.3.3 The Vowels of Crimean Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRONT</th>
<th>Unrounded</th>
<th>Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>i'</td>
<td>/u'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>e'</td>
<td>/o'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>/a'</td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.
The vowel phonemes and allophones of 16th century Crimean Greek

5.3.3.1 Figure 1 shows the vowel phonemes and allophones proposed for CGk on the basis of the MGk vowel system. The five-vowel system of CGk/MGk corresponds to that of Modern Greek (Demotic), i' /e' /a' /o' /u', except that CGk/MGk i' /a' /o' are apparently higher than the Modern Greek open vowels /e/ /a/ /o/ (cf. Mirambel 1959:20), for, according to Sergievskij (1934:536), MGk /i'/ /e' /a' /o' /u' are close vowel sounds when pronounced in isolation.

5.3.3.2 Word stress in CGk/MGk corresponds generally to that in Modern Greek (cf. Sergievskij 1934:544). In contrast to earlier stages of CGk/MGk, all five vowels can stand in both stressed and unstressed syllable (cf. fn.s 11, 12; Sergievskij 1934:539).

5.3.3.3 Sergievskij (1934) does not discuss vowel length, which is not by phonological constraints corresponding to these developments when he spoke CG. Compare, for example, (a) /o/ (less significantly) CG (e) /u/ in unstressed syllable: CG Ringo ring'; Ano 'hen, chicken', sesene 'seven' Orghene 'eyes'. The appearance of CG (ki) in Kilemeschke 'drink up your cup' suggests that the development [k'k'] > CGk/MGk /k'k/ was complete, for we might otherwise expect CG *Kilemeschke.

5.3.4.1 Figure 2 shows the consonant phonemes and allophones proposed for CGk on the basis of MGk.

5.3.4.2 CGk/MGk voiced consonants suffer no loss of voice in word-final position (cf. Sergievskij 1934:543).

5.3.4.3 Sergievskij (1934) does not discuss the presence or absence of long consonants in MGk, but presumably none occur in MGk, just as none occur in Modern Greek (cf. Mirambel 1959:21). On this basis it is probable that there were no long (geminate) consonants in CGk.

5.3.4.4 An important feature of the CGk/MGk consonant system is the distinction between voiced and voiceless consonant phonemes (cf. Sergievskij 1934:539ff; Mirambel 1959:21-23).

5.3.4.5 The voiceless stops, CGk/MGk /p/ /t/ /k/ are unaspirated as in Modern Greek (cf. Sergievskij 1934:539ff; also Dudewicz-Aussprachewörterbuch 1974:110).

5.3.4.6 CGk/MGk [ŋ] and [g] have no phonemic status but occur as allophones of /n/ and /k/ respectively in the sequence /nk/ (= [ŋg]): cf. MGk ぬŋ galí = ModGk νοŋ καλά (acc.) 'good sense' (cf. Sergievskij 1934:543).

5.3.4.7 With the adoption of Tartar into CGk/MGk, new consonant phonemes came into the language. These are the affricates /ʧ/ /ʃ/ and the voiced bilabial stop /ɓ/ (cf. Sergievskij 1934:541).

5.3.4.8 Whereas Modern Greek /x/ has both palatal and nonpalatal allophones, [ŋ] and [x] (cf. Mirambel 1959:22), only [x] occurs in CGk/MGk. ModGk [c] corresponds to MGk [s], e.g. MGk ṕer 'hand' = ModGk χέαρ (cf. Sergievskij 1934:542).

5.4 Distortion by the Nonnative Informant

Busbecq himself first cast doubt on the competence of his informant when he suggested that the latter may have provided some words from other languages (cf. 5.2). The Greek informant may well have been familiar with a number of languages,\(^9\) and a few of the CG forms classified by Busbecq as 'cum nostra lingua non satis congruientia' may indeed represent vocabulary foreign to NCG which was erroneously introduced by the informant. Some of the non-Germanic and indeterminate CG forms may be examples of such substitution. CG sada 'one hundred' and hazer 'one thousand' are Iranian in origin, Tellich 'foolish' is possibly of Turkish origin, and the cantilena is considered by some to be a Turkish song (cf. 10). Other languages may have been the source for CG vocabulary such as Cadariou 'soldier', Marzus 'marriage, wedding', Schedelt 'light', Stup 'she-goat', Kileneschkop 'drink up your cup'. However, such non-Germanic and indeterminate CG forms may well represent loan words in NCG.

The majority of the CG forms which Busbecq lists as 'cum nostra lingua non satis congruientia' are now recognized as Germanic. Thus the possibility of lexical error on the part of the informant is limited to a small number of the CG forms recorded.\(^8\) Inasmuch as the CG data consist overwhelmingly of unconnected forms, they provide only scant morphological and syntactical information (cf. 8), so that informant errors in the areas of morphology and syntax are hardly ascertainable. In the area of phonology, on the other hand, we may well expect to find some evidence of distortion by the nonnative informant, for mother-tongue interference will have affected his pronunciation of much of the CG vocabulary.

An examination of the CG forms with reference to the vowels and consonants reconstructed for Proto-Germanic vis-à-vis those I have proposed for 16th century CGk reveals a number of areas where inaccuracies in the nonnative informant's pronunciation of CG may have occurred. Of course the phonology of 16th century NCG cannot be equated with that of Proto-Germanic—secondary developments have taken place in NCG as in the other Germanic languages—but this comparison may serve as a starting point in an evaluation of informant distortion. Discussed below are several areas and instances of probable and possible interference by the informant's CG sound system in his pronunciation of the CG vocabulary.

5.4.1 The Vowels

5.4.1.1 PGmc *e appears as CG (ei) in seis 'six' (cf. BG saih\(s\), ON sex, OHG se\(h\)s). The apparent diphthong in this CG form may be the result of phonological distortion by the informant. CGk /e/ has the allophone [e]\(^7\) (tense with glide) in one-syllable words (cf. MGk pse\(l\)s 'yesterday' = ModGk ϕε\(l\)s; 5.3.3.5). By assuming that the informant substituted his CGk /e/-phoneme in this one-syllable word, pronouncing [se]\(^8\)s\(\)s for NCG *se\(s\)s, CG (ei) for PGmc *e is accounted for: Busbecq interpreted [e]\(^7\) as a diphthong, [ei] or [ei], which he transcribed as (ei) (cf. 6.6.1.6).

mother tongue of many Crimean Greeks (cf. Sergievskij 1934:533). The informant's role as an envoy to the sultan suggests that he may have traveled to Constantinople on previous occasions. As a merchant (cf. his commercial dealings with the Crimean Goths) and traveler he may have been familiar with Turkish, with Greek dialects other than his own, and with other languages as well.

Busbecq does not include in his report all of the CG vocabulary provided by the informant, but gives us only a sampling. He indicates that just as many words were unlike as were like those in his own (Germanic) language (cf. 1.2).
5.4.1.2 The informant’s CGk /e/-phoneme shows another allophone which permits an interpretation of the following CG forms: ıes ‘he’ (in ıes Varthata ‘he made’); īel ‘life, health; īeltsch ‘alive, well, healthy’; īel ‘healthy, well’ (in īel vbuert ‘may it be well, healthy’). Massmann (1841:362) correctly connects CG ıes to BG ı is ‘he’,21 and CGIel, īeltsch to BG hails ‘healthy’. Initial PGmc *e̞ has been lost in īel, īeltsch as it has in CG Aно ‘chicken’ (cf. BH hana ‘cock’), āel ‘stone’ (cf. CG hals ‘stone, rock’).22 While CG (ie) in īel, īeltsch, īes is usually interpreted as representing the monophthong [i:] (cf. von Grienerich 1898:131; Schwarz 1951:169), it can also be construed as [je] (cf. Loewe 1903:12; 6.6.2.9). The appearance of initial [je] in these CG words can be explained by assuming that the informant substituted his CGk /e/-phoneme for the initial vowel sounds in the underlying NCG forms. In substituting CGk /e/, which acquires a [j]-on-glide in initial position (cf. MGl jema ‘blood’ = ModGk αλύσ [‘ejo]; 5.3.3.5), the informant pronounced [je] for initial NCG */e/ < PGmc *e in CG ıes (cf. Runic eR, ÖHG er ‘he’) and for initial NCG */e:/ < PGmc *ai in CGIel, īeltsch (cf. BG hails, ÖHG heil ‘well’).23

5.4.1.3 CG shows a variety of vowels in untested syllable,24 e.g. (e) in Bruder ‘brother’ (cf. BG broフラ), Oegehne ‘eyes’ (cf. BG augona); (a) in Handa ‘hand’ (cf. BG handa); (o) in Ringo ‘ring’ (cf. ON hringer); (i) in Silivir ‘silver’ (cf. BG silubr). These untested vowels indicate no systematic correspondence to those of cognate words in other Germanic languages. It is probable that vowels in unstressed syllables had been reduced to an indeterminate vowel in NCG, as proposed by Loewe (1896:141). This would parallel the development of /o/ in other Germanic languages (cf. the development of /a/ in late Old High German: Penzl 1969:§39.2).

Loewe (1898:141-42) explains the appearance of CG (a) in unstressed syllable by proposing that NCG */a/ was pronounced farther back than Netherlandic or German /a/. Where CG (o) appears in unstressed syllable, e.g. Ringo, he suggests coloring by the preceding consonant (in NCG). It is more likely that the variation of CG vowel symbols for underlying NCG */a/ is the result of informant distortion. CG had no /a/-phoneme (cf. 5.3.3, Fig. 1), so that the Greek informant may well have substituted CGk full vowels, /i a o u/, for NCG */a/. The appearance of unstressed CG (e) in Schlipen ‘to sleep’, Bruder ‘brother’ Apel ‘apple’, Sun ‘sun’ suggests that Busbecq’s transcription of these words was influenced by Netherlandic and/or German orthography (cf. corresponding Neth slapel, broeder, appel,

21 Tomasehch (1881:65) links CG ıes to BG jains, OHG jenêr ‘that one’, whereby the loss of an original nasal is assumed.

22 The presence of initial (h) in CG Haa ‘house’, Hoet ‘head’, Handa ‘hand’ has probably resulted from the influence of the spelling of corresponding forms in Netherlandic and German (cf. 6.6.2.8).

23 Initial CG (e) occurs in only two forms: Eriden ‘to cry’, where (e) is clearly a misprint, and (e), an unglomosed form in the cantiiena.

24 The stress patterns of CG are assumed in the present study to correspond to those of other Germanic languages.

MNethl zonne; NHG schlafen, Bruder, Apfel, Sonne: 6.6.1.4). Thus untested CG (i), (o), (a), as in Silivir, Ringo, Handa, should be interpreted as the informant’s [i], [o], [a], which, along with untested CG (e), i.e. the informant’s [e a o] or [u], in Schlipen, Bruder, Apel, etc., represent underlying NCG */e/.

5.4.1.4 Long *i, *e, *u, *ô are reconstructed for Proto-Germanic as contrasting vowels (cf. Streitberg 1896:§106; Krahe and Meid 1969a:§31). PGmc *i appears in CG as (i) in CG Vinigar ‘vine branch’ (cf. BG weinagards, ÖHG wînagart(o) ‘vineyard’). PGmc *e in CG as (i) and (y) (a variant of (i); cf. 6.6.1.15): CG Mine ‘moon’ (cf. BG mene, ÖHG mâno), CG Schlipen ‘to sleep’ (cf. BG slepan, ÖHG skljf(y)an), CG Mycha ‘sword’ (cf. BG meki, ON mêker, OS mâkt ‘sword’). PGmc *u appears as (u) in CG Haa ‘house’ (cf. ON hús, ÖHG hûs). PGmc *ô also appears in CG as (u) in CG Plut ‘blood’ (cf. BG bolp, ON blôd, OS blôd, ÖHG blût), Bruder ‘brother’ (cf. BG broフラ, ON brôder, OS brôðar, ÖHG brôuder), CG Stul ‘chair’ (cf. BG stûlû, ON stûl, OS stôl, ÖHG stuol).

These forms indicate a merger of PGmc *e with *i as NCG */i/ and of PGmc *ô with *u as NCG */u/. Otherwise we would expect the informant to have reproduced a hypothetical NCG */e/ as CG [e], i.e. CGk /e/, and a hypothetical NCG */o/ as CG [o], i.e. CGk /o/. There is the possibility, however, that these apparent mergers are the result of informant distortion. If hypothetical NCG */e/ and */o/ were higher vowel sounds than CGk /e/ and /o/, the informant could have perceived these vowels as NCG */i/ and */u/ and reproduced them as [i], i.e. CGk /i/ and [u], i.e. CGk /u/, respectively. However, since CGk /e/ and /o/ were apparently higher than [e] and [o] (cf. 5.3.3.1), an informant merger of hypothetical NCG */e/ with */i/ and */o/ with */u/ seems unlikely.

5.4.1.5 Phonemic contrasts between long and short vowels are attested in the older Germanic languages25 and are reconstructed for Proto-Germanic (cf. Streitberg 1896:§106; Krahe and Meid 1969a:§44). CGk made no distinction between long and short vowels (cf. 5.3.3.3). Therefore, should contrasts between long and short vowels have existed in NCG, they are likely to have been neutralized by the informant. It is probable that both short and long NCG vowels were pronounced by the informant as short vowels or possibly as half-long vowels in stressed syllable (cf. 5.3.3.3): e.g. CG Plut [plut] (plut) ‘blood’ for NCG [blu:t] (cf. BG bolp, ON blôd, OS blôd, ÖHG blût) and CG Sun ‘sun’ (‘Sûne’ ‘sun’ for NCG *[suna] (cf. GN sunno, ON sunna, ÖHG sunna).

5.4.1.6 CG shows reflexes of Proto-Germanic short *e, *i, *u and long *e̞i, *i̞, *ô, *ô: e.g. CG (e) for PGmc *e in Schueweus ‘sister’ (cf. ÖHG sweswar); CG (i) for PGmc *i in Fiset ‘fish’ (cf. ON fiskr, ÖHG fis). CG (u) for PGmc *u in

25 There is a divergence of opinion regarding the phonemic status of vowel length in BG. Marchand (1973:§5.113) argues against vowel length as a phonemic feature of BG; Vennemann (1971) argues for it. Cf. Beck (1973) for a recent discussion of this issue.
Bruna 'spring, fountain' (cf. BG brunna, ON brunnr, OHG brunno); CG (a) for PGmc *a (Common Germanic a-umlaut: cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:336) in Goltz 'gold' (cf. BG gulp, OHG gold); CG (i) for PGmc *eA in Schlippen 'to sleep' (cf. BG slypan, OHG sláih🦞n); CG (i) for PGmc *i in Vingart 'vine branch' (cf. BG weinagards, ON vingardr, OHG wingart); CG (u) for PGmc *ó in Bruder 'brother' (cf. BG brofar); CG (u) for PGmc *uí in Hus 'house' (cf. ON hus, OHG hós).

If the informant neutralized the distinction between NCG long and short vowels (as I believe he did: cf. 5.4.1.5), and if the merger of PGmc *ei with *i and of *ô with *uí took place not in NCG, but rather in the speech of the informant (which I doubt: cf. 5.4.1.4), then the eight-way contrast of hypothetical NCG *oi/*i/*u/*iu/*ui/*eA/*ei/*io/*iU would have been reduced to a four-way contrast in the informant's CG, namely to /oi/ /iU/ /io/ /ui/.

5.4.1.7 Four diphthongs are reconstructed for the early period of Proto-Germanic: *ei, *ai, *au, *eu. During the Germanic period PGmc *ei is monophthongized (as *i and *eA) while PGmc *eu split as *iu and *ei. This yields the Germanic (Common Germanic, Late Germanic) diphthongs *ai, *au, *eA, *iu (cf. van Coetsen 1970:54-55). The reflexes of these diphthongs in CG can be interpreted as representing monophthongs (cf. 6.6.1): Gmc *eA (PGmc *ei) is reflected as *(i) (cf. CG [i]: cf. 6.6.1.8) in CG Schiet 'to shoot' (cf. ON skjoita, OE sceotan, OHG skiozjan); PGmc/Gmc *au appears as *(oo) (cf. CG [o]: cf. 6.6.1.11) in CG Broe 'bread' (cf. ON broad, OE bread, OHG brot), in CG Hoef 'head' (cf. BG haubip, OHG houbit) and in CG Oehgene 'eyes' (cf. BG augona, ONaugo, OHG augon); PGmc/Gmc *ai is reflected as *(ie) (cf. [ie]: cf. 5.4.1.2) in CG Iel 'life, health,' lettsch 'alive, healthy' (cf. BG hails 'healthy', OHG heil 'luck, health').

I have not reconstructed diphthong phonemes for CG (cf. 5.3.3, fn. 16), and therefore notice here of the possibility that the informant reproduced NCG diphthongs as monophthongs. While this is a possibility, I think it more likely that the Greek informant would have reproduced NCG diphthongs by combining the monophthongs available to him in his own CG vowel phoneme inventory. The apparent monophthongization of the Germanic diphthongs in CG, therefore, was probably a development in NCG.

5.4.1.8 CGK had no front rounded vowels (cf. 5.3.3) as are attested for North and West Germanic languages (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:337). If NGD had such vowels, Busbecq's informant may have substituted other vowels in the forms in which they should occur in our corpus, if any. Perhaps there was a high front rounded vowel, *y/ in the NGD form for NGK nyme 'nine' (cf. MHG niu(n) 'nine'), where MHG *iu = /y/. If a substitution for NGK *y/ was made, we might expect the Greek informant to have substituted high front unrounded CG [i] (= CG /i/). CGK (y) in nyme is a variant of CG (i) (= CG [i] cf. 6.6.1.15).

5.4.2 The Consonants

In the case of the consonants, I have proposed a fairly comprehensive inventory of phonemes for CGK (cf. 5.3.4, Fig. 2). As seen in Figure 3, CGK has equivalents for all the consonants reconstructed for Proto-Germanic (cf. van Coetsen 1970:64) except the semivowel *w ([w]).

5.4.2.1 It is significant that any voiced consonant could stand in final position in CGK (cf. 5.3.4.2). This means that the apparent final devoicing of Proto-Germanic obstruents in CG is a feature of NCG and has not been introduced by the informant as a result of interference by his CGK sound system. Some examples: CG Plat 'blood' (cf. OE, OS blôd), Alt 'old' (cf. OE eald, OS ald), Rink 'ring' (cf. OE, OS hrîng).

5.4.2.2 CGK had no geminate consonants (cf. 5.3.4.3). For this reason, if geminates were present in NCG at the time of Busbecq, they were probably simplified as single consonants in the speech of the informant. Some CG forms in which the informant may have simplified NCG geminates are CG Sunne 'sun' (cf. BG sunno, ON sunna, OHG sunna) and, since Busbecq's (n) does not necessarily represent a geminate consonant (cf. 6.6.2.24), Bruna 'spring, fountain' (cf. BG brunna, ON brunnr, OHG brunno). Another possible example is CG Ada 'egg' (cf. ON egg, OHG ei), i.e. ['ada], which may represent underlying NCG *adda/.

5.4.2.3 As there was no */w/-phoneme in CGK (cf. 5.3.4), the Greek informant might have substituted CG [v] (= CGK /v/) or CG [u] (= CGK /u/) for a hypothetical NGK */w/. Compare the following CG forms, in which PGmc *w ([w]) appears as CG (v) (v), (uu): CG Vingart 'vine branch' (cf. BG weinagards), CG Vinvich 'wind' (cf. BG wins), CG Schuuster 'sister' (cf. BG swistar). Busbecq's use of (v), (uu) points to CG [v] (cf. 6.6.2.22).

5.4.2.4 An important consonant missing from the CGK sound inventory is the glottal fricative /h/ (cf. 5.3.4, Fig. 2), a phoneme which develops in Germanic languages from PGmc *χ (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:875). If there was a NGK */h/, we might expect the informant to have reproduced it as CG [x] (= CGK /x/) or as *ç. We do find CG (h) in some CG words where it corresponds to /h/ in other

* Jones (1958:357-358) proposes that BG (u), e.g. in niu(n) 'nine', represented a monophthong, probably a high back vowel; similarly, Hamp (1958:361). Vennemann (1971:116, 126-27) suggests
Germanic languages: CG *hus 'house' (cf. ON, OE, OFris, OS, OHG *hus), CG *handa (cf. ON *hond, OE hand, *hond, OFris, OS hand, OHG *hant), CG *hoef 'head' (cf. OE heafod, OFris haved, OS hōbid, OHG hōbīt). But other CG forms lacking initial (*h) appear to correspond to forms in other Germanic languages which show initial /h/ < PGmc *χ: CG Ano 'hen, chicken' (cf. OE *hen, OHG henne 'hen', OE hana, OHG OS hano, OHG hane, OFris hōna 'cock'), CG *leitisch 'alive, healthy' (cf. OH heill, OE hēl, OS hēl, OHG heill), CG *ael 'stone' (cf. BG hallus, ON hallr, OE heall). It is possible that the informant reproduced an underlying NCG */h/ (as [x]) in some CG words but not in others as Busbecq’s transcription suggests. However, I think it is much more likely that initial PGmc *χ had been lost in NCG, and that the initial (*h) in CG *hus, *handa, *hoef was introduced by Busbecq, who was influenced by the Netherlandic and/or German spellings of the corresponding forms in these languages (cf. 6.6.2.8). In CG hazer ‘one thousand’ the informant must have pronounced initial [x]; for otherwise Busbecq would probably have transcribed this non-Germanic word as *azer. The informant’s ability to pronounce [x] here is good indication that the absence of initial CG (*h) in Ano, Iel, Ieltsch, Ael—Germanic words which Busbecq did not recognize (‘cum nostra lingua non satis congruentia’) —and in CG Lachen ‘to laugh’ (cf. BG klaiajan, OE klīehton), Rinck, Ringo ‘ring’ (cf. ON hringr, OE hring) reflects the loss of initial PGmc *χ everywhere in NCG.

5.4.2.5 The appearance of CG (p) in Plut ‘blood’ for PGmc *b (cf. BG bhop) is unexpected, since elsewhere in initial position PGmc *b appears as CG (*b), e.g. CG Broe ‘bread’ (cf. OE *bōad, OHG bōat), Bruder ‘brother’ (cf. BG brothar), Boga ‘bow’ (cf. ON bogi, OS, OHG bōgi), Bars ‘beard’ (cf. OE beard, OHG barte), Brunna ‘spring, fountain’ (cf. BG brunna). Assuming that (p) in CG Plut is not misprinted for (b), it appears that it represents CG [p], i.e. CG/k/p/, a voiceless unaspirated bilabial stop (cf. 5.3.4.5). On the basis of the CG forms with initial (b) we can assume that NCG had the phoneme */b/ (< PGmc *b). NCG */b/ was probably a lenis bilabial stop,* contrasting with the fortis bilabial stop NCG */p/, which appears for PGmc *p as CG (p) in Schilpen ‘to sleep’ (cf. BG şioup), Apep ‘apple’ (cf. ON apall, OS appel). NCG */b/ apparently had voiced and voiceless (or partially voiced) allomorphs, *[b] and *[β]. The voiceless allophone *[b] occurred initially before */l/ as evidenced by CG Plut alone. The Greek informant, whose CGK consonant system distinguished between voiced /b/ and voiceless /p/ (cf. 5.3.4.4), correctly perceived NCG *[b] as */b/ and reproduced it as CG [b], i.e. CGK /b/, as in CG Broe, Bruder, Boga, Bars, Brunna. In the NCG form underlying CG Plut, however, he perceived the voiceless allophone NCG *[β] (= */b/) as NCG */p/ and reproduced it accordingly by substituting his voiceless CGK /p/-phoneme, pronouncing CG [p], which Busbecq transcribed as (p).

5.4.2.6 A similar explanation can be made for the appearance of CG (t) and

---

* This is also suggested by Loewe (1896:143).
(th) in Tag 'day' and Thurn 'door'. These two forms, striking in their resemblance to the corresponding High German forms Tag, Tür, show the only CG reflexes of PGmc *d in initial position (cf. BG days 'day'; OLF duri, OS duri, OHG turi 'door'). Busbecq's (t), (th) suggest that he heard a voiceless fortis dental stop, CG [t], in CG Tag, Thurn (cf. 6.6.2.19). PGmc. *d appears as (d) in CG Handa 'hand' (cf. BG handus, ON hond, OS hand, fyder 'four' (cf. BG fidwor, fidur). Here the informant apparently pronounced a voiceless dental, CG [d].

The reflexes of PGmc *d as CG (t), (th) in Tag, Thurn, but as CG (d) in Handa, fyder can be explained by assuming that NCC */d/ < PGmc *d was a lenis dental stop in having the voiceal allophone NCC */d/ between sonorants (intervocally in fyder; prevocally following */n/ in Handa), but a partially voiceless or voiceless allophone in initial position, NCC */d/. The Greek informant, whose CGK distinguished between voiceless /d/ and voiceless /l/ (cf. 5.3.4.4), perceived */d/ as NCC */d/, but */g/ as NCC */l/, a fortis dental stop from PGmc *t, which occurs as CG (t), (th), e.g. in tua 'two' (cf. BG twa, ON tvau, OE twæ, OS twæ), Schiet 'to shoot' (cf. ON skjót, OE sceotan, OS scoitan), thine 'then' (cf. BG taihun, ON tio, OS tehan). Thus the informant correctly reproduced NCC */d/ as CG [d], i.e. CGk /d/, in CGfyder, Handa, but substituted CG [t], i.e. CGk /l/, for NCC */g/ in CGTag, Thurn. Busbecq could transcribe the informant's (t) only as (t) or (th).

5.4.2.7 The varied reflexes of PGmc *b in CG present a seemingly confused picture: In initial position PGmc *b appears as CG (t), (th), and (z), e.g. CGria 'three' (cf. BG brjia, ON brjía, OE bryþ), treithyen 'thirty', tho 'the' (cf. BG sa, pata, so, pøi, po, pos, OS the, that, thia, etc., OHG der, das, dia, etc.), Tzo 'you' (cf. BG þu, ON þuí, OS ðuí, ðu, OHG diu, du). Medially, PGmc *b is reflected by CG (d) Bruder 'brother' (cf. BG broþar, OE þeðor, OS þóðar, OHG braudar), furdeithien 'forty' (cf. ON fjørðe, OE fœorþ 'fourth'). In final position PGmc *b appears as CG (t,g) Goltz 'gold' (cf. CG: guilp, dat.

CG Tag, Thurn along with CG Plut (cf. 5.4.2.5) and also CG Cadariou, Kileschop, and Erient have been cited by Höffler (1956:302, 1957:248-49) as evidence for a late Gothic "Medienverhärtung," in which he sees a parallel to the High German Consonant Shift, as the title of his studies proclaim: "Die hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung und ihre Gegenstücke bei Goten, Vandalen, Langobarden und Burgundern" (1956) and "Die zweite Lautverschiebung bei Ostgermanen und Westgermanen" (1957). While Höffler's term "Medienverhärtung" implies a shift from lenis to fortis, in specifics he allows for a broader range of interpretation (Höffler 1957:243-44): he characterizes CG (p) in Plut as a "immersel Magedia oder Semifortis" and similarly describes the sound represented by CG (t), (th) in Tag, Thurn as a consonant which was articulated as a voiceless media or semi-fortis, "wenn nicht schon als Fortis.

Van de Velde (1964:117-18) is skeptical of Höffler's theory of CG parallels to the High German Consonant Shift. He considers Busbecq's 16th century CG material too far removed in time from mediaeval German to permit such comparisons and, because of its transmission to us by a nonnative informant, too unreliable for one to draw such far-reaching conclusions.

Loewe (1896:145) proposes that PGmc *d regularly became an aspirated tenuis in (N)CG, represented by CG (t) and (th), but that in certain positions it may have become a voiceless lenis, represented by CG (d) and (t).

(1) for PGmc *gh in Tinck 'ring' (cf. ON hring, OE, OFris, OS hring, OHG ring) clearly indicates a voiceless velar stop, CG [k] for underlying NCC */g/. In the alternate form for this word, CG Ringo 'ring', CG (g) probably represents the corresponding voiced velar stop, CG [g] for NCC */g/, so that CG Rincek, Ringe represent CG [rink], [ringo] for NCC *[rink]/, *[ringa]. The occurrence of PGmc *g as a stop after original *n is expected, since it reflects a development in German shown by all Germanic languages (cf. Krahe and Meid...
1969a:§77). The informant’s CGk had the allophonic sequence [ŋ] (cf. 5.3.4.6), which he could use in CG *Ringo, but no /gl/-phone (cf. 5.3.4, Fig. 2). Therefore, should PGmc *g have become a step in other positions in NCG35 as it does in certain other dialects of Germanic (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§78ff; Prokosch 1938:§24), the Greek informant may have been unable to reproduce it correctly. We might expect the informant to have substituted CG [y] or [k] (= CG /l/, /k/) for NCG *ŋ/gl. Indeed Busbecq’s CG (g), (gh) spellings, if we assume their Netherlandic values, suggest a voiced fricative, CG [ğ], except in (ng|h), which represents [ŋ], and in CG Tag ‘day’, where final (g) probably represents the voiceless velar fricative, CG [x](cf. 6.6.2.7). However, there is no evidence in the CG data which would indicate that Busbecq’s informant substituted CG [y] for NCG *ŋ/gl.36 While such a substitution is a possibility, I think it is more likely that the informant pronounced CG [y] for an underlying voiced velar fricative, NCG *ŋ/y/. Compare the following CG forms with (g), (gh) for PGmc *g: CG Goltz ‘gold’ (cf. BG gulp, ON gull, OHG gold), Reghen ‘rain’ (cf. BG rign, ON regn, OHG regon), Oeghene ‘eyes’ (cf. BG augona, ON auga, OHG ogun), VVaghren ‘wagon’ (cf. ON vagn, OHG wagan), Boga ‘bow’ (cf. ON bogi, OHG bogo).

5.4.2.9 Two CG forms appear to show evidence of a development paralleling the High German shift of PGmc *k to /x/. While PGmc *k has clearly been preserved as a step in initial position, where it occurs as CG (k), e.g. CG Kor ‘grain’ (cf. BG kaurn, ON korn, OE corn, OHG corn, corn), CG Ich ‘I’ (cf. BG ik, ON ek, OE, OS ic, OHG ih), which is surprisingly similar to corresponding High German ich, and CG Mycha ‘sword’ (cf. BG meki, ON meker, OS maki) show (ch) as the only CG reflexes of postvocalic PGmc *k. Busbecq’s (ch) also reflects PGmc *χ in CG Lachen (cf. BG hlajhan, OE hlıehhan, MNethl lachen, OS hlauhhan, OHG hlauhhan), where it undoubtedly represents a voiceless velar fricative, [x], as it does in Netherlandic (cf. 6.6.2.3). We can assume that Busbecq heard the velar fricative [x] and not the palatal fricative [ç] in CG Ich, Mycha as well, for only the former sound occurs in CGk (cf. 5.3.4.8; Fig. 2).37

I believe that the apparent shift of postvocalic PGmc *k to NCG *x/38 took place not in NCG, but rather in the speech of the informant. The reflex of PGmc *k in

35 The informant apparently had no difficulty reproducing final NCG *[pʰ] as CG [pʰ] in Rinck.
36 Compare PGmc *b, which became a stop in initial position in NCG (cf. 5.4.2.5), and PGmc *d, which became a stop in all positions in NCG (cf. 5.4.2.6; 7.2.2).
37 Otto Höfler (1957:241ff) believes that PGmc *g had become a stop in initial position in (NCG and in fact proposes that it underwent the “krimtizigsche Meirenverhârtung” (cf. fn 30 above). Höfler puts forward the following forms as possible evidence for a shift of initial /g/ to /k/: CG Eraten (for “Criten” ‘to cry’, Cadarzow ‘soldier’, Kilemschop ‘drink up your cup’. But none of these forms qualifies as an example of what Höfler terms the “Krimtizigsche Lautesweichung,” because the etymologies of all these words are in doubt (cf. Part II).
38 Should there have been an underlying palatal *[ç] here in NCG, as suggested by Loewe (1896:144), the informant would have reproduced it as CG [x].
39 Schwarz (1951:170) and Höfler (1957:250-51) attribute this development of PGmc *k in (NCG to aspiration and/or palatalization by the preceding vowel. It is surprising that Höfler, who seeks CG
6. Busbecq: The 'Fieldworker'

6.1 Biography

Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq was born in 1522 in Flanders in the village of Comines (Komen) as the illegitimate son of a nobleman, Georges Ghislain, Seigneur of Bousbecque. His father received him into his château, provided him with an excellent education and obtained legitimation for him from Charles V in 1540.

At age thirteen Busbecq began his studies at the University of Louvain in Brabant. He was an excellent student, and after five years of study in Louvain he continued his education in the great universities of Europe: Paris, Venice, Bologna, and Padua.

It is assumed that after his formal education Busbecq returned to Flanders to devote the next few years to perfecting and broadening his knowledge. During this period he may have traveled about in order to meet some of the distinguished personalities of the day. He first appeared on the political scene in 1550, when he attended the wedding of Mary of England to Philip of Spain as an attaché to Don Pedro de Castilla, who represented Ferdinand I of Austria.

In 1554 Busbecq accepted an assignment from Ferdinand I of Austria (later Ferdinand I, Holy Roman Emperor: 1558-1564) to undertake a diplomatic mission to the Ottoman Forte, the purpose of which was to negotiate a peace treaty with Sultan Suleiman I (Soliman I, Solymon I), 'the Magnificent' (reign: 1520-1566). Busbecq arrived in the Ottoman Empire on 20 January 1555, but then returned to Vienna in July of the same year in order to deliver a letter from Suleiman to Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, Ferdinand's brother. He returned to Constantinople early in 1556 and remained in Turkey for nearly seven years as ambassador of Ferdinand I, who in 1558 succeeded his brother as Holy Roman Emperor. Although he was Imperial Ambassador to the Sublime Porte, Busbecq was treated scarcely better than a hostage by his Turkish hosts. Ultimately, however, he was able to negotiate a treaty with Suleiman which was satisfactory to Ferdinand. He left Constantinople in late August 1562, traveling first to Vienna and then on to Frankfurt (21 November), where he presented the treaty to Ferdinand for ratification.

Busbecq provides an account of his experiences in Turkey in his four Turkish letters (Busbequeius 1589). During his diplomatic mission there he copied Greek and Latin inscriptions, collected ancient coins and Greek manuscripts, and, of primary interest to us, recorded the CG data.

After his return from Turkey Busbecq was knighted and retained in the employ of the imperial family, serving in the capacities of écuyer trenchant and governor to the sons of Maximilian II; seneschal to his daughter Elizabeth, Queen of France (wife of Charles IX and Henry III); personal representative of Rudolph II at the court of France.

In autumn 1592 Busbecq took leave of his post in France to visit his homeland. While traveling through Normandy, he was abducted by a band of soldiers. Although he was set free on the following day, the seventy-year-old Busbecq never recovered from the excitement of this outrage. He took ill and died 28 October 1592 near St. Germain.

Busbecq is remembered not only as a diplomat, humanist, and epistolarist, but also as a naturalist, for he introduced many plants and shrubs of Asia Minor into Europe, including the lilac and the tulip. But we are concerned here with Busbecq's contribution as the 'linguistic fieldworker' who recorded the CG data.

6.2 Linguistic Background

In order to assess Busbecq's competence as a 'linguistic fieldworker' (cf. 6.3), it is fitting that we examine his linguistic background. According to his biographers, Busbecq spoke seven languages with native fluency: Flemish, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, German, and 'Slavic'. This information is taken on the authority of a contemporary of Busbecq, Lodovico Guicciardini. In his Description of All the Low Countries (Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi), which he published in 1581, Guicciardini enumerates the languages Busbecq had mastered (Guicciardini

\footnote{The date of Busbecq's death is given elsewhere as October 28, 1592, except by the editors of Augeretus Gislenius Busbequeius, 1522-1591 . . . (1553), who move this date up one year (note title).}
German: It is quite likely that Busbecq had a knowledge of German. The affinities German had to his native Flemish would have facilitated the acquisition of this language, which he may have used while at court in Vienna in 1554 and 1555. Many of the forms in Busbecq’s transcription of the CG data show the influence of German orthography (cf. 6.6).

‘Slavic’: It seems most unlikely that Busbecq would have spoken fluent ‘Slavic’, although he may have acquired some familiarity with Slavic vocabulary during his travels through Bulgarian-speaking areas on his way to and from Constantinople. It is possible that Guicciardini added ‘Slavic’ to Busbecq’s repertoire of masterd languages to make a total of seven, a ‘magic number’. English: One might expect that Busbecq knew English, but there are no reports indicating that he did. Surely he picked up some English vocabulary and expressions during his visit to England in 1554 (cf. 6.1), but there is no evidence that he could speak or read this language.

Greek: There are apparently no records which state that Busbecq knew Greek (cf. Huussen 1949:17; Lambrechts in Augerius Gislenus Busbequius 1955:40). However, as a 16th century humanist, who attended the University of Louvain, where Erasmus once taught, and who during his diplomatic mission to the Ottoman Empire copied Greek inscriptions and collected nearly 250 Greek manuscripts, on whose quality he was able to pass judgment (cf. Forster and Daniell 1881:416-17), he obviously had a reading knowledge of (Classical) Greek. We know from his Turkish letters that Busbecq had contact with Greeks in Constantinople, and it is possible that he had also known Greeks during his student years in Italy. Thus he may have had an acquaintance with Modern (spoken) Greek as well.

Turkish: Busbecq evidently learned some Turkish during his seven-year tenure as ambassador to the Ottoman Porte. We know this, for he frequently uses and or explains Turkish words and expressions in the reports and anecdotes which make up his four Turkish letters. However, by the time of the recording of the CG data (1560-1562) we see that he still makes use of interpreters, as these are mentioned in his report on the meeting with the two envoys from the Crimea (cf. 1.2).

In summary we can say that in addition to his native Flemish Busbecq commanded Latin and presumably French and Italian by the time of the recording of the CG data. He appears also to have known Spanish and Classical Greek and probably

---
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1581:426). However, Guicciardini’s remarks concerning Busbecq are limited to a few sentences. I believe it likely that the basis for his statement attributing native fluency in seven languages to Busbecq was mere hearsay. Such proficiency may have been limited to a smaller number of languages.

The degree of Busbecq’s competence in the several languages listed by Guicciardini at the time of his ambassadorship to Turkey cannot be determined in each case. It will serve our purpose here to discuss each language Busbecq reportedly knew, as well as others with which he may have been familiar.

Flemish: Busbecq’s native language was Flemish, and he was obviously familiar with other Netherlandic dialects as well, for he had studied in Louvain in the Brabantine dialect area.

Latin: Busbecq’s command of Latin is evidenced by the elegant prose of his four Turkish letters. This knowledge of Latin clearly provided a sound basis for acquiring proficiency in French, Italian, and Spanish.

French: We know that Busbecq was proficient in French at a time several years subsequent to his return from Turkey, for the University of Leiden has in its library four letters written by Busbecq in French and dated 1576, 1584, 1585, and 1586 (cf. Augerius Gislenus Busbequius 1955:112-13 BiBu 123). It is certain that he had a command of French prior to this as well. There had been a great deal of intercourse between France and the Low Countries since the middle ages, and the influence of the French language was considerable (cf. van der Meer 1927:§33). The well-educated Busbecq, whose Flemish homeland lay on the border with French-speaking territory, and who had studied in Paris, was undoubtedly proficient in French at the time of his mission to the Ottoman Porte.

Italian: Busbecq had studied in Venice, Bologna, and Padua and here, presumably, learned Italian (dialects). According to Lambrechts (in Augerius Gislenus Busbequius 1955:40) there are letters written by Busbecq in Italian, which have come down to us. If this is the case, we can assume this proficiency in Italian was the result of his years of study in Italy.

Spanish: From 1516 to 1581 the Netherlands were part of the Spanish Monarchy. It seems quite probable, therefore, that Busbecq would have acquired some degree of proficiency in Spanish during his early education. A facility in Spanish may have been required in his capacity as attaché to Don Pedro Lasso de Castilla (cf. 6.1). There is in fact evidence in Busbecq’s Turkish letters that he knew Spanish, as he occasionally refers here to meeting and conversing with Spanish-speaking speakers in Constantinople. To what degree he was proficient in this language is not clear.

---

5 Braun (1890:56 fn.**) expresses complete confidence in Busbecq’s German: “Busbecc war von Geburt ein Vlaine, beherrschte aber natürlich auch das Hochdeutsche vollkommen.”

6 In Padua Busbecq studied under Baptista Egnatius, a friend and colleague of Erasmus (cf. Forster and Daniell 1881:48).

7 According to Vasiilev (1936:270 and fn. 1): ‘He [Busbecq] was deeply interested in the Turkish language, so that one of the eminent orientalists of our day calls him “the founder of Turkish studies.”’ This is a mistake on Vasiilev’s part. A comparison with the passage in question (Babinger 1919:108) reveals that he has misread this orientalist, Franz Babinger. To be sure, Babinger does mention “der geniale Aughier Ghislain van Busbeek,” but only parenthetically. It is Johannes Löwenkau upon whom Babinger confers the title “der Begründer der türkischen Studien.”
knew German as well. It is evident that he had some knowledge of Turkish, and he may have had an acquaintance with Modern (spoken) Greek and possibly with a Slavic language.  

6.3 The Recording of the Crimean Gothic Data

The only information we have concerning the recording of the CG data is Busbecq’s report itself, which is found in his fourth Turkish letter (cf. 1.2). This report gives us very few details. Busbecq does not indicate the date or even the year he recorded the CG data, and we must therefore propose terminus post quem and ante quem. The fourth Turkish letter is dated 16 December 1562 and was therefore completed in Frankfurt after the diplomat’s final return from Turkey. The third letter was written in Constantinople and is dated 1 June 1560. It seems probable that Busbecq’s meeting with the two Crimeans took place between these dates and the date of his departure from Constantinople. We can propose, therefore, that the recording of the CG data occurred between 1 June 1560 and late August 1562 (cf. 6.2).

In his report Busbecq tells us that he had instructed his interpreters to bring to him anyone they should happen to meet from the Germanic-speaking region of the Crimea. The two Crimeans were thus brought to him one day to dinner. Presumably Busbecq offered them food and drink and questioned them about their homeland, obtaining the cultural information contained in his report. As shown in 5.1, it appears that Busbecq relied primarily, if not solely, on one of the two men, namely the Greek. The impression is that the Greek was the head of this two-man delegation and thus did most of the talking.

Busbecq does not indicate what the working language of the interview with these Crimeans was. His interpreters, who had brought them to him, presumably were present and interpreted for him. Busbecq mentions these interpreters several times in his Turkish letters, but nowhere does he identify their nationality. They were not part of his household, and therefore were presumably subjects of the sultan. I think it very likely that Busbecq’s interpreters were trilingual Greeks, proficient in Greek, Turkish, and Italian. Greek would have been their native language, and Turkish a second language learned under their Ottoman rulers.

Italian seems the most likely candidate for the third language, for Italy exercised considerable influence in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 16th century. We know that Busbecq himself spoke Italian (cf. 6.2), and therefore the language which served as a medium of communication between Busbecq and his interpreters was almost certainly Italian. Whereas these interpreters would normally have worked with Turkish and Italian, it appears that on the day in question they worked with Greek and Italian, for Busbecq’s informant, although he may have known some Turkish, was, after all, a Greek (cf. 5.1).

I suspect that the procedure employed during the interview was as follows: Busbecq’s questions, posed in Italian, were translated into Greek for the informant, and the informant’s answers were translated into Italian for Busbecq. In the case of the CG data the informant, sometimes replying to Busbecq’s inquiry and sometimes volunteering items, pronounced a CG utterance and provided a Greek equivalent, which was then translated into Italian for Busbecq by his interpreters. Busbecq transcribed some or all of these CG utterances, glossing them (except for the numbers and the cantilena) in Latin or perhaps Italian. He probably asked to have the CG forms repeated as he transcribed them, possibly making corrections in his transcription as he did this. He apparently did not record the article with each noun (“omnibus vero dictionibus praeponebat articulum thot aut the”).

We cannot say whether Busbecq segregated the CG data into separate lists as he recorded them, but in his fourth Turkish letter he organized them into four categories: (a) that vocabulary which seemed similar to Netherlandic or German (“nostratia aut parum differentia”), (b) that vocabulary which seemed to him unlike Netherlandic or German (“cum nostra lingua non satis congruanti”), (c) the numerals, and (d) the cantilena. It is possible that Busbecq provided here only a selection of what he had recorded, for he tells us in his report that he will write but a few of the many ‘German’ words recited by the informant (“Nunc adscribam paucà vocabula de multis quae Germanica reddèbat . . . ”).

6.4 Busbecq’s Competence

Busbecq was among the ablest and most learned men of his time, a renaissance humanist educated at the great universities of Europe (cf. 6.1), a master of Latin

---

10 Forster and Daniell 1881:404: “He [Ferdinand I] knows several languages. Spanish, as his mother tongue, takes the first place, then come French, German, Latin, and Italian. Although he can express anything he means in Latin, yet he has not learnt it so accurately as to not infringe, at times, the rules of grammar, a fault to be blamed in a man of letters, but not, in my humble judgment, to be hardly criticised in an Emperor.”

11 Van de Velde (1964:107) suggests the date of the fourth letter, 16 December 1562, as the terminus ante quem.

12 Busbecq does tell us that the sultan’s first dragoman (interpreter), Ibrahim, was by birth a Pole (cf. Forster and Daniell 1881:370). This same Ibrahim accompanied Busbecq to Vienna and Frankfurt at the end of his diplomatic mission in 1562 (cf. 6.1).

13 The island of Crete, for example, formerly a part of the Byzantine Empire, was ruled by the Venetians until 1669, when the Turks finally took it over (cf. Browning 1969:94). Much (1898:201) also assumes that Italian was the working language used in Busbecq’s interview with the two Crimeans.

14 Busbecq may have been able to communicate directly with the informant in Greek, although perhaps to a limited extent (cf. 6.2), or possibly in Italian, if the informant spoke this language.

14 Cf. Biographie Nationale (1872:188): “Il n’était pas seulement un diplomate consommé; il était aussi un des hommes les plus doctes d’une époque féconde en savants illustres; il parlait sept langues, le latin, l’italien, l’espagnol, le français, l’allemand, le flamand, l’esclavon; aucune des branches des connaissances humaines ne lui était étrangère; il voulait tout savoir, tout approfondir.”
prose and proficient in several other languages (cf. 6.2). In spite of these qualifications, Busbecq has been characterized as a "linguistic dilettante" (Penzl 1972b:1246), for he did not go about the task of recording the CG data as would a modern-day, trained linguist, and his shortcomings as a 'linguistic fieldworker' must be considered in an analysis of CG.17

There are several areas in which Busbecq's gathering and recording of the CG data can be criticized:

a) The date of the recording of the CG material is not provided.

b) Busbecq did not choose a satisfactory informant, since the latter was not a native speaker of CG. Busbecq is of course not altogether to blame for this, since there was probably no native speaker of CG to be found in Constantinople. However, he should have been specific in indicating which of the two Crimea's provided the CG data (cf. 5.1).

c) The cantilena is not provided with a translation (cf. 10.).

d) Busbecq apparently allowed himself to be influenced by his native Flemish and/or by German in his perception and recording of the CG material (cf. 6.5; 6.6).

e) Busbecq's transcription of the CG data is inconsistent (cf. 6.6).

f) Busbecq transmitted only a sampling of the CG data available to him. He states that he will write down a few of the many German words the informant repeated ("nunc adscribam paucu vocabula de multis quae Germanica reddebat . . ."). Undoubtedly many CG data were lost to us forever as a result.

On the other hand, it is Busbecq whom we must thank that any CG material at all has come down to us. It should be noted that his recording of the CG data was not a completely casual undertaking. His interest in the Crimean Goths and their language was longstanding, and not a spontaneous development resulting from his chance meeting with the two Crimea's. Busbecq tells us himself in his report that he had heard of these people, and had long wanted to meet one of them, and, if possible, obtain something written in their language (cf. 1.2). From this we can assume that Busbecq undertook the recording of the CG data in all seriousness.18 In spite of orthographic inconsistency and the apparent influence in his perception and recording of some of the Germanic data by corresponding Netherlandic and/or German forms, I think we can assume that Busbecq took a considerable amount of care in the transcription of the CG data. This, after all, was the same Busbecq who copied Greek and Latin inscriptions in Asia Minor. As I have suggested above (6.3), he probably had each word repeated at least once before he recorded it. Except for the cantilena and most of the numbers (which are unambiguous anyway), Busbecq provides Latin glosses for each utterance.

Busbecq's organization of the CG data into four categories (cf. 6.3) shows a conscious attempt on his part to interpret this material. His remarks regarding the vocabulary he classifies as being dissimilar to Netherlandic and German ("cum nostra lingua non sati satis congruentia") demonstrate a considerable degree of insight into the problem of CG. In effect he suggests that these words show independent development in NCG, or that they possibly reflect informant incompetence, whereby the latter (unconsciously) substituted foreign vocabulary for NCG words (" . . . sive quod eius linguae natura id ferat, sive quod eum fugiebat memoria et peregrina cum vernaculis mutabat").

Another example of Busbecq's linguistic insight is his classification of CG Schuualth 'death' as a word he considers to be similar to Netherlandic and German ("nostratia aut parum differentia"). Busbecq apparently linked this CG noun to the Flemish verb zwelten 'to die' (cf. BG swilten).19

In concluding his report Busbecq offers some discussion concerning the origin of the Crimean Goths. He is undecided whether they are actually Goths or perhaps Saxons (cf. 1.2).

6.5 Distortion by the 'Fieldworker'

As seen in 5.4, the Greek informant appears to have distorted some of the Germanic vocabulary he provided. Busbecq, the 'linguistic fieldworker', has further distorted the CG vocabulary, obscuring the phonetic shape of some of the words as they were pronounced by the informant. This distortion is the result of phonological interference and of the influence of Netherlandic and German orthographic practices.

6.5.1 Phonological Interference

As shown in 6.2, Busbecq was familiar with a fairly wide range of languages and therefore with a large number of speech sounds. It is possible, however, that...
some of the CG speech sounds produced by the Greek informant were unfamiliar to Busbecq, and that he therefore may have incorrectly perceived and/or inadequately transcribed these sounds. Mitzka (Braune and Mitzka 1967:883), for example, believes that Busbecq, who may have been unfamiliar with the speech sound [ʃ], may have misheard CG [ʃ] as [ts], since he transcribes it as (tz) in CG Goltz ‘gold’, Tzo ‘you’, Stutt ‘land’ (cf. 5.4.3.7).

Phonological interference may also have occurred as a result of linguistic bias on Busbecq’s part. As we have seen, Busbecq had known of the Germanic nature of the language of the Crimean Goths long before his meeting with the two Crimeans in Constantinople. For this reason Busbecq fully expected his informant to provide CG vocabulary which was similar to that of the Germanic languages with which he was familiar, namely Netherlandic and German. In this anticipation, it is very probable that he perceived some of the CG forms as sounding closer to Netherlandic and/or German than they in fact did.59 The similarity of some CG words to corresponding forms in Netherlandic and German may have distorted Busbecq’s perception of much of the CG vocabulary. He may, for example, have misheard CG short vowels as long vowels when they corresponded to long vowels in Netherlandic and/or German. Although this type of phonological interference surely took place, it is impossible to determine to what extent it occurred. This is because only in the CG vocabulary which Busbecq recognized as Germanic (‘nostratia aut parum differentia’) would such ‘analogue’ interference have been operational, and precisely in these words, the influence of Netherlandic and German orthography will have been the far greater factor in obscuring the phonetic structure of the CG forms as they were provided by the Greek informant.

6.5.2 Orthographic Influence

Unfortunately, Busbecq did not have a phonetic alphabet at his disposal, nor does it seem that he attempted to devise one. It appears, rather, that he relied chiefly on the orthographic traditions of Netherlandic and German for his tran-

cription of the CG data. As we have seen, Busbecq recognized the similarity much of the CG data bore to Netherlandic and German. He describes these words as ‘German’ (‘germanica’), i.e. Germanic, and in fact compares them to his native Netherlandic by referring to them as “the same as ours, or only a little different” (‘nostratia aut parum differentia’). Thus it is not at all surprising that he should pattern his transcriptions of this familiar vocabulary after the corresponding forms in Netherlandic and German.

Netherlandic spelling conventions were, to a degree, particularly well-suited for Busbecq’s purposes, for his Turkish letters, after all, were addressed to another Netherlander, Nicolas Michault, Seigneur of Indeveldt (cf. 4.1). Examples of CG forms which appear to have been influenced by Netherlandic orthography are CG Vvingart ‘vine branch’ (cf. MNetl wingart, NNethl wijngaard), Apel ‘apple’ (cf. MNethl apel, appel, NNethl appel), Hoef (for *Hoefi) ‘head’ (cf. MFlem hoof, NNethl hoofd), Miera ‘ant’ (cf. MNethl mier, NNethl mier), Schieté ‘to shoot’ (cf. MNethl sieten, NNethl sieten).

It appears, however, that Busbecq considered some CG utterances to be closer to German than to Netherlandic, for he follows German orthography in several instances. We must therefore assume with Scardigli (1964:295; 1973:252-53) that the German spelling conventions used by Busbecq in his transcription of the CG data were also familiar to the circle of readers for whom his letters were intended (cf. 4.1). Examples of CG forms which appear to have been modeled after German are CG Alt ‘old’ (cf. ENHG alt), Bruder ‘brother’ (cf. ENHG bruder), Schwester ‘sister’ (cf. ENHG schwester), Tag ‘day’ (cf. ENHGtag), Ich ‘I’ (cf. ENHG ich).

Some CG forms could have been influenced by either German or Netherlandic orthography, e.g. CG Lachen ‘to laugh’ (cf. MNethl lachen, NNethl lachen, ENHG lachen), VVaghen ‘wagon’ (cf. MNethl wagen, ENHG wagen). A combination of German and Netherlandic orthographic practices appears to be present in CG Schlipen ‘to sleep’ (cf. MNethl slappen, NNethl slappen, ENHG schlafen).

6.6 Busbecq’s System of Transcription

The following interpretation of Busbecq’s system of transcription attempts to establish the phonetic values he intended to convey for the CG forms. At the same time it suggests instances of possible distortion on Busbecq’s part.

I have relied primarily on historical grammar of Netherlandic and Middle Netherlandic grammars to determine sound values for those CG forms which appear to have been influenced by Netherlandic orthography (Caron 1972; Franck 1910; Jacobs 1911, 1927; van Loey 1962; van der Meer 1927; Le Roux and Le Roux 1969; Schönfeld and van Loey 1959). Moser (1929) served as a guide to the phonetic interpretation of Early New High German orthographic conventions which Busbecq may have followed. (For another analysis of Busbecq’s transcription of CG, cf. Molini [1975].)
6.6.1 The Vowels (alphabetically arranged)

6.6.1.1 CG (a): Where CG (a) stands in closed syllable, e.g. CG Alt 'old', Tag 'day', Handa 'hand', Busbecq presumably intended it to represent a short vowel, [a], as it did in Middle Netherlandic (cf. van Loey 1962:§1). In open syllable, e.g. CG Apel 'apple', Ada 'egg', sada 'one hundred', Busbecq may have intended CG (a) to represent a long vowel, [aː], as it did in Middle Netherlandic (cf. van Loey 1962:§40), since he could have doubled the following consonant symbol to indicate a short vowel (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27). In particular, the form Apel, which corresponds to MNethl, NNethl appel (cf. also, however, MNethl apel), appears to indicate that Busbecq heard something other than a short vowel here.

I believe, however, that the informant made no distinction between [a] and [aː], but rather used his single CGk /a/ phoneme where Busbecq writes (a). Since CGk /a/ was subject to slight lengthening in stressed syllables (cf. 5.3.3.3), Busbecq may sometimes have perceived half-long CG [aː] as long [a].

CG (a) appears in quite a number of words outside what can be assumed to be the syllable with main stress, e.g. CG Boga 'bow', tria 'three', Mycha 'sword', Bruna 'spring, fountain'. Here Busbecq apparently heard [a], because we would otherwise expect (e) here for [aː] (cf. van Loey 1962:§97).

6.6.1.2 CG (aa), (ae): The spellings (aa) and (ae) in CG Baar 'boy' and Ael 'stone', if not misprints, would appear to represent long [a_TRIANGLES]. The doubling of a vowel symbol and the addition of (e) to a vowel symbol were regular orthographic practices in Middle Netherlandic to indicate long vowels (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28), although the spelling (aa) was somewhat rare during this period (cf. van Loey 1962:§41.2). The informant presumably used his single CGk /a/ phoneme in these words. Busbecq may have perceived it as a long vowel here, since CGk /a/ had slightly lengthened allophones in stressed syllable (cf. 5.3.3.3). Otherwise one might suggest the possibility that CGk /a/ had the long allophone [aː] before simple liquids. However, I believe it is quite possible that CG Baar and Ael have simply been modeled after Netherlandic forms which in their phonetic structure approximated the informant's CG utterances. Possible models are NNetl baer 'in cash' (cf. MNethl baer 'naked') and NNethl 'eet'.

6.6.1.3 CG (au): In Early New High German (v) was used in word initial position for both vowel and consonant, and (u) in medial position for both vowel and consonant (cf. Moser 1929:§14, p. 258). This practice was apparently followed by Busbecq, by the copyist, or by the typesetter of our text as well, for the Latin forms here show this to be the case, e.g. Pluua, Vitis, siue, vsurpabat, vt (cf. Plates I-VI, pp. 21-26). This leaves us in doubt as to whether the (u) in CG Knauen 'good' is consonantal (cf. 6.6.2.21) or part of a diphthong, (au) (= [aʊ]?)

6.6.1.4 CG (e): The grapheme (e) as used in Middle Netherlandic and in Early

New High German in stressed syllable regularly represents [e] in closed syllables and before doubled consonant symbols (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27; Moser, 1929:§30). In Middle Netherlandic (e) is sometimes found for [e] (usually spelled (i)), particularly in Middle Flemish, especially beforecht and m-clusters (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux, 1969:§79).


The Greek informant probably used his MGK /e/ Phoneme in the first syllable of CG Scheddi 'light', stega 'twenty', Telich 'foolish'. Since CGk /e/ was probably a closer vowel sound than MNethl [e] (cf. 5.3.3.1) and may have been slightly lengthened in stressed syllable (cf. 5.3.3.3), it is possible that Busbecq perceived CG [eː] here as [eː] rather than as [e]. Otherwise we should expect CG *Schediitt, *steeggaa, *Telichh, with doubled consonant symbols indicating a preceding short vowel. The forms CG seewe 'seven' and Reghen 'rain' have probably been modeled after corresponding forms in Netherlandic.

In unstressed syllable in Middle Netherlandic and Early New High German the grapheme (e) was used to represent the unstressed vowel [a] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27; Penzl 1969:§39.2). It is possible, therefore, that Busbecq intended to indicate [a] by writing (e) in forms such as CG Bruder 'brother', Apel 'apple', Lachen 'to laugh'. However, Busbecq may actually have heard unstressed [e] here, or even [a], [i], [o], or [u], since the informant may not have been able to pronounce [a]. This is suggested by other CG forms where (a), (i), (o), (u) appear in unstressed syllable (cf. 5.4.1.3). Busbecq could still have written (e) here for [a], [i], [o], [u] in some forms under the influence of Netherlandic and German orthography.

6.6.1.5 CG (ee): MNethl (ee) represents [eː] or [eː] in closed syllable (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28). The only two instances of CG (ee) are CG Geen 'to go' and Breen 'to roast'. However, because it appears in a verb infinitive in both instances, CG (ee) may well represent two syllables, whereby the first syllable belongs to the verb stem and the second to the morpheme forming the infinitive, i.e. CG Ge-en, Bre-en (cf. CG Lachen 'to laugh', Kommen 'to come', Schiefe 'to shoot'.

6.6.1.6 CG (ei): The digraph (ei) appears in the forms CG seis 'six', treithyen 'thirty', fardeithen 'forty' (CG Stein 'star' is clearly a misprint for *Sterne). According to Middle Netherlandic orthography, (ei) would normally represent the diphthong [ei], but, with (i) as a length marker, it could also stand for MNethl [ei] or [eː] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§§28-29). ENNH (ei) represented the diphthong [ae] in parts of the German-speaking territory of the 16th century (cf. Moser, 1929:§79).\footnote{Willemyns (1971:69, 299) believes that the spelling (ei) in 15th and 16th century records of the West Flemish dialect of Brugge represents a short vowel lying phonetically between [e] and [i]. But}
In my opinion Busbecq intended CG (ei) to represent the informant’s CG [eɪ] for underlying NCG *[e] in seis (cf. 5.4.1.1), for it is unlikely that NCG *[ae] developed from PGmc *e in this form. CG (ei) in treithyen, fardeithien presumably represents CG [eɪ], though the presence of underlying NCG *[ei] here is problematic.


In closed syllable in CG forms such as Rinck, Rino 'ring', Fisc 'fish', WVintch 'wind', Ich 'I', Singhen 'to sing' Busbecq probably intended (i) to represent a sound which he perceived as [I] or [e]?). CG VWingart 'vine branch' shows CG (i) in closed syllable next to corresponding MNethl wijnjargart with (i) for long [I:] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28). Here too, then, CG (i), which in this case corresponds to Gmc long *i, appears to indicate a short vowel. However, CG VWingart may simply have been modeled after MNethl wijnart, with shortened stem vowel (i), which also occurs (cf. Franck 1910:§42).

In open syllable, as in CG Mine 'moon', Schlipen 'to sleep', Eriten 'to cry', Ita 'one', CG (i) would seem to indicate long [i:] or [i:].

I believe that the Greek informant used his single CG k[i]-phoneme pronouncing CG (i) or [i:] (cf. 5.3.3.3) in all of the CG forms where Busbecq writes (i). It is possible that Busbecq perceived this vowel as being short in closed syllable, e.g. CG Rintsch 'mountain', and long in open syllable, e.g. CG Ita 'one', but many CG forms may simply have been influenced by corresponding Dutch or German forms. The CG forms Mine, Schlipen, Eriten (for *Kriten or *Grieten), for example, may have been influenced by MNethl mane 'moon', slaven 'to sleep', kriten 'to scream', which, like the CG forms, show simple consonants following the vowels of the first syllable.

6.6.1.8 CG (ie): In CG Miera 'ant', Schieté 'to shoot', CG (ie) apparently represents a monophthong, since (ie) represents the monophthong (i:) in Middle Netherlandic (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28) and in Early New High German (Middle German) (cf. Moser 1929:§81). The informant, however, probably pronounced a shorter vowel here, namely CG [i] or [i:] (= CGk/i/). CG Miera and Schieté appear to have been modeled after corresponding MNethl mieere, schieiten.

CG (ie) and (ye) in -thien, -thyen in CG fardeithien 'forty', treithyen 'thirty' would seem to indicate a monophthong here also. Although rare, the spelling (ye)

Hoebeke (1973:63-66) is skeptical of Willemsen's theory, and in any case it seems unlikely that Busbecq, who from age thirteen to eighteen was a student at the University of Louvain in Brabant, should have been particularly influenced by orthographic practices prevailing in Brugge.

In Upper German ENHG (ie) represented the diphthong (ia) (cf. Moser 1929:§81, p. 190).

11 In Upper German ENHG (ie) represented the diphthong (ia) (cf. Moser 1929:§81, p. 190).

Occurred in 15th century Middle Netherlandic for the monophthong [i:] (cf. van Loey 1962:§69). It is possible that Busbecq intended CG (ie), (ye) to represent a diphthong, or a sequence of two vowels in these forms, [ia], [i:a], [ie], [i:e], [i:e], or [ie] (cf. 6.6.1.9).

CG (ie) in Iel 'life, health', Ietsch 'alive, healthy', Ies 'he' is usually interpreted as representing the monophthong [i:] (von Grienberger 1898:131; Schwarz 1951:169). It is my opinion, however, that initial CG (i) here represents a voiced palatal fricative, [j], so that CG (ie) in these forms stands for [je] (cf. 5.4.1.2; 6.6.2.9).

6.6.1.9 CG (ii): MNethl (ii) ({{ii}}) represented [I:] in closed syllable (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28). By the 16th century, ENHG (ii) ({{ii}}) = [i:] had been replaced by (y) (cf. Moser 1929:§7, p. 17). CG (ii) occurs in CG thine 'ten', thiinita 'eleven', and Scheditt 'light'. Possibly Busbecq intended to represent a monophthong, (ii) or [i:] in all of these forms for a sound the informant would have pronounced as CG [i] or [i:] (= CGk/ii/).

However, in CG thine 'ten', thiinita 'eleven' CG (ii) stands in open syllable, where we might expect (i) or (y) for a monophthong (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§28; van Loey 1962:§66, n. 2). This and the spelling of what is apparently the same stem as -thien and -thyen in CG fardeithien 'forty' and treithyen 'thirty' (cf. 6.6.1.8; Part II) suggest the possibility that Busbecq intended CG (ii) in thine, thiinita to stand for two syllables, [ii], i.e. [i:i] plus [i:]. The informant could have pronounced CG (ii) here for underlying NCG *[ia] (cf. 5.4.1.7). A diphthong or a sequence of two vowels might be represented by CG (ii) in the etymologically unclear form CG Scheditt as well.

6.6.1.10 CG (o): In Middle Netherlandic the grapheme (o) could stand for a number of vowel sounds. In closed syllable MNethl (o) represented short open [ə] or short close [o]. In open syllable MNethl (o) stood for long open [ɔː], long close [oː], and for long close [uː] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§§27, 28, 31). In Early New High German, as in New High German, (o) represented a long vowel in open syllable and a short vowel in closed syllable and before doubled consonant symbol (cf. Moser 1929:§§30, 49, 50).

CG (o) in Goltz 'gold', Kor 'grain' stands in closed syllable and therefore suggests a short vowel here. In CG Kommen 'to come' the (mm) would indicate that CG (o) is short here also, for the doubling of consonant symbols to signal a preceding short vowel was an orthographic convention of Middle Netherlandic (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27). In German this practice is also used, but it was not yet fixed in the Early New High German period (cf. Moser 1929:§30, pp. 46-55). However, (mm) in the form CG Kommen may very well be due to the influence of MFlemish commen, with short stem vowel, which corresponds to the form commen, with long stem vowel, found in other Middle Netherlandic dialects (cf. van Loey 1962:§82, n. 3).
CG (œ) in open syllable, as in Boga 'bow', Tzo 'you', suggests a long vowel, but CG Boga, with single (g), may have been influenced by the spelling of the corresponding Netherlandic or German form (cf. MNethl boge, NNethl boog, ENHG bozen), so that CG (œ) may represent a short vowel here also. The informant presumably used his single CGk lo'-phoneme in all the CG forms where Busbecq writes (œ). Busbecq may sometimes have perceived this vowel as short, and sometimes as long, but in many cases apparently patterned his transcriptions of the words in which it occurred after corresponding forms in Netherlandic and German.

6.6.1.11 CG (œ): Busbecq uses the digraph (œ) in three forms: CG Broe 'bread', Hoef 'head', Oeghe 'eyes'. There is an apparent consistency in the occurrence of CG (œ) in these forms, for in each case (œ) reflects PGmc *au. Furthermore, it appears that CG Broe, Hoef, Oeghe show the only CG reflexes of PGmc *au.

It is possible that Busbecq's (œ) represents a diphthong or two vowel sounds, perhaps CG [œ] (how else would he have transcribed it?). But the digraph (œ) represented a monophthong in Netherlandic, the language to which Busbecq compares CG, and since he addressed his Turkish letters to a fellow Netherlander, he must have recognized that his friend would assume that CG (œ) was equivalent to Nethl (œ). On these grounds, it seems likely that Busbecq intended CG (œ) to represent a monophthong.

In Middle Netherlandic the digraph (œ) represents a variety of monophthongs: [u], [o], [e] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§828, 31). The usual phonetic value of MNethl (œ) was [u] (cf. van Loey 1962:§85). However, Busbecq apparently used CG (u) to transcribe a high back rounded vowel, CG [u], in CG Plut 'blood', Stul 'chair', Hus 'house' (cf. 6.6.1.14), and thus Busbecq apparently intended CG (œ) to represent a sound other than [u]. It is also unlikely that he intended to represent [œ] with CG (œ), as the informant had no front rounded vowels in his CGk sound inventory (cf. 5.3.3; Fig. 1).

Whereas Jacobs (1927:9-10) proposes a number of phonetic values for (œ) in West Flemish, van Loey (1962:§85) describes MFllem (œ) as "a long and perhaps very close monophthongal o-sound."

Caron (1972:80) concludes on the basis of Erasmus' comments on (œ) in his Pronuntiatio (1528), that early 16th century Nethl (œ) represented a sound 'between o and [u]'. Caron (1972:101 n. 6) assumes this was a close o-sound, approximately as in NNethl grot (cf. also Schönfeld and van Loey 1959:§68, pp. 83-84). In interpreting CG (œ), van de Velde (1964:102, 112) describes (œ) as "late Middle Netherlandic spelling . . . for [œ]": similarly, Feist (1939:106, 266, 380). I believe with Feist and van de Velde that Busbecq intended CG (œ) to represent [œ]. The informant, however, probably pronounced a shorter vowel here, CG [œ] ([œ]': cf. 5.3.3.3) (= CGk lo') (cf. 5.4.1.5).

There is the possibility that CG Broe (for *Broet), Hoef (for *Hoeft), Oeghe were modeled after or influenced by corresponding Flemish forms with (œ). MFllem (œ) sometimes occurred for OLF 6 < PGmc *au. Jacobs (1911:§§110, 111) cites, among other examples, corresponding MFllem Broede (pl.), Hoef., Oeghe.

6.6.1.12 CG (œ): The ligature (œ) appears in a single CG form, unglossed Haemisclup, in the cantilena (cf. 10.).

6.6.1.13 CG (ou): Busbecq uses the digraph (ou) in three CG forms: Cadariou (for *Cadarioun?) 'soldier', and in two unglissed forms, ingdoluou and Galizou, which appear in the cantilena (cf. 10.). MNethl (ou) represented the short diphthong [ou] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§29), but in Flanders (ou) was a variant of (œ) before labials and velars (cf. van Loey 1962:§85).

I believe that Busbecq used CG (ou) to indicate the sound CG [u] where it appeared in final position. Thus Busbecq uses this originally French digraph as a variant of CG (u) (cf. 6.6.1.14).

6.6.1.14 CG (u): Busbecq uses the grapheme (u) in a large number of CG forms, e.g. Plut 'blood', Stul 'chair', Hus 'house', Thurn 'door', Stene 'sun', Brunn 'spring, fountain', Menu 'meat'.

In stressed syllable MNethl (u) represented [y], [j]-, and [p]: in unstressed syllable it represented [y] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27, 28). In Early New High German, as in New High German, (u) could stand for a long vowel or a short vowel (cf. Moser 1929:§30, 49, 50).

In spite of Loewe's (1896:140) insistence that CG (u) in Plut, Stul, Bruder represents [y]: as in Middle Flemish, I think it unlikely that this is the case. The informant's native CGk had no front rounded vowels (cf. 5.3.3; Fig. 1), and he probably would have been unable to pronounce such sounds, even if they existed in NCG (cf. 5.4.1.8).

Van de Velde (1964:112) believes that Busbecq intended CG (u) in forms such as Plut, Stul, Hus to represent long [u]: as it does in German orthography. This interpretation is probably correct, although the pronunciation of the Early New High German forms corresponding to CG Plut, Stul, Hus would have varied from one German-speaking area to another, as would their spellings. In Middle German of the 16th century ENHG blut 'blood' and stul 'chair' would have had [u:] < MHGuo as a stem vowel (cf. Moser 1929:§81, p. 197). Riparium, a West Middle German dialect, preserved MHG ù in his 'house' as [u:] (cf. Moser 1929:§77, p. 161). Perhaps Busbecq was familiar with Middle German dialects, for his homeland, the Netherlands, bordered on the West Middle German dialect area. However, the German which Busbecq may have heard in Vienna would have shown quite a different vocalism in the three forms in question, for in Bavarian MHG ù
had been diphthongized to (au) = [aʊ], and MHG uo had been preserved as a diphthong, [uː], (cf. Moser 1929:§77, p. 154f; §81, p. 190f).

The variant spellings of Busbecq’s name (cf. fn. 2 above) lend support to the theory that CG (u) (at least in some forms) is intended to represent [uː]. The (u) in Busbecq, which in this French form is pronounced [bys'bek] (cf. Dudenz-Aussprachewörterbuch 1974:199), corresponds to (ou) = [uː] in the French form Bous(e)beque, and to (oe) = [uː] in the Netherlandic version Boesbeke (Boesbeke) (cf. 6.6.1.11; 6.6.1.13).

I agree with van de Velde (1964) that Busbecq probably intended to indicate [uː] by writing (u) in CG Plut, Stul, Bruder, Hus, and possibly in CG Sune. However, the informant probably pronounced a shorter vowel here, CG [u] (L [u]) (cf. 5.3.3.3), i.e. CGk /u/ (cf. 5.4.1.5).

In the form CG Brunna ‘spring, fountain’ the doubled symbol (nn) would appear to indicate a preceding short vowel (cf. 6.6.2.24), but this spelling may simply have been influenced by the corresponding German form, ENHG (Upper German) brunn(en) (cf. Moser 1929:§74, p. 135). The Middle Netherlandic form was borne, and the New Netherlandic form (since the 16th century) was bron (cf. Schönfeld and van Loey 1959:§58). The German form was apparently closer to what Busbecq heard. In my opinion, the (u) in CG Brunna, Thunn—as well as in CG Plut, Stul, Bruder, Hus, Sune and elsewhere in stressed syllables—represents the informant’s CG [u] (L [u]) (cf. 5.4.1.5).

6.6.1.15 CG (y): In 15th century MNethl (y) was a variant of (i) = [e], and of (i), (ii) = [iː] (cf. van Loey 1962:§71a,n.; §66a,n.2; Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27, 28). ENHG (y) represented [iː] (cf. Moser 1929:§7, p. 17). CG (y) probably stands for CG (i) or (ei) in CG Mycha ‘sword’, fyder ‘four’, fyf (for *ffyf) ‘five’, nyne ‘nine’, and possibly in reithyen ‘thirty’ (cf. 6.6.1.8). Busbecq may sometimes have perceived CG (i) (ei) as a long vowel, and sometimes as a short vowel (cf. CG (i): 6.6.1.7).

6.6.1.16 CG (ye): Cf. CG (ie) (6.6.1.8).

6.6.2 The Consonants (alphabetically arranged)

6.6.2.1 CG (b), e.g. in Bruder ‘brother’, Boga ‘bow’, Broe ‘bread’, clearly represents a voiced bilabial stop, [b].

6.6.2.2 CG (c), which occurs in Cadariou ‘soldier’, represents a voiceless velar stop, [k]. Cf. CG (ck) (6.6.2.4), (k) (6.6.2.10).

6.6.2.3 CG (ch): The digraph (ch) occurs in a number of CG forms, e.g. Lachen ‘to laugh’, Ich ‘I’, Mycha ‘sword’, Telich ‘foolish’, VVichtgata ‘white’. The (ch) for PGmc *k in CG Lachen is not entirely unexpected, but the CG forms Ich and Mycha with (ch) for PGmc *k are particularly interesting, since we might expect (k) here (cf. 5.4.2.9).

In Middle Netherlandic (ch) represented the voiceless velar fricative [x] (cf. van Loey 1962:§111). In Early New High German the digraph (ch) regularly stood for both the allophones of x/ , the voiceless velar fricative [x] and the voiceless palatal fricative [ç], which had developed in late Middle High German (cf. Penzl 1969:§52). In Flanders and Brabant (ch) frequently replaced MNethl (k) (cf. van Loey 1962:§110), but surely Busbecq would not have chosen (ch) to represent CG [k] in this transcription, for he would immediately have recognized that a form such as CG Ich for [ik] or even [iːk] (with aspirated [kʰ]) would be interpreted as being equivalent to German ich, [ɪç].

I believe we must assume that the CG digraph (ch) always represents the informant’s CG [x], a voiceless velar fricative, and never the palatal fricative [ç], since only the former sound occurred in his native CGk (cf. 5.3.4.8).

6.6.2.4 CG (ck): This symbol, which appears only in the form CG Rinck ‘ring’, is a variant of CG (k) and represents a voiceless velar stop, [k]. Cf. CG (c) (6.6.2.2), (k) (6.6.2.10).

6.6.2.5 CG (d), occurs in a number of CG forms, e.g. Bruder ‘brother’, Ada ‘egg’, fyder ‘four’, Handa ‘hand’, sada ‘one hundred’, clearly represents a voice dental stop, [d].

6.6.2.6 CG (f), e.g. in Fisch ‘fish’, Hoef ‘head’, clearly represents a voiceless labio-dental fricative, [f].

6.6.2.7 CG (g), (gh): In prevocalic position except after (a), Busbecq’s graphemes CG (g), (gh) probably represent a voiceless velar fricative, [ɣ], e.g. CG Golzt ‘gold’, Geen ‘to go’, Boga ‘bow’, Oeghene ‘eyes’, VVaghen ‘wagon’, Reghen ‘rain’.

MNethl /ɣ/ was usually spelled (gh) before front vowels, (g) elsewhere (cf. van Loey 1962:§112). This explains CG (gh) in Oeghene, VVaghen, Reghen, versus CG (g) in Golzt, Boga (but cf. (g) in CG Geen). The digraph (gh) for (ɣ) also occurs in Low German and in Middle German, especially Middle Franconian (cf. Moser 1929:§37, p. 63). We might expect Busbecq to have written (ghh) or (gg) for a voice velar stop, (gh) (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§23; van Loey 1962:§112). Since he does not, it is probable that CG (g) and (gh) represent [ɣ], a sound which the informant had in his native CGk (cf. 5.3.4.2; Fig. 2).

CG (g) in Tag ‘day’ is the only example of an orthographic symbol which might suggest a voice obstructed in final position in CG. MNethl /ɣ/ does not occur finally, for here it was replaced with /x/, which is usually spelled (ch) in Middle Netherlandic, e.g. MNethl dach ‘day’ (cf. BG days). However, MNethl (g) or (gh) sometimes occurs for final MNethl /x/ when it corresponds to medial /ɣ/ in related forms (cf. van Loey 1962:§112). It is therefore probable that (g) in CG Tag represents a voiceless velar fricative, [x], just as it does in New Netherlandic orthography (cf. NNethl dag ‘day’). The sound [x] was available to the Greek informant as CGk /x/ (cf. 5.3.4; Fig. 2).

In the combinations (ng) and (ngh), as in the forms CG Singhen ‘to sing',
Ringo 'ring', CG (g) and (gh) apparently represent a voiced velar stop, [g], as they did in Middle Dutch (cf. van Loey 1962:§106). Although CG lacked the phoneme /g/, [g] did occur allophonically in the cluster [gg] (cf. 5.3.4.6; 5.4.2.8). In Early New High German the digraph (ng) represented the phoneme /ng/ from earlier [gg] (cf. Penzl 1969:§52). However, the appearance of CG (nk), which clearly represents [nk], in place of (ng) in final position, as seen in CG Rinck 'ring' next to CG Ringo 'ring', points to [ng] for CG (ng(h)). CG (nk) in Rinck is also further indication of the spirantal quality of (g) and (gh) where not preceded by (n), for otherwise we would expect CG *Tack for CG Tag 'day'.

6.6.2.8 (h): The appearance of CG (h) in Hus 'house', Hoef 'head', Handa 'hand' would seem to point to the preservation of PGmc *χ between initial vowels in NCG as a glottal fricative, [h], since (h) in corresponding MNeth hauss, hovet, hant and ENGH haus, haupt, hand(t) also represents [h] (cf. van Loey 1962:§113; Penzl 1969:§60.4). However, initial prevoicalic [h] had disappeared in Middle Flemish, although (h) was retained (without consistency) in the orthography (cf. van Loey 1962:§121). We would therefore expect the highly educated Busbecq to write initial (h) in those CG forms corresponding to Netherlandic words which were regularly spelled with initial (h) (and which in some dialects of Netherlandic preserved initial PGmc *χ as [h]). Because initial [h] was lacking in Busbecq's native Flemish, it would have been natural for him to write initial (h2) in these cases, whether or not he actually heard initial CG [h]. Therefore, initial CG (h) in the above forms may actually correspond to ɔ in the respective CG utterances. This is suggested first of all by the fact that the informant did not have the sound [h] in his native CGk (cf. 5.3.4; Fig. 2), but especially by the absence of initial (h) in certain CG forms which Busbecq did not recognize as Germanic ("cum nostra lingua non satis congruentia") , but whose Germanic cognates show initial [h] < PGmc *χ: CG Ano 'hen, chicken' (cf. BG hana, ON hane, OHG hano 'cock'), Ael 'stone' (cf. BG hallus, ON halir, OE heall), Ieltsch 'alive, well, healthy' (cf. BG hails, ON heill, OHG heill 'healthy, well'). In my opinion, the informant pronounced initial CG [h] neither in CG Ano, Ael, Ieltsch, nor in CG Hus, Hoef, Handa. In these last three forms the presence of initial CG (h) reflects more orthographic tradition, this symbol having been introduced by Busbecq, who associated these CG forms with their cognates in Netherlandic and/or German. In light of the preceding, initial CG (h) in hazer 'one thousand' requires explanation. Busbecq's informant may well have pronounced initial CG [x] in this form, which is Iranian in origin. Otherwise we might expect Busbecq, who presumably knew no Iranian dialects, to have transcribed this form as CG *azer (cf. 5.4.2.4).

6.6.2.9 CG (i): In CG Iel 'life, health', Ieltsch 'alive, healthy', Ies 'he', CG (i) represents, in my opinion, a voiced palatal fricative, [j], so that initial CG (ie) in these forms stands for [je] (cf. 5.4.1.2). Prevoicalic (i) was commonly used in the 16th century to represent [j] (cf. Moser 1929:§12, pp. 233). This usage is demonstrated in the Latin text of Busbecq's report by words such as iussus and dictiicare. CG (ie) in these forms has also been interpreted as representing [i] (cf. von Grienberger 1898:131; Schwarz 1951:169).

6.6.2.10 CG (k), e.g. Kor 'grain', Kommen 'to come', represents a voiceless velar stop, [k]. Cf. CG (c) (6.6.2.2), (ck) (6.6.2.4).

6.6.2.11 CG (l), e.g. Lachen 'to laugh', Stul 'chair', represents a lateral, [l].

6.6.2.12 CG (m) and (mm), e.g. Mine 'moon', Kommen 'to come', represent a labial nasal, [m].

6.6.2.13 CG (n), (nn): Except before velar consonants, CG (n), (nn) represent a dental nasal, [n], as in CG Reghen 'rain', nyne 'nine', Brunsa 'spring, fountain'.

Before velar consonants, e.g. Rinck, Ringo 'ring', Singhen 'to sing', CG (n) represents a velar nasal, [ŋ], as in Middle Netherlandic (cf. van Loey 1962:§106). The velar nasal, [ŋ], was available to the informant as an allophone of CGk /n/ in the sequence /nk/ = [ŋg] (cf. 5.3.4.6; 5.4.2.8; 6.6.2.7).

6.6.2.14 CG (p), e.g. Plut 'blood', Schlipen 'to sleep', Apel 'apple', clearly represents a voiceless bilabial stop, [p].

6.6.2.15 CG (r), (rr), e.g. Rinck 'ring', Bruder 'brother', Borrotsch 'wish', represents a trill, probably apico-alveolar [r], a sound which the informant had in his native CGk (cf. 5.3.4; Fig. 2).

6.6.2.16 CG (s), e.g. in Salt 'salt', Singhen 'to sing', Hus 'house', seis 'six', Siluar 'silver', represents a voiceless alveolar sibilant, [s]. Surely Busbecq would have transcribed an initial voiced alveolar sibilant as (z) (cf. van Loey 1962:§116), a symbol he uses in CG hazer 'one thousand' and Marthus 'wedding, marriage'. The forms above with initial and final CG (s) suggest that this symbol always stands for [s]. Cf., however, CG (sc), (sch), (st) (6.6.2.17; 6.6.2.18).

6.6.2.17 CG (sc), (sch): Busbecq uses the trigraph (sch) in several CG forms in initial and final position, e.g. Schuus (for *Schnos) 'fiancée', Schueuster 'sister', Schiet 'to shoot', Schlipen 'to sleep', Rintsch 'mountain', Borrotsch 'wish', Ieltsch 'alive, healthy', Fisc (for *Fisch) 'fish'.

In initial position MNeth (sch) regularly stood for the cluster [sx], whereas medially and finally it stood for [s] (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§33). In Early New High German (sch) represented the voiceless palatal sibilant [s] in all positions, as it had already in the Middle High German period (cf. Penzl 1969:§51).

* It is possible that these forms were transcribed with (je) in Busbecq's original manuscript, and that (j) was set as (ie) during the first printing of the fourth Turkish letter (Busbequius 1589).
Since it is hardly plausible that initial NCG *[sxr]*, *[sxv]*, and *[sxh]* could have developed from historical *sn*, *sw*, and *sl* in CG *Schuus* (for *Schnos*), *Schuester*, *Schilpen*, it appears that Busbecq intended initial CG (sch) to represent [s] as it does in German, not only where it is a reflex of PGmc *s*, but also where it corresponds to PGmc *sk*, as in CG *Schiët*, which immediately precedes CG *Schilpen* in Busbecq’s list (cf. Plate IV, p. 24).

In final position, CG (sch) may represent [s] in the form Fiscst (for *Fisch*). Busbecq apparently modeled this word after corresponding ENHG fisch (with initial (f)) rather than corresponding MNethl, NNethl visch (with initial (v)). Since final ENHG (sch) = [s], it is possible that Busbecq intended to indicate final [s] in CG *Fisch*.

Elsewhere in final position CG (sch) appears to represent final CG [-s]: e.g., CG Jeltsch ‘alive, healthy’, Rintsch ‘mountain’, Vlentsch (for *Vlentsch*) ‘wind’, Borrotsch ‘wish’. Here (after (t)) Busbecq writes final (sch) for [s], following Netherlandic orthography (cf. also Jellinek 1926:777).

CG (sc) occurs in two unobscured forms of the cantilena: CG Scu and Heemisclp. MNethl (sc), which was a variant of (sch) (cf. van Loey 1962:§116), appeared before back vowels (cf. Franck 1910:§99). Therefore, CG (sc) may represent [s] in Scu and [s] in Heemisclp, but the possibility that (sc) = [sk] in both forms should also be considered (cf. 10).

6.6.2.18 CG (st), e.g. in Stul ‘chair’, Stein (for *Stern* ‘star’, Statz ‘land’, would seem to represent [st], since Busbecq gives no indication that this spelling represents anything other than its Netherlandic value, [st] (cf. van Loey 1962:§116). In CG Schilpen ‘to sleep’, Schuester ‘sister’, Schuus (for *Schnos*) ‘fiancée’ he indicated initial CG ([st], [sv], [sn] as (sch) -, (schn) -, (schn) -, respectively. Had he intended to indicate initial CG [st] in Stul, Statz, etc., we might expect him to have transcribed this cluster as (scht). It is quite possible, however, that Busbecq was following German orthography here, as suggested by Schwarz (1951:171). In Early New High German, as in New High German, initial (st-) represented the cluster [st-] (cf. Moser 1951:§146), so that initial CG (st-) may also stand for [st-]. The development of initial NCG ([sn]) from PGmc *sn*, as evidenced by CG Schuus (for *Schnos*) ‘fiancée’ (cf. ON snor, OHG snur ‘daughter-in-law’), lends some support to this interpretation. Initial PGmc *[s]*-, like PGmc *[sn]*-, was a cluster consisting of *s* plus dental consonant, and thus its development in NCG may well have paralleled that of PGmc *sn*-, i.e. PGmc *[st]* > NCG *[st]*-. In such a case the development of initial PGmc *[sl]*-, *[sw]*-, *[sn]*-, *[st]*- in NCG would correspond to that in German (cf. Penz1 1969:§51).

6.6.2.19 CG (t), (th): CG (t), e.g. in Tag ‘day’, Plut ‘blood’, Stul ‘chair’, Salt ‘salt’, clearly represents a voiceless dental stop, [t]. CG (th), e.g. in Thurn ‘door’, thine ‘ten’, Athe ‘eight’ is simply a variant of (t) as it is in Middle Netherlandic and in Early New High German (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§33; Moser 1929:§29, p. 42).

6.6.2.20 CG (tz): The most interesting CG consonant symbol is the digraph (tz), which appears in four forms: CG Tzo ‘you’, Goltz ‘gold’, Statz ‘land’, Galtzou (unglossed form in the cantilena). In the first three examples (tz) corresponds to PGmc *Þ* (cf. BG †Bu ‘you’, guila, dat. sg. ‘gold’, stapa dat. sg. ‘shore’). Although PGmc *Þ* also appears as CG (t), (th), and (d), the CG digraph (tz) always corresponds to PGmc *Þ* (except perhaps in CG Galtzou). For this reason, the possibility of a misprint of CG (tz), e.g. for (th), appears unlikely. CG (tz) must therefore be explained in another way.

The digraph (tz) is common in German where it represents the affricate [ts]. However, I do not believe with Mitzka (Braune and Mitzka 1967:§83, p. 82) that Busbecq misread CG [tz] as [ts] in the forms he transcribes with (tz), since CG [ts] is transcribed by Busbecq as (tsch) (cf. CG Jeltsch, Rintsch, Vlentsch for *Vlentsch*; 6.6.2.17).

Loewe (1896:141) proposes that the CG digraph (tz) is perhaps an attempt by Busbecq to represent a voiced interdental fricative [ð]. Voiced [ð] may be present in CG Tzo, but seems unlikely in the case of Goltz and Statz, since there is good indication that voiced obstruents do not occur in final position in CG (cf. 7.2). Both [ð] and [t] were available to the informant in his native CG (cf. 5.3.4; Fig. 2), but neither existed in 16th century Netherlandic or German. It is therefore doubtful that Busbecq would have distinguished between [ð] and [t], and he may have written (tz) for both sounds, should they have occurred in the informant’s CG.

As has been pointed out above (5.4.2.7), Busbecq’s use of the German digraph (tz), which represents ENHG, NHG [ts], appears to be an attempt to transcribe a voiceless interdental fricative, CG [t]. His association of [t] with [ts] is in keeping with Erasmus’ comments on Greek (θ), as pointed out by Jellinek (1926:777): “[[CG] tz ist gewiss Lautersatz für p; ein anderer Niederländer, Erasmus von Rotterdam, der griesch. θ engl. th in thief, smith gleichsätzlich, berichtet: ‘qui crusse docent, monstrant θ propemodum sonare, quod nobis sonat θ’...” In my opinion, Busbecq did not confuse [θ] with [ts], but rather, at a loss to transcribe [θ] with conventional orthographic symbols (CG (th) represents [t]): cf. 6.6.2.19, employed the digraph (tz), which represented a sound he thought was similar to [θ].

6.6.2.21 CG (u): In the forms CG seuen ‘seven’, Siluir ‘silver’, and possibly Knauen ‘good’ CG (u) has consonantal function (cf. vocalic CG (u): 6.6.1.14; CG (au): 6.6.1.3), and probably represents a voiced labio-dental fricative, [v], as it did in Middle Netherlandic (cf. van Loey 1962:§109). Busbecq describes CG seuen as being identical to the corresponding Flemish word (“. . . seuene, prorsus, ut nos Flandrii”)

6.6.2.22 CG (uu), (vv): The appearance of CG (vv) and its medial variant (uu) in CG Vlentsch ‘wind’, WVaghen ‘wagon’, Vvingart ‘vine branch’, Schuester ‘sister’, which Busbecq recognized as Germanic, and whose transcriptions he modeled (in part at least) after corresponding forms in Netherlandic and/or German (cf. MNethl wint, waghen, wingart, ENHG waghen, schwester), suggests that he
intended this spelling to represent a sound similar to Nethl ⟨w⟩ or German ⟨w⟩. MNethl ⟨w⟩ represented a voiced bilabial glide, ⟨w⟩, or a voiced bilabial fricative, ⟨β⟩ (cf. van Loey 1962:§101; Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§20, n. 4). ENHG ⟨w⟩ was a voiced labio-dental fricative, ⟨v⟩ (cf. Penzl 1969:§60.1).

Since Busbecq uses ⟨u⟩ in CG Siluir ‘silver’, seunne ‘seven’ to represent ⟨v⟩ (cf. 6.6.2.21), it would appear that he intended ⟨vv⟩, ⟨uw⟩ to represent a sound other than ⟨v⟩, namely ⟨β⟩ or ⟨w⟩. But the Greek informant had no ⟨β⟩ or ⟨w⟩ in his native CGk, only labio-dental ⟨w⟩ (cf. 5.3.4), and thus probably pronounced ⟨v⟩ in CG Vwicht, Schauerste, etc., as well as in CG Siluir, seunne, possibly neutralizing a distinction between NCG *v/w and *v/w or *v/w and *β/. The divergent spellings in the CG forms can be interpreted as having been influenced by Netherlandic orthography: cf. MNethl silver, seven vs. wint, wagen, etc.

6.6.2.23 CG ⟨z⟩: CG ⟨z⟩ occurs in hazar ‘one thousand’ Marzus ‘wedding, marriage’, dorbiza (unglossed form in the cantilena) and probably represents a voiced alveolar sibilant, ⟨z⟩, as does MNethl ⟨z⟩ (cf. van Loey 1962:§116). In German and Italian ⟨z⟩ represents an affricate, but Busbecq surely intended CG ⟨z⟩ in the form hazar to represent the same sound as Nethl ⟨z⟩: CG hazer has as its source MPers hazār, where ⟨z⟩ = ⟨z⟩.

6.6.2.24 Doubled consonant symbols in CG: Although there is some possibility that geminate consonants may still have been pronounced in Middle Netherlandic as long consonants (cf. van Loey 1962:§XIV, p. 6), this was surely no longer the case in the 16th century. By Busbecq’s time doubled consonant spellings in Netherlandic simply indicated that the preceding vowel was short (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:§27). Doubled consonant spellings occur in CG Kommen ‘to come’, Brenna ‘spring, fountain’, Borrotsch ‘wish’. Since CGk did not have geminate consonants (cf. 5.3.4.3), it is doubtful that Busbecq’s Greek informant could have reproduced such consonants in CG (cf. 5.4.2.2). The ⟨rr⟩ in CG Borrotsch may simply indicate a short preceding vowel, and the spellings ⟨nn⟩ in CG Kommen and ⟨nn⟩ in CG Brenna have been explained as imitations of Flemish and German spellings, respectively (cf. 6.6.1.10; 6.6.1.14).

7. Crimean Gothic Phonology: Its Development from Proto-Germanic

Presented here is an overview of the development of CG vowels and consonants from Proto-Germanic. This outline is based on the analysis of the CG data undertaken in chapters 4, 5, 6, and in Part II. (For a different interpretation, cf. Molinari [1975].)

7.1 The Vowels

It is probable that word stress in NCG corresponded to that in other Germanic languages, so that we can assume, for example, CG Vwāhen, Sīnhen, Brūder, Lāchen, etc. (cf. NHG Wāgen, sīngen, Brūder, lāchen). This assumption allows us to discuss the development of vowels in stressed and unstressed syllables in CG. The vowels reconstructed for Proto-Germanic serve as a starting point in this development (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§§30-34; Penzl 1975:§3.5, 10.1, 10.2).

7.1.1 Short Vowels in Stressed Syllable (cf. Fig. 4)

From Proto-Germanic to Native Crimean Gothic

7.1.1.1 PGmc *i has been preserved as NCG *iː: CG Siluir, Fisct (for *Fischt), trīa, thiunetrīa.

7.1.1.2 PGmc *e is regularly preserved as NCG *eː: CG Reghen, Schauerste, Fers, Stein (for *Stern), Ies, seis, seunne. Before nasal plus consonant PGmc *e merges with PGmc *i as NCG *iː: CG Vwicht (for *Vwichts), fyf (for *fyf), Rinck, Ringo, Rintsch, Singhen (cf. also CG Menus). In CG fyder PGmc *e appears to have merged with NCG *iː before an originally following ⟨u⟩ (cf. also CG thiine, seunne).

7.1.1.3 PGmc *u continues in NCG as *ːuː: CG Vwīgart, Alt, Salt, Vwāhen, Tag, Hanada, Apel, Schuath, Statz, Ate, Bars, Lachen, Ada, Ano, Aotchta, malthata, Baar, Ael (cf. also CG Vvarhata and Varhata [both for Vvarhata], Gadeltha). There is no apparent reflex of Common Gmc *ā < PGmc *aː before *χ (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§42).

7.1.1.4 PGmc *u is preserved as NCG *ːuː: CG Sune, Brunna, Thurn, vburt.
Before originally following *o, *a PGmc *u becomes NCG */oː/: CG Goltz, Kor (for *Korn), Boga (cf. also CG Kommen, Borrotsch).

From Native Crimean Gothic to Crimean Gothic

7.1.2.1 NCG */i/ is reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [i] ([iː]; cf. 5.4.1.5) which Busbecq transcribes as (i) (cf. 6.6.1.7) in CG Siluir, Fisc (for *Fisch), tria, thanetria, VVintch (for *VVintsch), Rineck, Ringo, Rintsch, Singhon (cf. also thiine); as (y) (cf. 6.6.1.15) in CG fyder, fryf (for *fyrf); and possibly as (e) in CG Menus, seune.

7.1.2.2 NCG */e/ in initial position is reproduced by the informant as CG [je] (cf. 5.4.1.2), which Busbecq transcribes as (ie) (cf. 6.6.1.8) in CG les. In the one-syllable word CG seis the informant pronounces NCG */e/ as [ei] (cf. 5.4.1.1), which is transcribed as (ei) (cf. 6.6.1.6). Elsewhere the informant reproduces NCG */e/ as CG [e], which Busbecq transcribes as (e) (6.6.1.4): CG Reghen, Schuweester, Stein (for *Stern), Fers, seune.

7.1.2.3 NCG */a/ is pronounced by the informant as CG [a] ([aː]; cf. 5.4.1.5), which Busbecq transcribes as (aa) in Baar, (ae) in Ael, and as (a) elsewhere (cf. 6.6.1.1; 6.6.1.2): VVingart, Alt, Salt, VVaghen, Tag, Handa, Apel, Schuwaalth, Statz, Athe, Bars, Lachen, Ada, Ano, Atochta, malthata, Vvarhata, Varhata, Galdeitha.

7.1.2.4 NCG */oː/ is reproduced by the informant as [o] ([oː]; cf. 5.4.1.5), for which Busbecq writes (o) (6.6.1.10): CG Goltz, Kor, Boga, Schuas (for *Schnoos), Kommen, Borrotsch. Cf. also CG -kop in Kilemschkop.
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7.1.2.5 PGmc *i appears to be preserved as NCG */iː/, as seen by CG VVingart, where VVin- reflects a Common Germanic loan word from Latin vinum.

7.1.2.6 PGmc *ei appears in hiatus position as CG (e) in Geen, Breen. Preserved here as NCG */eː/ or */eː/? Merger with *(e)? (cf. 7.1.2.5). Elsewhere PGmc *ei merges with PGmc *i as NCG */iː/: CG Mine, Schlipen, Mycha, Lista (cf. also CG Eriten [for *Criten, *Kriten, or *Griten]).

7.1.2.7 PGmc *u is preserved as NCG */uː/, as seen in CG Hus.

7.1.2.8 PGmc *i merges with PGmc *i as NCG */uː/: CG Plut, Stul, Bruder.

7.1.2.9 PGmc *ei merges with PGmc *i as NCG */iː/ in CG VVichtgata (for *VVigious) (cf. also CG Eriten [for *Criten, *Kriten or *Griten]). A possible reflex of PGmc *ei > *ez (cf. van Coetsem 1970:4.216; PenzL 1975:4.6) is CG (e) in stega (but cf. 7.1.2.7). Here *ez may be preserved as NCG */eː/ or */eː/.

7.1.2.10 PGmc *eu appears to have merged with PGmc *ei and *i as NCG */iː/ in CG Schiei (cf. also CG Miera, nyne, furdeithen).

7.1.2.11 PGmc *ai is reflected as (ei) in CG Ielsch, Iel (noun), and Iel (adjective). Another possible reflex of PGmc *ai is CG (e) in stega, but this (e) could also reflect *ez (cf. 7.1.2.5). CG *ai appears to have been monophthongized in NCG, where it merges with *ez as NCG */eː/ or */eː/.

7.1.2.12 PGmc *au has apparently been monophthongized in NCG, probably as */aː/ or */əː/: CG Broe, Hoef, Oegheine.
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7.1.2.13 NCG */iː/ is reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [i] ([iː]; cf. 5.4.1.5), which Busbecq records as (i) (cf. 6.6.1.7) in CG VVingart, VVichtigata (for *VVigious), Mine, Schlipen, Eriten (for *Criten, *Kriten, or *Griten), as (y) (cf. 6.6.1.15) in CG Mycha, nyne, and as (e) (cf. 6.6.1.8) in CG Schie, Miera (cf. also CG thiine, treithyen, furdeithen).

7.1.2.14 NCG */eː/ (*/eː/) is pronounced by the informant as [je] where it occurred in initial position (cf. 5.4.1.2). Busbecq transcribes this as (ie) (6.6.1.8): CG Ielsch, Iel (noun), Iel (adjective). Elsewhere NCG */eː/ (*/eː/) is reproduced by the informant as CG [e] ([eː]) (cf. 5.4.1.5), which Busbecq records as (e) (6.6.1.4; 6.6.1.5): CG stega, Geen, Breen.

7.1.2.15 NCG */uː/ is reproduced by the informant as CG [u] ([uː]) (cf. 5.4.1.5), which Busbecq transcribed as (u) (cf. 6.6.1.14): CG Hus, Plut, Stul.

7.1.2.16 NCG */oː/ (*/oː/) is reproduced by the informant as CG [o] ([oː]) (cf. 5.4.1.5), which Busbecq transcribes as (oe) (cf. 6.6.1.11): CG Broe (for *Broet), Hoef (for *Hoef), Oegheine.
7.1.3 Vowels in Unstressed Syllable (cf. Fig. 6)
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7.1.3.1 Because of the inconsistency in the CG reflexes of Proto-Germanic vowels (monophthongs) in unstressed syllable, it appears that a weakening of these vowels to */a/* has taken place here in NCG as it has in other Germanic languages. Compare for example the following reflexes of Proto-Germanic vowels in unstressed syllable: PGmc */a/* in CG Branna, Boga but also in CG Bruder, Schiête, Schlipen, Ringe; PGmc */i/* in CG Mychar; PGmc */u/* in CG Handa; PGmc */o/* in CG Oegheine (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969:§28). Compare also CG ⟨e⟩ for Middle Persian ā in CG Hazer, and epenthetic vowels written ⟨e⟩, ⟨i⟩ in CG Reghen, Waghen, Apel, Siluhr. I believe with Loeve (1896:141ff) that these examples indicate that Proto-Germanic vowels have been reduced to NCG */a/* in unstressed syllable.
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7.1.3.2 The appearance of NCG */a/* not only as CG ⟨e⟩, but also as CG ⟨a⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩ results from the substitution by the informant of vowels other than ⟨a⟩ for NCG */a/* (cf. 5.4.1.3). Where Busbecq writes CG ⟨a⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩ in unstressed syllable we can assume that the informant has substituted ⟨a⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩.

[u] for NCG */a/*. Where Busbecq writes CG ⟨e⟩ in unstressed syllable it is possible that it represents the informant's ⟨e⟩. However, in some words which Busbecq links to corresponding Netherlandic or German vocabulary this ⟨e⟩ has probably been influenced by Netherlandic and/or German orthography (cf. 6.6.1.4). Possible examples are CG Schlipen, Bruder, Apel, Sune.

7.1.4 The Vowel System of Native Crimean Gothic (cf. Fig. 7)

The preceding interpretation yields a vowel system for NCG which shows great symmetry. There may also have been a long */a/*-phoneme in NCG, so that the contrasting vowels NCG */a/* and */a/* would parallel the other long/short pairs, NCG */i/* ≠ */i/*, */e/* ≠ */e/*, */u/* ≠ */u/*, */o/* ≠ */o/*. However, there is no evidence for NCG */a/* in the CG data (cf. 7.1.1.3).

Figure 7
The vowel system of Native Crimean Gothic
7.2 The Consonants

7.2.1 Labials (cf. Fig. 8)
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7.2.1.1 PGmc *p becomes NCG */p/, a voiceless fortis bilabial stop, in CG Schlipen, Apel (cf. also CG -kop in Kilemskhop).

7.2.1.2 PGmc *f remains in NCG as */f/, a voiceless fortis fricative, probably labio-dental: CG Fisck (for *Fisch), Fers, fyder, fyuf (for *fyuf), fardeithen.

7.2.1.3 PGmc *b: In initial position PGmc *b becomes NCG */b/, a lenis bilabial stop having voiced and voiceless allophones, *[b] and *[b]. In the CG data the voiceless allophone *[b] occurs before */f/ in CG Plut. Elsewhere in the data NCG */b/ occurs as *(b): CG Bruder, Boga, Bars (for *Bart), Broe (for *Broet), Bruna, Baar, Breen, Borrotsch. Between sonorants PGmc *b becomes NCG */v/, a voiced lenis fricative, probably labio-dental: CG seuen, Silair. In final position and before voiceless consonants PGmc *b merges with PGmc *f as NCG */v/: CG Hoef (for *Hoef).

7.2.1.4 PGmc *w (r) appears to have been lost in the cluster PGmc *gw (*gw), as seen in CG Singhen; possibly also in PGmc *kw (*kw): cf. CG Kommen. PGmc *w has become vocalic in CG tua, where it merges with NCG */w/ (cf. 7.1.1.4). Elsewhere PGmc *w probably becomes NCG */v/, a voiced lenis labio-dental fricative (merging intervocically with PGmc *b in CG Knauen?).

Cf. Vlivingart, VWichty (for *Wichty), VBricty (for *Wicty), Vwarta and Vartata (both for *Warta), vbart (for *vwart), Schuuester, Schuwaith.
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7.2.1.5 NCG */p/ is reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [p] which Busbecq transcribes as ⟨p⟩ (6.6.2.14): CG Apel, Schlipen (cf. also CG Kilemskhop).

7.2.1.6 NCG */f/ is pronounced by the informant as CG [f], which is transcribed by Busbecq as ⟨f⟩ (cf. 6.6.2.6): CG Fisck (for *Fisch), Fers, fyder, fyuf (for *fyuf), fardeithen, Hoef (for *Hoef).

7.2.1.7 NCG */b/: The informant misinterprets the voiceless allophone of NCG */b/ as NCG */p/, pronouncing NCG *[b] as CG [p] (cf. 5.4.2.5), which Busbecq

transcribes as ⟨p⟩ (cf. 6.6.2.14) in CG Plut. Elsewhere in the CG data NCG */b/ apparently occurs as a voiced *[b] which the informant correctly reproduces as CG [b], transcribed by Busbecq as ⟨b⟩ (6.6.2.1): CG Bruder, Boga, Bars (for *Bart), Broe (for *Broet), Bruna, Baar, Breen, Borrotsch.

7.2.1.8 NCG */v/ is correctly reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [v]. Busbecq’s transcription of CG [v] would appear to indicate a distinction between the reflexes of PGmc *b and *w (cf. 7.2.1.3; 7.2.1.4), but this is probably the result of the influence of Netherlandish orthography. He writes (u) for CG [v] in CG Silair, seune (but also in CG Knauen?) (6.6.2.21); ⟨uu⟩ in CG Schuuester, Schuwaith; ⟨vv⟩ in CG Vlivingart, VWichty (for *Wichty), VWarta (for *Warta), Vwarta and Vartata (both for *Warta), vbart (for *vwart) (6.6.2.22).

![Diagram](image)

Figure 8

The development of the labials in Crimean Gothic

7.2.2 Dentals (cf. Fig. 9)
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7.2.2.1 PGmc *p: In medial position, in initial position before *r, and initially in the unaccented articles304 PGmc *p merges with */d as NCG */d/, a lenis dental stop (cf. 7.2.2.2): CG Bruder, fardeithen, tria, thaneteria, treithyen, tho, the, 1

1 Loewe (1903:4) also explains the divergent development of initial PGmc *p in the CG articles as a result of reduced stress.

304 The development of PGmc *p in these positions in NCG has a parallel in Old High German. As I have noted above (5. fn. 32), these positions were among those in which OHG [d] for */p/ < PGmc *p first appeared (cf. Penzl 1971:§18.3b).
-thata in malthata and Varthata/Varthata (both for *VVarthata). Elsewhere PGmc *ṭ is preserved as an interdental spirant, NCG *θ/θ: CG Tzo, Goltz, Statz.

7.2.2.2 PGmc *d: In final position and before voiceless consonants PGmc *d merges with *r as NCG *u/, a fortis stop: CG VVingar, Alt, Plut, VVintch (for *VVintsch), Rintsch, Borrotsch, vburt (for *vuvrt) (cf. 7.2.2.3). Elsewhere *d becomes NCG *d/, a lenis stop with voiced and voiceless allophones, *[d] and *[d]. The voiced allophone *[d] occurs intervocally and medially after liquids and nasals: cf. CG *(d) for PGmc *d in CGfyder, Handa (also in CG Gadeltha?). NCG *[d]/(d)/ also occurs for PGmc *h in CGBruder, furdeithen (cf. 7.2.2.1) and for PGmc *ji- in CG Ada (cf. 7.2.5.2). The voiceless allophone of NCG *(d), *(d), occurs in initial position as seen by the appearance of CG (t), (th) for PGmc *d in CGTags, Thurn. NCG *(d)/(d)/ also appears for PGmc *h in CGtria, theu, the, -thata in malthata and Varthata/Varthata (both for *VVarthata) (cf. 7.2.2.1).

7.2.2.3 PGmc *r becomes NCG *u/, a fortis dental stop: CG tua, theu, *thetua (for *thetina), Schiet, Eriten (for *Criten, *Kriten, or *Griten), Stul, Stein (for *Stern), Statz, stega, Lista, Schuwerster, Salt, thine, thinitua, thunetia (for *thetina), treithen, furdeithen, Ahe, Schauwalt, Gadeltha, VVarthata/Varthata (both for *VVarthata), Atocha, VVichtgata, malthata. NCG *u/ also occurs for PGmc *d as seen by CG VVingar, Alt, Plut, VVintch (for *VVintsch), Rintsch, Borrotsch, vburt (for *vuvrt) (cf. 7.2.2.2).
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7.2.2.4 NCG *θ/θ is correctly reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [θ] (cf. 5.4.2.7), which Busbecq transcribes as (τζ) (6.6.2.20): CG Tzo, Goltz, Statz.

7.2.2.5 NCG *(d): The voiced allophone *[d] is accurately reproduced by the informant as CG [d] and transcribed by Busbecq as (d): CG fyder, Handa, Gadeltha, Bruder, furdeithen, Ada. The informant misinterprets NCG *(d), the voiceless allophone of NCG *(d), as NCG *u/ (cf. 7.2.2.3) and thus reproduces it as CG [t] (5.4.2.6, 5.4.2.7), which Busbecq transcribes as (t) or (th) (6.6.2.19): CG Tags, Thurn, tria, thunetia (for *thetina), treithen, the, the, -thata in malthata and Varthata/Varthata (both for *VVarthata).

7.2.2.6 NCG *(u/) is reproduced by the informant as CG [t], for which Busbecq writes (t) or (th) (6.6.2.19): CG tua, theu, *thetua (for *thetina), Schiet, Eriten (for *Criten, *Kriten, or *Griten), Stul, Stein (for *Stern), Statz, stega, Lista, Schuwerster, Salt, thine, thinitua, thunetia (for *thetina), treithen, furdeithen, Ahe, Schauwalt, Gadeltha, VVarthata/Varthata (both for *VVarthata), Atocha, VVichtgata (for *VVigtata), malthata, VVingar, Alt, Plut, VVintch (for *VVintsch), Rintsch, Borrotsch, vburt (for *vuvrt).

7.2.3 Velars (cf. Fig. 10)
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7.2.3.1 PGmc *k: Except in the cluster PGmc *sk (cf. 7.2.4.2), PGmc *k becomes NCG *k/θ, a voiceless fortis velar stop. This phoneme was probably realized as aspirated *(kʰ) in all positions in NCG: CG Kor (for *Korn), Kommen, Knuwen, -kop in Kimalschkop, Ich, Mycha.

7.2.3.2 PGmc *χ has apparently been lost in initial position in NCG before consonants and vowels, as seen by CG Ringo, Rinck, Lachen, VVichtgata (for *VVigtata), Ano, Ael, Iel (noun), Jel (adjective), Ieltsch. In CG Handa, Hus, Hof (for *Hof) initial CG (h) (for *h) has been introduced by Busbecq under influence of the spellings of the corresponding Netherlandic and/or German forms (6.6.2.8). Medially before, *j, PGmc *χ seems to have been preserved as NCG *(x)/: CG Lachen. Elsewhere in medial position, intervocally and before consonants, PGmc *χ is lost: CG thine, thinitua, thunetua (for *thetina), thunetria (for *thetina), treithen, furdeithen, seits, Atha.

7.2.3.3 PGmc *g: In initial position and medially (except after *n) PGmc *(g)

* In the present study the PGmc labio-velars *(k), *(g), *(x), are interpreted as the phoneme clusters PGmc *(kˌg) *(kʷg) *(kʃg) (cf. Pennz 1975:§36c(2)). PGmc *(kʰ) may be reflected by (k) in CG Kommen 'to come' (cf. BG gimen, OHG gueman) which would indicate loss of the labial element. The labial element of PGmc *(kètre) appears to have been lost also, as seen by CGSinghen 'to sing' (cf. BG sigeswan, OHG singen). PGmc *(k̞ʰ) is reflected by CG *(v) in VVichtgata (for *VVigtata) 'white' (cf. BG heits, ON hvitr, OE hwit).
apparently becomes NCG */ŋ/; a lenis velar fricative;* CG Goltz, Geen, Reghen, Oegehe, VVagh'en, Boga, stega (cf. also CG VVingart, Gadelthia, Eriten [for *Critten, *Kritten, or *Gritten]). PGmc *ng occurs as NCG */ŋg/ (= */nŋ/) as seen by CG Ringo (vs. CG Rinck), Singhen (cf. also CG VVingart). In final position (except after *n) PGmc *g probably becomes NCG */x/; a voiceless fortis velar fricative (compare the development of PGmc *b, *d > NCG */b, */d: 7.2.1.3; 7.2.2.2): CG Tag. In final position PGmc *ng (*/ŋg/) becomes NCG */gk/ (=/nk/), whereby *g merges with PGmc *k as NCG */k/ (7.2.3.1): CG Rinck.
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7.2.3.4 NCG */k/: The Greek informant apparently misinterprets post-vocalic NCG */k/, i.e. aspirated */kʰ/, as NCG */x/, reproducing it as CG [x] (5.4.2.9),

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{P PMC} & *k & *x & *ng \\
\text{NCG} & *k/ & *[kʰ] & *x/ & *y/ & *[ŋg] \\
\text{Recorded by Busbecq as:} & (k) & (ch) & (h) & (ch) & (g) & (ng) \\
\text{Reproduced by informant as CG:} & [k] & [x] & [h] & [y] & [ŋg] \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 10

The development of the velars in Crimean Gothic

which is transcribed by Busbecq as ⟨ch⟩ (6.6.2.3): CG Ich, Mycha (cf. also CG Telich). Elsewhere the informant pronounces NCG */k/ (*/kʰ/) as CG [k], which Busbecq writes as ⟨k⟩ (⟨(c)⟩) in CG Kor (for *Korn), Kommen, Knauen.

* A development of PGmc *g to NCG */ɡ/, a lenis velar stop, is also a possibility. This might have taken place in initial and medial position, or perhaps initially only (parallel to the development of PGmc *b and *d in CG: cf. 7.2.1.3; 7.2.2.2). The Greek informant would probably have pronounced NCG */ɡ/ as CG [ɣ], though there is no evidence indicating that this was the case (cf. 5.4.2.9). If anything, the presence of CG ⟨ck⟩ (CG [k]) in Rinck vs. ⟨g⟩ (CG [x]) in Tag (cf. 6.6.2.7) points to the development of PGmc *g as NCG */ɣ/ in medial position (except after *n). The loss of initial PGmc *x in NCG (7.2.3.2) may have been favorable for the retention of PGmc *g as a velar approximant in initial position as well.

* Allophonic */ŋɡ/ can also be assumed for PGmc */ŋɡ/ (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§77).

Kilemschkop (cf. also CG Cadariou, Eriten [for *Critten or *Kritten?]), and ⟨ck⟩ in CG Rinck (6.6.2.2; 6.6.2.4; 6.6.2.10).

7.2.3.5 NCG */x/ is correctly reproduced by the informant as CG [x] (cf. 5.4.2.4) and recorded by Busbecq as ⟨ch⟩ in CG Lochen (6.6.2.3), as ⟨g⟩ in CG Tag (6.6.2.7), and possibly as ⟨h⟩ in CG hazer (6.6.2.8).

7.2.3.6 NCG */y/ is accurately reproduced by the Greek informant as CG [j] (cf. 5.4.2.8), which Busbecq transcribes as ⟨g⟩ or ⟨h⟩ (6.6.2.7): CG Goltz, Reghen, Oegehe, VVagh'en, Boga, stega, Geen (cf. also CG Gadelthia, VVingart, Eriten [for *Gritten?]). NCG */ŋɡ/ (=/nŋ/) is duplicated by the informant as CG [ŋg] (cf. 5.4.2.8), which Busbecq records as ⟨ng⟩, ⟨nhg⟩ (6.6.2.7): CG Ringo, Singhen (cf. also CG VVingart).

7.2.4 Sibilants (cf. Fig. 11)
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7.2.4.1 PGmc *s appears to be preserved as a voiceless dental sibilant, NCG */s/, initially before vowels: CG Siiur, Salt, Sune, Singhen, seis, seune; medially before *r: Schueester, Lista; and finally, CG Hus, seis. The cluster PGmc *sk becomes NCG */ks/, a voiceless palatal sibilant: CG Schieitė, Fischt (for *Fischt). Initially before *r, *w, *n PGmc *s merges with *sk as NCG */ks/: CG Schilpen, Schueuer, Schuualth, Schuus (for *Schnos). It is not clear whether initial PGmc *st- is preserved as NCG */st-/ or whether it has become NCG */št-/ (cf. 6.6.2.18): Stul, Stein (for *Stern), Statz, stega.

7.2.4.2 PGmc *z*, which appears to have CG reflexes only in final position (but cf. CG Marzus, hazer with medial ⟨z⟩), merges here with PGmc *s as NCG */s/: CG Schuus (for *Schnos), Ies, Ieltzit, Rintsch, WVintzch (for *VWintsch), Fers, Menus, Borrotsch.
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7.2.4.3 NCG */s/ is pronounced by the Greek informant as CG [s]. Busbecq records this sound as ⟨ʃ⟩ (6.6.2.16): initially in CG Siiur, Salt, Sune, Singhen, seis, seune, sada; internally before ⟨t⟩ in CG Schueester, Lista; finally in CG Hus, seis, Schuus (for *Schnos), Ies, Fers, Menus, Marzus. In final position after ⟨t⟩ Busbecq transcribes CG [s] as ⟨sch⟩ (6.6.2.17): CG Ieltsch, Rintsch, Borrotsch, WVintzch (for *VWintsch) (cf. also CG Kilemschkop). Busbecq’s ⟨st⟩ may represent CG [st] for NCG */st/ in CG Stul, Stein (for *Stern), Statz, stega (cf. 6.6.2.18; 7.2.4.4).

7.2.4.4 NCG */s/ is reproduced by the informant as CG [ʃ]. This sound is transcribed by Busbecq as ⟨sch⟩ (6.6.2.17) in CG Schilpen, Schueester, Schuualth, Schuus (for *Schnos), Schieten, Fischt (for *Fischt) (cf. also CG Schiedit). Busbecq’s ⟨st⟩ may represent CG [st] for NCG */st/ in CG Stul, Stein (for *Stern), Statz, stega (cf. 6.6.2.18; 7.2.4.3).
7.2.5 Liquids, Nasals, and Semivowels (cf. Fig. 12)
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7.2.5.1 PGmc *l, *r, *m, *n: The development of the liquids and nasals in NCG corresponds to that in other Germanic languages in that they are regularly retained as NCG */l/, */r/, */m/, */n/. No further discussion is required. Examples of liquids and nasals in CG are: CG Lachen, Plut, Schlipen, Stul, Reghen, Ringo, Bruder, Siluir, Mine, Miera, Mycha, Kommene, nynne, VVaghene, Brunna.

7.2.5.2 PGmc *j (*/j/) has no reflex in initial position in NCG. After consonants PGmc *j appears to have been lost in NCG: CG Lachen (cf. also CG Ano). Intervocalic PGmc *jj-* (*/jj-/) becomes NCG */d/ (*/dd/?)’, thus merging with PGmc */d/ (cf. 7.2.2.2); CG Ada.

7.2.5.3 PGmc *w (*/u/) apparently becomes NCG */w/. This development is treated above in the discussion of the labials (7.2.1.4).
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7.2.5.4 NCG */l/, */r/, */m/, */n/ are reproduced by the informant as CG [l], [r], [m], [n] and recorded by Busbecq as (l), (r), (m), (n). Examples: CG Lachen, Plut, Stul, Reggen, Ringo, Bruder, Siluir, Mine, Miera, Mycha, nynne, VVaghene. The doubled spellings (rr), (mm), (nn) also occur (cf. 6.6.2.24): CG Borrotsch, Kommen, Brunna.

7.2.5.5 NCG */d/ (< PGmc *jj-): Cf. 7.2.2.5 for a discussion of the development of NCG */d/ in CG.

7.2.5.6 NCG */w/ (< PGmc *w): Cf. 7.2.1.8 for a discussion of the development of NCG */w/ in CG.

7.2.6 The Consonant System of Native Crimean Gothic (cf. Fig. 13)

On the basis of the preceding analysis, a consonant system can be proposed for NCG (Fig. 13). The proposed system is not entirely symmetrical. I have not proposed NCG */g/ (a lenis velar stop)—one could argue for it (cf. fn. 6)—but NCG */g/ for */y/ does occur (cf. 7.2.3.3). Also lacking in this system is the semivowel */j/. It is probable that there was a */j/-phone in NCG, but there is no reflex of PGmc *j as CG [j] (cf. 7.2.5.2) and CG [j] in tel, leitsch, les appears to have resulted from informant distortion (5.4.1.2). There is no apparent medial
reflex of PGmc *z in CG, but on the basis of CG (z) in hazer, Marzus and dorbiza (if we assume these forms represent underlying NCG words) one might posit NCG */z/, a voiced dental sibilant. However, NCG *[z] here could be an allophone of NCG */s/ (word internally CG (s) occurs only before consonant symbols: CG Schuuester, Lista, Fisc, Ielsch, Rintsch, Borrotsch, Kilemschkop, Haemiscepl).

8. Crimean Gothic Morphology and Syntax

As has already been pointed out in 3.1, very little morphological and syntactical information is provided by the CG data. This is partially owing to the relatively small size of the CG corpus, but primarily because the CG vocabulary consists almost entirely of individual words out of context. Outlined below are the identifiable features of CG morphology and syntax.

8.1 Morphology

8.1.1 Nouns

Indications are that NCG nouns distinguished number, gender, and case. Although Busbecq glosses the CG nouns with Latin nouns in the nominative case, the CG nouns are not necessarily always nominative forms. It is quite possible that the Greek informant provided the CG nouns in the forms he had most frequently heard them, so that those nouns which were usually used as subjects were given in the nominative, while those which were typically used as direct objects were given in the accusative (cf. von Grienberger 1898:135).

8.1.1.1 For most CG nouns it is impossible to distinguish between nominative and accusative forms, or to recognize gender. Many nouns may have passed from one declension to another in NCG. However, the following CG nouns appear to be nom. sg. forms, since they have apparently preserved a final PGmc *-z (< Proto-Indo-European nominative sign *-s) as NCG */s/, which is reflected by CG ⟨s⟩, ⟨sch⟩, as noted by Tomashchek (1881:59): CG Vintsch (for *Vintisch) ‘wind’ (‘Ventus’) (cf. BG winds), Fers ‘man’ (‘Vir’) (cf. BG fairhus ‘world’), Rintsch ‘mountain’ (‘Mons’), and Borrotsch ‘wish, desire, will’ (‘Voluntas’) (cf. final NCG */s/ < PGmc *z also in CG Schuos [for *Schnos] ‘fiancéé’, Ies ‘he’, Ielsch ‘alive, healthy’: 8.1.2.3).

8.1.1.2 The two-word expression CG Knauen tag ‘good day’ is glossed in the nom. case as ‘Bonus dies’. Busbecq clearly should have glossed this phrase as a Latin accusative (‘Bonum diem’), as pointed out by von Grienberger (1898:124), for the adjective CG Knauen apparently has an acc. masc. sg. inflection (cf.
8.1.3.3. Therefore, CG tag in Knauen tag can be taken as a masc. acc. sg. noun (cf. corresponding masc. acc. sg. BG dag, ON døg, OE dæg, OS døg, OHG Tag). CG Stul ‘chair’ (‘Sedes’), Rinck ‘ring’ (‘Annulus’), Wingart ‘vine branch’ (‘Vitis’), which lack final ⟨s⟩, ⟨sch⟩, for CG [s], may also represent underlying NCG masc. sg. acc. forms (cf. the corresponding nom. forms: BG stols, ON hringr, BG weinagards).

8.1.1.3 The only CG form glossed as a plural is CG Oegnehne ‘eyes’ (‘Oculi’). This is presumably a nom. or acc. pl. form (cf. nom./acc. pl. BG augona, ON augo, OE ēagan, OS ēgan, OHG augun). CG Ringo, which next to CG Rinck is glossed in the singular as ‘ring’ (‘Annulus’), possibly reflects an underlying inflected form in NCG rather than a mere variant and thus may also represent a NCG plural.

8.1.2 Pronouns

8.1.2.1 The CG data include three personal (anaphorical) pronouns in the nom. case: CG Ich, 1st pers. nom. sg., in CG Ich malthata ‘I say’ (‘Ego dico’); CG Tzo, 2nd pers. nom. sg., in CG Tzo Varthata ‘you made, did’ (‘tu fecisti’); CG Les, 3rd pers. masc. nom. sg., in Les Varthata ‘he made, did’ (‘Ille fecit’). CG Ich corresponds to BG ik, ON ek, OE ic, OS ic, OHG ich; CG Tzo to BG ðu, ON þu, OE þu, OS þa, OHG ði, CG les to BS is, OHG er.

A fourth personal pronoun may appear as enclitic CG -(a)ta, as we interpret this as an object pronoun attached to a verb form in CG Varthata and Varthata (both for *VVarthata), malthata. In such a way it is possible to explain CG Tzo Varthata (‘tu fecisti’) as ‘you made, did it’, les Varthata (‘Ille fecit’) as ‘he made, did it’, Ich malthata (‘Ego dico’) as ‘I say it’. CG -(a)ta would then correspond to BG ita, OS it, OHG iz, 3rd pers. neut. acc. sg. (but see 8.1.2.2).

8.1.2.2 Busbecq indicates two CG demonstrative pronouns, théo and thé, which he describes as articles (‘ omnibus vero dictionibus praeponebat articulum tho aut the . . . ’). Since neither actually appears in combination with the CG nouns in Busbecq’s lists, they cannot be accurately described in terms of gender, number, and case.

It appears that a leveling out of the dental reflex of PGmc *þ may have taken place in the NCG paradigm of the demonstrative pronoun (cf. BG sa, þata, so, þai, po, þos) and that CG tho and the both correspond to NCG unstressed */ða/ (*/ða/), which may have been used for all genders, all numbers, and all cases.

Another demonstrative pronoun may appear as enclitic CG -thata, as we interpret this as an object pronoun attached to a verb form in CG Varthata (Varthata (both for *VVarthata), malthata. In this way we can construe CG Tzo Varthata (‘tu fecisti’) as ‘you made, did that’, les Varthata (‘Ille fecit’) as ‘he made, did that’, and Ich malthata (‘Ego dico’) as ‘I say that’. CG -thata would then correspond to BG þata, ON þat, OE þet, OS that, OHG daz, demonstrative pronoun, neut. acc. sg. (but see 8.1.2.1).

8.1.3 Adjectives

8.1.3.1 The following CG adjectives are glossed with Latin equivalents in the masc. nom. sg.: CG Alt ‘old’ (‘Senex’), leitachs ‘alive, healthy’ (‘Vivus, sanus’), Telich ‘foolish’ (‘Stultus’). It is possible that final CG ⟨sch⟩ (= CG [s] for NCG *-s) in CG leitachs reflects final PGmc *-z < PIE *s, the sign for the nominative (cf. 8.1.1.1). If so, CG leitachs would then correspond to BG hailis ‘healthy’, which is a masc. nom. sg. of the strong declension. CG Alt, Telich, without final ⟨s⟩, ⟨sch⟩, may represent underlying NCG uninflated neut. nom./acc. sg. forms (cf. BG blind next to blindata, both neut. nom./acc. sg., strong declension). Otherwise one might think of a new formation here in NCG, or that the Greek informant simply provided uninflated stems.

8.1.3.2 A number of CG adjectives glossed with Latin neuter forms have inflectional endings corresponding to the neut. nom./acc. nominal endings of the strong adjective declension in BG. CG -ia, -tha (= CG [ta] for NCG *-ta) in CG Atucha ‘bad’ (‘Malum’), Vwichgata (for *Vitchgata) ‘white’ (‘Album’), Gadethla ‘beautiful’ (‘Pulchrum’) correspond to BG -ata in blindata. This same ending may also be present in the NCG form underlying CG ita ‘one’ (cf. BG ainata, neut. nom./acc. sg., strong declension of ains ‘one’: Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:140).

The CG adjective lel ‘healthy’ is also glossed with a Latin neuter form in the phrase CG lel vburr ‘may it be well, healthy’ (‘sit sanum’). A masc. form of this adjective immediately precedes CG lel in Busbecq’s list: leitachs ‘alive, healthy’ (‘Vivus, sanus’) (cf. 8.1.3.1). CG lel ‘healthy’ may correspond to the BG uninflated neut. nom./acc. of the strong adjective declension (cf. BG blind next to blindata).

8.1.3.3 CKnauen ‘good’ in Knauen tag ‘good day’ is surely a masc. acc. sg. form, in spite of the Latin gloss ‘Bonus dies’, which is given in the nominative. Busbecq should have put this gloss into the accusative, i.e. ‘Bonum dies’ (cf. von Grienberger 1898:124). CK Knauen tag almost certainly represents a greeting, in which case the accusative is fully expected here (cf. NHG Guten Tag). CK Knauen, then, is a masc. acc. sg. of the strong adjective declension (cf. BG blindana, OS blinden, OHG blintan).

8.1.4 Adverb

The only CG adverb is Lista ‘too little’ (‘Parum’). CG Lista appears to reflect a NCG form based on a superlative adjective stem (cf. the CG adverbs frumist ‘first’,
maist ‘the most’) to which has been added an adverbial suffix (cf. BG-ō in galeiko ‘similarly’, ħiubjo ‘secretly’) (cf. Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:§211, 212 Anm. 4).

8.1.5 Numerals

In his report Busbecq records the following eighteen CG cardinal numbers (Latin glosses are indicated where Busbecq provides them):

1 = CG Ita
2 = CG tua
3 = CG tria
4 = CG fyder
5 = CG fyuf (for *fyuf)
6 = CG seis
7 = CG sewene
8 = CG Athe
9 = CG nyne
10 = CG thiine
11 = CG thiinita
12 = CG thunetua (for *thunetua)
13 = CG thunetria (for *thunetria)
20 = CG stega ‘Viginiti’
30 = CG treithyen ‘triginta’
40 = CG fardeithien ‘quadraginta’
100 = CG sada ‘centum’
1000 = CG hazer ‘mille’

While CG Ita ‘one’ may be cognate to BG īta ‘it’, the CG cardinal numbers 2-10 correspond nicely to those in other Germanic languages. Compare, for example, BG twa (neut.) ‘two’, prija (neut.) ‘three’, fidwar ‘four’, fimf ‘five’, saiks ‘six’, sibun ‘seven’, ahtau ‘eight’, niun ‘nine’, taihun ‘ten’ with the CG numerals 2-10, tua, tria, fyder, fyuf (for *fyuf), seis, seuene, Athe, nyne, thiine (cf. Part II).

8.1.5.2 Surprisingly, the CG cardinals 11-13 (and presumably also the unattested CG cardinals 14-19) do not correspond in structure to the same numbers in other Germanic languages. Compare CG thiinita ‘eleven’ to BG ainlif, OE eallfeon, OS ellefan, OHG eillon ‘eleven’; CG thunetua (for *thunetua) ‘twelve’ to BG twalif, OE wolfe, OS twelif, OHG zwelif ‘twelve’; CG


CG thiinita ‘eleven’ is compounded from two stems meaning ‘ten’ and ‘one’, CG thunetua ‘twelve’ from the stems ‘ten’ and ‘two’ and CG thunetria ‘thirteen’ from the stems ‘ten’ and ‘three’: thus CG thiinita = ‘ten-one’, thunetua (for *thunetua) = ‘ten-two’, thunetria (for *thunetria) = ‘ten-three’ (cf. CG thiine ‘ten’, Ita ‘one’, tua ‘two’, tria ‘three’).

CG thiinita, thunetua, thunetria indicate that in NCG the cardinal numbers 11-13 had been restructured, possibly after a Turkic or Greek model, as suggested by Loewe (1903:15).² Compare Modern Turk onbir ‘eleven’ (i.e. ‘ten-one’), oniki ‘twelve’ (i.e. ‘ten-two’), onni ‘thirteen’ (i.e. ‘ten-three’); MGk δεκατριά ‘thirteen’ (i.e. ‘ten-three’), δεκάτεστα ‘fourteen’ (i.e. ‘ten-four’), but jëndeka ‘eleven’, dôdeka ‘twelve’ (cf. Sergievskij 1934:557).

8.1.5.3 The CG words for ‘twenty’, ‘thirty’, and ‘forty’ are also divergent from equivalents in other Germanic languages. Here the cardinal numbers 20-60 represent combinations of the digits (2-6) with PGmc *tigu- ‘ten’ (cf. Szemerényi 1960:27): cf. BG twai tīgias, ON tattugu, OE twēntig, OS twēntig, OHG zwoinziug ‘twenty’; BG āris tīgias, ON þir tiger, OE hrīg, OHG drīzig ‘thirty’; BG fôðwar tīgias, ON fjôrð tiger, OE fjôrego, OE fjórrego, OS fjôrrego ‘forty’ (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:$64).

CG stea ‘twenty’ can be linked to OFris stītge, MNethl stīte, NHG Stiege ‘a score, a twenty-count, twanzig Stück’. Though the phonological developments are not entirely clear, CG treithyen ‘thirty’ and fardeithien ‘forty’ can best be explained as combinations of the ordinal numbers meaning ‘first’ and ‘fourth’ with the word for ‘ten’: thus CG treithyen (‘thirty’) = ‘third ten’, and CG fardeithen (‘forty’) = ‘fourth ten’ (cf. BG jrida, ON þrīpe, OE ērida, OS thridio, OHG dritt(i)o ‘third’; ON fjôrpe, OE fjôro, OS fjårdo, OHG fjôordo ‘fourth’; CG thiine ‘ten’: cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:$67).

8.1.5.4 The CG words for ‘one hundred’ and ‘one thousand’ are non-Germanic (Iranian) in origin and therefore presumably represent loan words in NCG, though they could have been erroneously substituted for NCG Germanic forms by the Greek informant: CG sada ‘one hundred’ (cf. Ossetic sādā ‘one hundred’), hazer ‘one thousand’ (cf. MPers hazar ‘one thousand’).

8.1.6 Verbs

The CG data include twelve, possibly thirteen verb forms: eight infinitives, one form which is glossed as a present indicative, but which has also been interpreted

² There is a possibility that this apparent restructuring did not occur in NCG, but rather that the informant provided distorted CG forms, influenced by his native CGK, or perhaps by Tartar or Turkish, should he have been familiar with these languages (cf. 5.4 and fn. 19).
as a preterite indicative, one possible imperative, two preterite indicatives, and one preterite optative.

8.1.6.1 The eight CG verb forms glossed as infinitives all appear with final -en except CG Schiêt 'to shoot (an arrow)' ('Mittere sagittâ'), which shows (ê) for (en): CG Schlipher 'to sleep' ('Dormire'), Kommen 'to come' ('Venire'), Singhend 'to sing' ('Canere'), Lachen 'to laugh' ('Ridere'), Eriten (for *Criten, *Kriten, or *Griten) 'to cry' ('Flere'), Geen 'to go' ('Ire'), Breen 'to roast' ('Assare'). Any classification of these verbs as 'strong', 'weak', etc. can be made only on the basis of comparative evidence in other Germanic languages (cf. Part II).\(^3\)

8.1.6.2 Busbecq glosses CG Ich maltha as 'I say' ('Ego dico'), which indicates that CG maltha is a 1st pers. pres. ind. verb form. This assumption presents no particular difficulty, if we interpret final -tha (or -a) in CG maltha as an enclitic pronoun object (cf. 8.1.2). However, the similarity of the final syllables of CG maltha to those in the preterite forms, CG Vvaratha and Varthata (cf. 8.1.6.4 below), has led most scholars to assume that CG Ich maltha has been misglossed as 'Ego dico' for 'Ego dixi' ('I said'). In such a way CG maltha has been interpreted as a pret. ind. form. However, the fact that CG Ich maltha immediately follows CG Tzo Vvaratha 'you made, did' ('tu fecisti') and Ies Varthata 'he made, did' ('ille fecit') in the CG word list indicates all the more Busbecq's deliberateness in glossing it with the Latin present indicative, 'Ego dico'.

8.1.6.3 In CG Kilemschkop 'drink up your cup' ('ebibe calicë') it appears that -kop can be interpreted as an object noun, 'cup'. This permits interpretation of CG Kilemschcop- as an imperative form. According to the Latin gloss 'ebibe', this would be a 2nd pers. sg. imperative, but the underlying NCG form could have been a plural (cf. Part II).

8.1.6.4 Two CG verb forms are glossed as Latin perfect indicatives: CG Vvaratha and Varthata (both for *Vvaratha) in Tzo Vvaratha 'you made, did' ('tu fecisti'), Ies Varthata 'he made, did' ('ille fecit'). CG Vvaratha, Varthata therefore represent underlying NCG past tense (preterite) indicative forms, 2nd and 3rd pers. sg. respectively. Final CG -tha may represent a disyllabic preterite ending paralleling that found in the preterite plural in BG (cf. BG nasidemud 'we saved', nasidedap 'you [pl.] saved', nasidedan 'they saved'). However, as seen above (8.1.2), the final syllables in CG Vvaratha/Varthata can also be explained as enclitic pronoun objects. This, in my opinion, is the more satisfactory solution (cf. Part II).

8.1.6.5 CG vburst (for *vburst) is glossed with a Latin present subjunctive: CG Iel vburst 'may it be healthy, well' ('Sit sanum'). CG vburst (for *vburst) is best explained as a 3rd pers. sg. preterite optative (strong verb, 3rd ablaut class), corresponding to OHG wurti (from werdan) (cf. Part II).

8.2 Syntax

The CG vocabulary consists overwhelmingly of unconnected forms glossed in Latin. There are, however, five short CG phrases:

- Knauen tag 'good day' ('Bonus dies')
- Iel vburst (for *vburst) 'may it be well, healthy' ('sit sanum')
- Tzo Vvaratha 'you made, did' ('tu fecisti')
- Ies Varthata 'he made, did' ('ille fecit')
- Ich maltha 'I say' ('Ego dico')

plus a possible sixth:

- Kilemschkop 'drink up your cup' ('ebibe calicë')

In addition to these phrases there is a longer, continuous text. This is the three-line beginning of a song, the cantilena (cf. 10.):

VVara vvara ingadolou
Sceu te gira Galtzou
Hamiscltep dorbiza ea.

Regrettably, the cantilena is un glossed, so that there is no way we can be sure of its meaning. Nor can we identify with any certainty even a single one of its forms (the language may not even be Germanic). Therefore, syntactical information must be drawn from the CG phrases alone.

The morphological analysis in 8.1 permits a tentative analysis of (N)CG syntax. Three CG phrases are identifiable as transitive sentences having pronominal subjects followed by verb forms with enclitic pronoun objects:

(Pronoun-Subject) (Verb) (Pronoun-Object)
Tzo Vvaratha -tha 'you made, did that'
Ies Varatha -tha 'he made, did that'
Ich mal -tha 'I say that'

If this analysis is correct, and if we assume that these sentences have not been syntactically distorted by the nonnative informant, then we can tentatively classify NCG as an SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) language. However, another CG phrase in which subject, verb, and indirect object are elliptical, and which also must be interpreted as transitive, shows an attributive adjectival preposed before an accusative object noun:

(Atributive Adjective) (Object-Noun)
Knauen tag '[I bid you] good day'
Such proposed position of nominal modifiers is a feature associated with SOV languages (cf. Lehmann 1972:§2). In view of the three SVO constructions above, this SOV pattern suggests that NCG was an inconsistent SVO language (cf. Lehmann 1974:§1.6).

One more CG phrase—if it actually represents an underlying phrase in NCG rather than a single word—may be added to the four transitive sentences discussed above. This CG sentence can be interpreted as an imperative verb form plus object noun.

(Verb) (Object-Noun)

*Kilemsch*

-kop

’drink up [your] cup’

In addition to these transitive sentences one CG phrase is identifiable as an intransitive sentence. This sentence consists of an adjective (noun?: cf. Part II) followed by a 3rd pers. preterite optative verb form:

(Adjective [?]) (Verb)

*lēl* *vburt*

‘may [it] be well, healthy’

---

9. The Position of Crimean Gothic in the Family of Germanic Languages

9.0 Introductory

The relationship of CG to the other Germanic languages has been variously described. These descriptions attempt to account for those features which link CG to BG. Loewe (1896:165) believes CG is a West Germanic dialect (the language of the Herules) which has been influenced by (East) Gothic. Schwarz (1951:174), who proposes a Gotha-Nordic unity in his bipartite division of Germanic into North and South Germanic, identifies CG as a North Germanic language close to BG. Several scholars have suggested that CG represents a mixture of Germanic dialects. Karsten (1928:218) proposes that CG represents the language of the East Goths “‘oder richtiger eines aus Goten und Herulern zusammengesetztes Mischvolkes.’” Krause (1968:§22) sees in CG “‘die Sprache eines besonderen, vielleicht mit westgermanischen Volksstammens von alters her untermischten Gotenstammes,’” while Arntz (1934:63) calls it simply “‘eine Mischung.’” Usually, however, CG is categorized as East Germanic or ‘Gothic.’ Krahe (1967:§5 fn. 2) believes it is “‘kaum ein Rest des eigentlichen Gotischen, sondern geht eher auf einen anderen ostgermanischen Stamm zurück.’” Streitberg (1896:§13) classifies CG specifically as “‘Ostgotisch’” (cf. also Much 1898:208). Sayce (in Wright 1954:380) refers to CG as “‘a form of Gothic,’” while Scardigli (1964:310 fn. 2) introduces the term “‘perigtico.’”

A discussion of the issue of the grouping of the Germanic languages lies beyond the scope of the present study. No attempt is made here to redefine the divisions of Germanic on the basis of the CG data, nor are these data used to support or attack the divisions proposed by others. It is appropriate, rather, to discuss the relationship of CG to the other Germanic languages on the basis of the criteria pertinent to such discussion. For this purpose I use the terms North Germanic (NGmc), East Germanic (EGmc), and West Germanic (WGmc) in their traditional meanings, as

---

1 This subject is treated by Maurer (1943), Schwarz (1951), Kuhn (1955), Rosenfeld (1955), Zirmunskij (1964), Lehmann (1966), and Kufner (1972).
is common practice in studies on the relationships of the Germanic languages to one another (cf., for example, Kufner 1972).

Discuss below are those aspects of CG treated in the preceding chapters and in Part II which are relevant to the question of the relationship of CG to the other Germanic languages. As will be shown, it is with good reason that previous scholarship has linked CG to BG. It is fitting, therefore, that those isoglosses which connect these two languages, as well as those which separate them, receive special attention.

9.1 Phonology

9.1.1 Vowels

9.1.1.1 The development of PGmc *e in CG (cf. 7.1.1.2) distinguishes this language from BG. Whereas PGmc *e always appears (identically with PGmc *i) as BG (*i) (except before (r), (h), (b), where (ai) occurs), the CG reflexes of PGmc *e correspond to those in North and West Germanic (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§35). Cf., for example, CG (*i) for PGmc *e in *Vintich (for *Vintsch) ‘wind’ (= BG winds, ON vindr, OHG wint), Singhen ‘to sing’ (= BG siggwän, ON syngwa, OHG singan), but CG (*a) for PGmc *e in *Reghegn ‘rain’ (= BG regn, ON regn, OHG regan), Schwaester ‘sister’ (= BG swistar, Runic stwezar, OHG stwezar).

9.1.1.2 Another decisive difference between CG and BG vocalism is the divergent development of PGmc *u in these languages. BG preserves PGmc *u as (u), except before (r), (h) where it appears as (au), but the development of PGmc *u in CG (cf. 7.1.1.4) parallels that of North and West Germanic: PGmc *u appears as CG (*u) and (o) (u-asumlaut: cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§36). Cf. CG (u) for PGmc *u in *Sune ‘sun’ (= BG sunno, ON sunna, OHG sunna), Brunna ‘spring, fountain’ (= BG brunna, ON brunnr, OHG brunno), but CG (o) for PGmc *u (Common Gmc *o) in Goltz ‘gold’ (= BG gulg, ON goll, OHG gold), Boga ‘bow’ (= ON bogi, OHG bogo), Kor (for *Korn) ‘grain’ (= BG kaurn, ON korn, OHG korn). CG shows no development corresponding to the ‘Brechung’ of PGmc *u in BG to (au) (= [aː]) before original *r; cf. CG *Thurn ‘door’ (= ON dyr, OHG tur, vburt (for *vurt) in lel vburt ‘may it be well, healthy’ (= BG waUrP, ON yrde, OHG wurti).

9.1.1.3 The lowering of PGmc *ei to NGmc-WGmc *ai is an innovation which separates the North and West Germanic languages from BG (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.2.3). Therefore, the appearance of PGmc *ei as CG (i), (y) (= CG [i] for NCG *i) in CG Mine ‘moon’ (= BG mena, ON mäne, OHG män), Mycha ‘sword’ (= BG meki, Runic makia, ON mäker, OS maki), Sclipen ‘to sleep’ (= BG slepan, OHG slâfjan) (cf. 7.1.2) places CG closer to BG than to North or West Germanic. Krause (1968:§29) points out Ostrogothic parallels to the raising of PGmc *e to a high front vowel (*ei/ in NCG. The extant manuscripts of BG, which represent copies of Wulfila’s 4th century West Gothic Bible translation, are generally assumed to have been penned in Italy by East Gothic scribes in the 6th century (cf. Krahe 1967:§5, but also Marchand 1970:§1.41). These manuscripts show the occasional spellings (ei) (= [i]) and (i) (= [i]) in place of expected (e) (= [e]): e.g. BG geins for gens ‘wife’, birusios for berusios ‘parents’. This indicates a raising of PGmc *ei to a high front vowel in the East Gothic dialect of the scribes, a development which is also shown by Ostrogothic personal names.

9.1.1.4 The apparent raising of PGmc *o to NCG *u/ evidenced by CG (u) for PGmc *e in CG Plut ‘blood’ (BG blöd, OHG blut), Stal ‘chair’ (BG stols, ON stäl, OHG stual), Bruder ‘brother’ (BG brofar, ON broður, OHG broder) (cf. 7.1.2.4) is also paralleled by an Ostrogothic development (Krause 1968:§22, 29). The East Gothic scribes sometimes write BG (u) or (u) in place of (o) or (o): e.g. BG uhedun for uhedun ‘they were afraid’. Such spellings indicate the development of PGmc *o to a high back rounded vowel in East Gothic.

The development of PGmc *o to NCG *u/ is of course less striking than that of PGmc *e to NCG *i/ (9.1.1.3), for PGmc *o also occurs as *u/ in West Germanic languages, indeed regularly in New High German: cf. NHG u/ < au < OHG au < PGmc *o (cf. Penzl 1969:§54) in NHG Blut ‘blood’ (BG blöb), Bruder ‘brother’ (BG brofar), Stuhl ‘chair’ (BG stols).

9.1.1.5 The PGmc diphthongs *ai and *au have apparently been monophthongized in NCG. Cf. CG (ie) (= CG [je] for NCG *i/ [i]/: cf. 5.4.1.2) for PGmc *ai in CGjelitsch ‘alive, well, healthy’, *lal ‘healthy, well’, ‘life, health’ (cf. BG hallts ‘healthy’), and CG (oe) (= CG [o] for NCG *o/ [o]/: cf. 6.6.1.11) for PGmc *au in CG Hoef (for *Hoeft) ‘head’ (BG haubib, ON hafad, OHG hauht), Oeghen ‘eyes’ (BG augonu, ON augu, OHG augun), Broe (for *Broot) ‘breed’ (ON brað, OHG brot). This monophthongization is also compared by Krause (1968:§29) to a corresponding development shown by Ostrogothic personal names. Indeed the development of PGmc *ai and *au to monophthongs has been assumed for BG as well, though this is not universally accepted. However, monophthongization of PGmc *ai and *au also occurs in West Germanic (both are regularly monophthongized in Old Saxon: cf. Krahe and Meid 1969:§32), so that this NCG development is not decisive for the placement of CG in Germanic.

---

1 OE slâpan, OFris slêþa ‘to sleep’ with dr, í (< *i; cf. Prokosch 1938:§37, Kufner 1972:§3.2.3; Penzl 1975:§5.3c) for PGmc *ei appear close to CG Sclipen, but OEnóna, OFrismóna with oh for *i, are clearly distinct from CG Mine.

9.1.1.6 A vocalic characteristic that CG shares with BG is the lack of evidence for *i-mumlaut. But there are only a few words in CG in which we might expect *i-mumlaut to occur, i.e. forms which may have had an original *i or *j following an unumlauted vowel in stressed syllable. These are CG Lachen 'to laugh' (cf. BG lähjan, ON lækja, OS lähjan), CG Ada 'egg' (PGmc *ajja-: cf. ON egg, OHG ei), Ano 'hen, chicken' (if it corresponds to OE henn, OHG henna 'hen'), vburt (for *voburt) in lelvubtur 'may it be well, healthy' (BG waurchi, ON yrde, OHG wurti), Thurn 'door' (ON dyr, OHG tur). However, the lack of evidence for *i-mumlaut in these CG forms is no means conclusive. The absence of *i-mumlaut here might be the result of leveling in NCG, or distortion by the nonnative informant (cf. 5.4), the 'fieldworker' (cf. 6.5), or perhaps by the copyist or typesetter (cf. 4.2). In the case of CG Ada, where we find initial */a/ rather than */e/, the lack of *i-mumlaut could be explained by proposing that PGmc *ji- became Pre-NCG */i/ (/*i/*i? before the *i-mumlaut of PGmc */a/ to NCG */e/ (compare the BG reflex, */di/).

9.1.2 Consonants

9.1.2.1 The most striking consonantal feature of CG appears in the form CG Ada 'egg', where */d/ reflects intervocalic PGmc *ji-. This development is evidenced by this form alone, but the correspondence of CG Ada to ON egg, OHG ei 'egg' (PGmc *ajja-) is unmistakable. The apparent development of NCG */d/ from PGmc */ji- is crucial for the placement of CG in Germanic. The development of stops from PGmc */ji- and */wv- to */j- and */w- ('Holtzmann's law', 'Verschärfung') is a well-known isoglossing North Germanic and East Germanic (BG) (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.1.1). The reflexes of PGmc *ji- in the Germanic dialects are particularly interesting, since they show a completely different development in each of the three groups, East, West, and West Germanic, as seen by BG twadde, ON tveggja, OHG zweio 'of two' (gen. pl.) < PGmc *twaijjo(n) (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§18). The appearance of a dental reflex of PGmc */ji- is an innovation which CG shares only with BG (East Germanic).

9.1.2.2 Another striking consonantal feature of CG is the reflex of PGmc *z in several CG forms as */s/ (sch) = CG [s] (cf. 6.6.2.16; 6.6.2.17) for NCG */s/. Cf. final */s/ for nonfinal PGmc *z in CG Schusus (for *Scnuos < *Snuos) 'finger' (ON snuor, OHG snuor(a)), Menus 'meat' (BG mir), and final */s/ (sch) for final PGmc *z in CG les 'he' (BG is), Runic eR, OHG er), Fers 'man' (BG faryhus, ON fjar, OHG fere), Borrostir 'wish, desire, will' (cf. BG gaurhjus 'pleasure'), litsch 'alive, healthy' (BG heal, ON heili, OHG heil), Vvintich (for *VVintich) 'wind' (BG winds, ON windr, OHG wind), and cf. also CG Rintsch 'mountain'. There is no apparent medial reflex of PGmc *z in CG.

The development of PGmc *z in the Germanic dialects is an important classification feature. The loss of final PGmc *z (except in one-syllable words after a short vowel) is an innovation peculiar to the West Germanic group (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§115), though 6th century Ostrogothic names appear to indicate this loss as well (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.3.4). The CG reflexes of final PGmc *z cited above clearly distinguish 16th century NCG from the languages of the West Germanic group and place it closer to North and East Germanic (BG). An innovation shared by the North and West Germanic groups is the development of PGmc *z to r ('rhotacism') (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.2.1). The preservation of PGmc *z as a sibilant in NCG is therefore an archaism of paramount importance for the placement of CG in Germanic. This NCG development exactly parallels that in BG, including the voicing of *z to */s/ ('Auszusterverhärzung'). Thus, the CG reflexes of PGmc *z link CG to BG (East Germanic) and separate it from North and West Germanic.

9.1.2.3 A classification feature which has been used to connect the West Germanic dialects is the uniform development of PGmc *d, which became a stop in all environments in this group (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.3.3). The development of PGmc *d in NCG parallels that in West Germanic, for here too it becomes a stop in all positions (cf. 7.2.2.2). See, for example, CG (d) for PGmc *d in fyder 'four' (BG fidur-), Handa 'hand' (BG handus, ON hend, OHG hant); CG (t) for PGmc *d in Tag 'day' (BG dagos, ON dagr, OHG tag), Plut 'blood' (BG blod, OHG blut), Vvintich (for *VVintich) 'wind' (BG winds, ON windr, OHG wind). While this innovation in NCG does not necessarily link 16th century CG to the West Germanic dialects, the appearance of CG (t) for CGALT *d in final position clearly distinguishes it from 4th century BG. Postvocalic PGmc *d was devoiced in BG to */b/ in final position and before final */s/ ('Auszusterverhärzung'), thus merging there with PGmc */p/ (cf. Wright 1954:§173); cf. BG hauhp 'head' (ON hauþ, OHG hauht), gobis 'good' (ON gudr, OHG gout). No merger of PGmc *d with */b/ takes place in these positions in NCG (PGmc */b/ occurs as */dz/ in CG Goltz 'gold', Statz 'land').

9.1.2.4 Two CG forms show consonants which stand in 'grammatischer Wechsel' to those in the corresponding BG forms. CG shows (t) (NCG */t/) for PGmc *d in CGALT 'old' (cf. ON aldor, OE eold, OS ald, OHG alt), Plut 'blood' (cf. ON blod, OE blod, OS blod, OHG blut), whereas BGalt 'old', blod (gen. blodis) 'blood' have */b/ for PGmc */p/. The CG forms clearly reflect PGmc *d, for we would otherwise expect CG (tz) for final PGmc */p/ (cf. CG Goltz, Statz). Sixteenth century CGALT, Plut could not have descended from the BG forms. This is clear evidence that these two languages were distinct from one another at a time predating Wulfila.

9.1.2.5 The consonantism of CG Goltz 'gold' is of significance for the placement of CG. Whereas PGmc */p/ is preserved in NCG (where final) as */θl/, as shown by CG (ltz) in Goltz (cf. 6.6.2.20), a divergent development of PGmc */p/ takes place in the North and West Germanic languages: cf. ll for */pl/ in ON goll, goll 'gold', and Id for */pl/ in OE gold, OFris gold, OS gold, OHG gold 'gold' (cf.
Krahe and Meid 1969a:§74). The preservation of PGmc *þl as */l/ in 16th century NCG shows that this language could not have descended from any of the North or West Germanic dialects cited. It indicates, rather, an affinity to BG, which also preserves PGmc *þl as */l/; cf. BG gulþ 'gold'.

9.1.2.6 The loss of the labial element in the PGmc clusters *ŋkw, *ŋgw is common to the West Germanic dialects (Kufner 1972:§3.3.2). The CG data also show this loss: cf. CG Singhen 'to sing' (= BG sigwgan, ON sinngwa, OHG singan). The development of PGmc *ŋgw in CG thus parallels that in the West Germanic dialects. However, the apparent loss of this archaic feature in 16th century NCG is hardly cause for proposing a closer relationship of CG to West Germanic.

9.2 Morphology

9.2.1 As seen above (9.1.2.2) final PGmc *-z is preserved as a sibilant in NCG, where it has been devolved to */s/ as in BG. In the CG nominal forms *Vvintsch (for *Wvintsch), Ijletsch, Fers, Borrotsc'h, Rintsch (cf. 8.1.1.1; 8.1.3.1) final CG (s), (sch) for PGmc *z reflect the PIE nominative sign *s. Reflexes of PGmc *z as a nominative sign occur in North Germanic (cf. ON vindr 'wind' with -r < PGmc *-z) and in BG (cf. BG winds 'wind' with -s < PGmc *-z), but not in West Germanic (cf. OE wind, OS wind, OHG wint). This morphological feature of CG therefore links NCG to North and East Germanic (BG), while the phonological development of PGmc *-z to NCG */s/ places it closer to BG.

9.2.2 A morphological feature which is common to BG and Old High German (cf. Kufner 1972:§3.5.2) is also shared by CG. Corresponding BG is and OHG er 'he' contrast with ON hann, OE hē, OS hē, hi 'he'. The CG pronoun for the masc. 3rd pers. sg., Ies 'he' (= NCG /es/; cf. 5.4.1.2), corresponds to the forms in BG and Old High German. But cf. also Runic eR, ON or (relative particles) 'he'.

9.2.3 The CG Adjectives Gadaltha, Aotchta, Wvichtgata show what appears to be a neuter nom./acc. pronoun ending, i.e. NCG */-tal/, */-atal/, corresponding to BG -ata as in blindata 'blind' (cf. 8.1.3.2). According to Krahe (Krahe and Meid 1969b:§37, pp. 62-63; §50), final -a in BG -ata reflects the particle PIE *-omin (lengthened grade of *-em/-om) which came to stand exclamatively in this pronominal inflection in Pre-BG. This correspondence of CG to BG is unique, for no other Germanic dialect shows a reflex of this particle in the neuter pronominal adjective declension.

9.2.4 If the presence of a disyllabic preterite indicative sg. ending were to be assumed in CG Vwarthata and Varthata (in Tzv Vwarthata 'you made, did', Ies Vwarthata 'he made, did'), one could cite a parallel in the preterite indicative plural of BG weak verbs (cf. 8.1.6.4). However, the form CG malthata (in Ich malthata 'I say'), with what appears to be the same ending, is glossed as a present indicative (cf. 8.1.6.2). This casts doubt on the theory of a disyllabic preterite ending in NCG, since the appearance of final CG -hata in both present and preterite forms suggests the more likely possibility that CG -hata (or -ata, -ta) is an enclitic pronoun object (cf. 8.1.2.1; 8.1.2.2).

9.3 Lexicon

A comparison of the CG vocabulary to that of the older attested Germanic dialects reveals that a number of CG lexemes have cognate equivalents in all of these dialects, e.g. CG Hoeft 'head' = BG haubip, ON hofuð, OE hēofoot, OFris haved, OS hōbitt, OHG houbit, while other CG forms have cognate equivalents in only some of them, e.g. CG les 'he' = BG is, OHG er vs. ON hann, OE hē, OFris hi, OS hē. Still other CG words have no exact cognate equivalents in any of the older Germanic languages, e.g. CG Atocha 'bad' vs. BG ubils, ON illr, OE yfel, OFris evel, OS ubil, OHG ubil. Comparisons of this sort are made in glottochronological analyses, such as has recently been done for CG by Costello (1973). 4

The selection of the equivalents for glottochronological test lists is somewhat subjective, as Costello (1973:504) suggests. Be that as it may, the nature of glottochronological analyses, which attempt to establish time-depth relationships, requires that the investigator select these equivalents without regard to their cognate or noncognate status. For this reason, available cognate forms which might be central to the establishment of early dialectal alignments may be ignored in such studies. See the following examples of equivalents to CG vocabulary provided by Costello (1973:486-87, 494-95):

a) CGIjetsch 'alive': BG gius, OE cwik, OS quik, OFris quik, ON kvikr, OHG quec
b) CGRintsch 'mountain': BG fairguni, OE beorg, OS berg, OFris berch, ON fjall, OHG berg
c) CGAel 'stone': BG stains, OE stān, OS stēn, OFris stēn, ON steinn, OHG stein
d) CG Baar 'boy': BG magus, OE cn iht, OS cnapo, OFris knapa, ON drengr, OHG kneht
e) CG Broe 'bread': BG hlaifs, OE hlāf, OS brōd, OFris brād, ON braud, OHG brōt
f) CG Schuualth 'death': BG dauþus, OE dēað, OS dōð, OFris dāðh, ON dauði, OHG tōd

* Costello's detailed glottochronological analysis of CG includes two column tables (one representing 'basic core vocabulary', the other 'nonbasic core vocabulary'), which together list all the CG forms except those of the cantilena and contrast them with equivalents (translations) in BG, Old English, Old Saxon, Old Frisian, Old Norse, and Old High German (Costello 1973:486-87, 494-95)
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CG Geen, nor does Old West Norse, but cf. Late ON (Late Olc.) gà ‘to go’ (cf. Seebold 1970:216f, gē-). I see no reason not to assume with Schwarz (1951:118, 164-65) that both stems shown by West Germanic were present in Proto-Germanic and that in BG the verb gaggan completely replaced *gēn*, which was preserved in some dialects of the North Germanic group.

h') CG Hus ‘house’ corresponds to ON hús, OE hús, OFr. hús, OHG hús, but is etymologically unrelated to the BG words for ‘house’, razn and gards. However, the BG cognate to CG Hus, ON hús, etc. appears as final -hus in BG gud-hus ‘temple’. Also, correspondences to BG razn and gards can be found in some of the other Germanic languages: cf. ON rann, OE ear, ren, OFr.  ren ‘house’; ON gardr, ‘fence, secured area, courtyard, garden’, OE geard, OS gard ‘enclosure’, pl. ‘dwelling’, OHG gart ‘enclosure, yard, court’. Thus, stems corresponding to BG -hus, razn, and gards can be assumed for Proto-Germanic. Apropos of the noncorrespondence of CG Hus to BG razn, it should be recalled here that a word corresponding to BG razn was reported by Karsten (1928:182; cf. §3.1) to have lived on as a loan word in Crimean Tartar in the meaning ‘Dachlate’ (cf. OE ræn ‘plank’). Perhaps this Crimean Tartar loan word was borrowed from NCG.

i') CG Statz ‘land’ is cognate to BG stupa, OE steð, OFr. steh, OS stodo, OHG stod ‘shore’, Norw. dial. stad ‘river bank’.

j') CG Borrotsch is glossed in Busbecq’s report as ‘Voluntas’ (‘wish, desire, will’). Costello has accepted the emendation of this gloss to ‘Voluptas’ (‘pleasure’), as was proposed by Massmann (1841:361). With or without this emendation, CG Borrotsch can be linked to BG ga-baurþus ‘pleasure’ (cf. Part II).

Aside from CG Geen (discussed above under g’) and iæs (cf. 9.2.2), whose correspondents in Germanic have been used as isoglosses, the lexical make-up of CG does not indicate a particular alignment to either the East, North, or West Germanic dialect groups. However, mention should be made here of the following lexical comparisons. Two CG forms appear to have attested correspondents only in BG (East Germanic). These are CG Borrotsch ‘wish, will, desire’ = BG ga-baurþus ‘pleasure’, and CG Menus ‘meat’ = BG minn ‘meat’. Two other CG words correspond to forms found only in North Germanic: CG Knauen ‘good’ in Knauen tag ‘good day’ = ON knær ‘capable, brave’, and CG Rintsch ‘mountain’ = Norw. dial. rind, rinde, rende ‘ridge, crest of hills’.

Schwarz (1951:163, 166) attempts to demonstrate a closer relationship of CG to North Germanic (Gotho-Nordic) on the basis of the lexemes CG Stein (for *Stern* ‘star’ (= BG starn, ON stjarna), CG Miera ‘ant’ (= ON muura), this in spite of West Germanic correspondents: cf. OHG stern ‘star’, MNethl mier ‘ant’.

---

g') CG Geen ‘to go’ is cognate to OE gān, OS gān, OHG gān, gēn, Late ON gā, but, though phonologically similar, not to BG gaggan, on gān, etc. ‘to go’, as both groups reflect different Proto-Indo-European roots (cf. Kluge 1967:230, Gang; 241, gehem). The appearance in the West Germanic dialects of the athematic (contract) verbs illustrated by OHG gān ‘to go’, stān ‘to stand’, tuon ‘to do’ has been used as an isogloss separating these languages from North Germanic and East Germanic (BG) (cf. Lehmann 1966:§3.1.5). To be sure, BG shows no form corresponding to...
9.4 Summary and Conclusion

Busbecq’s recording of the CG vocabulary dates 1560-1562 (cf. 6.3), and therefore these records are much later than the earliest records of most other attested Germanic languages: Runic, 3rd century; BG, 4th century; Old English, 8th century; Old High German, 8th century; Old Saxon, 9th century (but Old Frisian, 14th century). Changes in NCG since the first millennium have doubtless obscured its affinities and dissimilarities to the other Germanic languages. But in spite of this, and in spite of the distorted form in which the data have come down to us, it is possible to discuss the relative position of CG in the family of Germanic languages on the basis of certain features in its phonology (9.1), as well as a few in its morphology (9.2). A satisfactory subgrouping of CG on the basis of agreement and/or nonagreement of CG lexical components with those in the other Germanic dialects is not possible (9.3).

Sixteenth century CG is not a descendant of BG. This is evidenced by a number of decisive phonological differences between these two languages. These are: the apparent preservation of PGmc *e in NCG as seen by CG (e) for *e in CGRegen, Schuwestor vs. BG (i) for *e in rigen, swister (9.1.1.1); the appearance of CG (o) for PGmc *u, e.g. in Goltz vs. BG (u) for *u in guulp (9.1.1.2); the preservation of PGmc *u before r in CG, e.g., in vbert (for *uert) vs. BG (au) for *u in waupfl (9.1.1.2); the noncoalescence of final PGmc *d with *p in NCG as seen in CGPlat with (t) for *d and CGGoltz, Statz with [θ] (tz) for *p vs. BGhauhip with (p) for *d and BG guulp with (p) for *p (9.1.2.3); ‘grammatischer Wechsel’ between CG (i) (< PGmc *d) and BG (p) (< PGmc *p) in CGAlt, Plut vs. BG alpeis, blop (gen. blopis) (9.1.2.4). These phonological divergences are convincing evidence that CG was distinct from BG at a time predating Wulfilas’s Bible translation (c. 350 A.D.).

Other phonological features in CG indicate that NCG descended from a dialect which was distinct from the North and West Germanic languages at a time before their records begin. The most striking of these features is the absence of ‘rhotaicism’ of PGmc *e in NCG: cf. (s) for PGmc *e in CG Schues vs. r for *e in ON snor, OHG snur (9.1.2.2). Another notable distinction is the raising of PGmc *i in NCG to */i/, as opposed to its lowering to *i in North and West Germanic: cf. (y), (i) for e in CG Mycha, Mine vs. NGmc-WGmc *ei in Runic makeia, OS maki; ON mane, OHG maeno (9.1.1.3). The preservation of PGmc *ip as NCG */ip/ also separates NCG from North and West Germanic: cf. CG Goltz vs. ON gol, OE gold, OS gold, OHG gold (9.1.2.5).

Although CG is distinct from the other attested Germanic languages, a number of CG features demonstrate a closer relationship to BG. The nonlowering of PGmc *i in NCG places it closer to BG than to North or West Germanic: cf. CG Mycha,

---

Mine, Schlipen = BG mëki, mena, steplan (9.1.1.3). The neuter pronominal adjective ending in CG corresponds only to that in BG: cf. CGGadeltha, Atocha, Wichtaga (9.2.3). Two phonological innovations shared exclusively by CG and BG are clear justification for grouping these languages together. PGmc */z/ is preserved in NCG as a sibilant and is devoiced in final position to NCG */sl/, exactly paralleling the development in BG: cf. CG Vintich (for *Vintich), Ileitz, Ies = BG winds, hails, is (9.1.2.2). A dental reflex of PGmc */jj/ occurs only in CG and BG: cf. CG Ada (9.1.2.1). It is not determinable whether these shared innovations were inherited from an unattested common ancestor (‘subproto-language’: cf. Penzl 1972a:§7.1.1) in the ‘Stammbaum’ tradition, or whether they represent parallel but independent developments (‘polygenesis’). The possibility of borrowed innovation as a result of dialect mixture (‘wave theory’) should also be considered. In any case, a classification of CG within Germanic based on linguistic features necessitates grouping it with BG.

From the above discussion we must conclude that NCG developed as a separate dialect of Germanic from an early date (perhaps c. 200 A.D., after the migrations of the Goths from the Vistula: cf. Krause 1968:§5). Implicitly requisite to a definitive subgrouping of CG in the family of Germanic languages would be the definitive subgrouping of all other Germanic languages. However, since the question of the separation and grouping of Germanic languages has not been settled (cf. 9.0 and fn. 1), only a preliminary classification of CG can be offered here. I have shown above that, on the basis of linguistic features, CG must be grouped together with BG. The unique position of BG in Germanic presents certain terminological difficulties, however. Ignoring for a moment Busbecq’s CG data, we see that BG is the only recognized East Germanic language with a real corpus. For this reason the term ‘East Germanic’ has come to be synonymous with ‘Gothic’, i.e. BG. If we adhere to the equation East Germanic = BG, then, in the strictest sense, no language other than BG itself is entitled to be classified as East Germanic. The West Germanic group, on the other hand, embraces several greatly differentiated languages, and the North Germanic group likewise includes more than one dialect. Therefore, if we are to retain the terminology of the traditional tripartite division of Germanic for purposes of a preliminary classification of CG, I see no reason why the term ‘East Germanic’ like ‘West Germanic’ and ‘North Germanic’ should not be used as a cover term for a group of Germanic languages showing certain common features not shared by other Germanic languages. Using this rationale, we may classify CG (together with BG) as East Germanic.  

---

4 Final (−t) for PGmc *d in CG Alt, Wvingart is less significant in this context, since postconsonantal PGmc *d appears in BG as d, e.g. BGalds ‘age’, gords ‘house’ (cf. Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:§74).

8 Loewe (1896:155) suggests that the development of PGmc */jj/ in NCG may have been influenced by Gothic, or that the single CG form in which a reflex of */jj/ occurs, CG Ada ‘egg’, may represent a borrowing from Gothic.

9 Because of this situation, Marchand (1970:6.0) is reluctant to classify even BG as East Germanic!

10 The question whether ‘East Germanic’ should also include the languages of the Burgundians and the Vandals, which are traditionally placed here (cf. Streiberg 1896:§13), is not argued in the present study.
The question remains whether CG, as an East Germanic language, can be called ‘Gothic’, in which case this term must be used in a broadened sense so as to include CG and BG. Presumably, CG represents the language spoken by the (linguistic) descendants of the Crimean Goths (cf. Much 1898:208), Gothic tribes who first occupied the Crimea c. 258 A.D. (cf. Krause 1968:§5). Therefore, the ethnographic designation ‘Gothic’ may also be applied to their language. Geographically, the Crimean Goths must be classified as East Goths (Ostrogoths) (cf. Mossé 1956:§5; Mastrelli 1975, map opposite p. 20), and thus the designation of CG as ‘East Gothic’ used by Streiberg (1896:§13) and others is justified and may serve to distinguish CG from the West Gothic (Visigothic) language of Wulfila (BG).

10 Because of linguistic differences between CG and BG, Schwarz (1951:173) is convinced that the Crimean Goths were not among the tribes who participated in the original Gothic migrations to the south: “Alles deutet darauf hin, dass sie erst in der Mitte des 3. Jh. direkt aus der nordischen Heimat die Wanderung nach dem Siden angetreten haben.”

11 A subdivision of East Gothic is necessary for the inclusion of other Ostrogothic material (cf. Wrede 1891).

10. The Cantilena

In addition to the lists of CG words, phrases, and numbers, Busbecq includes in his report the three-line beginning of a song, the cantilena (literally ‘old song’), which, he tells us, was also in that (CG) language (“Quin etiam cantilenam eius linguae recitabat, cuius initium erat huiusmodi”):

\[ 
VVara wvara ingerolu
Sceu te gira Galtzou¹
Hazmislep dorbiza ea. 
\]

Regrettably, Busbecq does not supply a translation of these lines, nor does he give us a hint of their content. The cantilena might be a sailor’s song, a hunter’s song, a soldier’s song, a children’s song, a religious song, a harvest song, a drinking song, a love song, etc.

The lack of a translation suggests that Busbecq may not have determined the meaning of these lines. Since none of the forms in the text of the cantilena is immediately distinguishable as a Germanic word,¹ it follows that Busbecq did not recognize familiar forms here either. This may be because the words of this song were run together in a continuum of speech. Whether or not he knew the content of this song, he is very likely to have missegmented some lexical elements in these three lines.

¹ It should be noted that in the interpretations of the cantilena discussed here, various readings of the form Galtzou occur. Mannhardt (1856), Braun (1890), and Scardigli (1964, 1973) have used editions of Busbecq’s fourth Turkish letter which show this form as Galiz. Kuun (1880) has apparently used the second edition (Frankfurt 1955) and reads Galiz here, as do I. Förstemann (1875:167) reads Galtzou in the first edition, but prefers the reading Galiz. Loewe’s (1896:129) and Streiberg’s (1920:282) reprints of Busbecq’s report show the reading Galizou, which is followed by Dirich (1951).

The facsimile of the first edition of Busbecq’s report (Busbecquiis 1589) which I obtained from the Houghton Library, Harvard University, clearly shows this form as Galtzou (cf. Plate V, p. 25). Vulcanius’ extract of Busbecq’s report also has Galtzou (Vulcanius 1597:53), which indicates that he referred to the first edition.

It is possible that during the printing of the first edition the type (t) used for Galizou was in some way affected, so that in some copies the printed letter took on the appearance of an undotted (i). Loewe (1896) apparently referred to one of these defective copies. Van de Velde (1965:65; 1966:337) also reads Galizou in the first edition.

¹ Tomaschek (1881:67) asserts the opposite: “unzweifelhaft verrathen die drei Zeilen deutsche Lauten, deutsche Wortformen.”
The Greek informant, although he was probably aware of the content of the cantilena, is likely to have inaccurately reproduced some of the underlying NCG forms here, just as he did in the case of some of the other CG data (cf. 5.4). And, as with the other CG material, there is also the possibility that these lines have been further distorted by the copyist and/or the typesetter (cf. 4.2).

The difficulties attending an analysis of the cantilena are enormous. As elsewhere in the CG corpus, one must contend with the possibility of distortion at several levels. By far the greater problem here, however, is that we have no way of knowing what these lines represent. It is not impossible that underlying NCG nonsense words or syllables occur here: compare for example "a tisket, a tasket" or "fee fi fo fum." Because Busbecq did not supply the cantilena with a translation or even indicate the subject matter of this song, any interpretation of this material seems predestined to be largely an exercise in fantasy, for the results of such an analysis must remain totally unsubstantiated. In spite of this, several bold attempts to analyze the cantilena have been undertaken. The diversity of the results of these analyses is remarkable.

In 1669 Johannes Peringsköld provided a Swedish translation of the cantilena along with a Latin version (cf. Mannhardt 1856:167):

Wara wara in dälla
wi sku göra galîpur
hamskip tsîr stëelig aëch a—
Estate obsequentiores,
faciamus incantationem
transformamini audacter in—

In 1758 Franz Aton Knittel reconstructed and translated the cantilena as follows (cf. Mannhardt 1856:167):

Vardja, vardja in dalja
scara jëra galisip nuh
—hiuma lclëp draibips—vëga.
Custos, custos in foëam
procella tempore congregabit
—populus dormit agitatum—mutum. 6

Mannhardt (1856) bases his analysis of the cantilena on an interpretation of the other, glossed CG data, the principles of Germanic alliteration and metrics, Germanic mythology, and the history of the Crimean Goths! He offers a 'Gothic' version and German translation of this song, in which he recognizes the name of a god, Yngvi (Ingdall):

1 "Be more yielding./Let us make the incantation/You are boldly transformed into . . ."
2 "Watchman, watchman, into the pit/The storm will gather in time/The people sleep restlessly—motion . . ."

Vârei várei / I'ggadâllu
scûta je'rë / gâlaize
hauhmiks hlaîs / ëaurbîza ëîv

Wehre, wehre Ingdall
dem dahinschuz der jahre der zaubervollen;
die nahrung des volkes dürftiger je—

Förstemann (1875:167) suggests that the cantilena may have been sung by "those Goths" as a warning to a young man rushing to a drinking bout and offers the following translation:

Wohin, wohin, junger Thor?
Scheue (dich) zu begehen die Becher;
Hausbrod (ist) immer derber.

Géza Kuun (1880:243) was the first to interpret the cantilena as a Turkish song. He provides the following reading and translation:

vara vara ing dolu,
şu tegira gölt(ä) su.
Gâmi isle dor-d-îsâ ea

Sensim sensim impletur,
haec regio tota aqua est.
Navis quum ilic constitit6

Braun (1890:60-61) attempts to improve on Kuun's (1880) analysis, enlisting the aid of Wilhelm Radloff, an eminent Turkologist. Braun is convinced that the cantilena is "rein türkisch" and believes with Kuun that the words describe a flood. He provides the following Turkish version and German translation:

vara vara ing dolu
schu tegirä gåldi su
hâm isclâp6 dur bizâ (ea).
genhed, geheid ganz voll
bis hierher kam das Wasser
auch (Alles) machend ist uns—

The most fanciful interpretation of the cantilena is that by Dirichs (1951), who considers the song to be a warning to a young girl to avoid imprudent, wanton sex (''eine Warnung vor unbedachtgem, tollem Sexualgenuss'')! He concludes that

6 "Gradually, gradually it is filled./This region is all water./When the ship stands at that place . . ."
(Kuun's Latin is faulty: The last line in Turkish means 'he is preparing a boat'.)
6 Braun suggests also the alternative reading gâmi isclâp, i.e. 'ein Boot machend.'
the *cantilena* and the CG vocabulary are "echt gotisch" and offers the following reading and translation:

Wàra wàra ñingdolóù
Scù te gira Gálizóù
Hênsmiscled dorbìza ëa.

Vorsichtig, vorsichtig, Junctolle!
Scheue die Leidenschaften (Begierden) in
kundiger (kluger) Weise,
Den Beischlaf, die Tüürwarterei, die
Schändlichkeiten (Schamlosigkeiten)!

Scardiglì (1964:296) believes that the *cantilena* is Gothic and that it represents a Christian lullaby. He reconstructs the song using BG vocabulary and translates it into Italian:

Warei warei, aggilu:
Skauta [garaweï (? ga-alith-].
Himi(na)slep [/? biuth izai] . . .
Veglia veglia, angelo:
in grembo (a te) riposa la creatura (mia).
Concedile (?) sonno celeste . . .?'

The problematic status of the *cantilena* is well-illustrated by these divergent interpretations and especially by the fact that some scholars have identified it as Turkish, while others are convinced it is Gothic. Loewe (1896:207) assumes with Braun (1890:60) that the Greek informant unwittingly represented a Turkish song to Busbecq as CG. I think this unlikely, for the informant’s facility in CG is demonstrated by the vocabulary in Busbecq’s lists. I believe that this informant would have been able to distinguish a Turkish or Tartar song from a NCG song (cf. his familiarity with the Tartars of the Crimea). Busbecq’s interpreters, who were presumably present at the meeting between Busbecq and the two envoys from the Crimea, would certainly have recognized and identified this song as Turkish, if it had been such. Indeed, Busbecq himself might have recognized a Turkish song. Therefore, we have no reason to suspect that the *cantilena* represents anything other than what Busbecq tells us it is: the beginning of a song in that (NCG) language.

As I have pointed out above, no interpretation of the *cantilena* can be substantiated, and thus this material offers little, if anything, to an analysis of the CG data as a whole. For this reason, I make no attempt here to analyze the lines or forms of the *cantilena*. I prefer, rather, to follow Massmann (1841:366) and not draw tenuous conclusions "wo andere schon kühneres gewagt haben."

? "Watch, watch, angel/in (your) lap repose, my (your) child. Allow (?) her (him) celestial sleep . . . ."
Discussed here are the individual CG forms found in Busbecq’s report. In order to facilitate cross-reference, all forms are integrated and arranged in strict alphabetical order. The CG forms are introduced by their Latin glosses where Busbecq has provided them. Emendations are suggested for suspected misprints. The forms which Busbecq classifies as “nostratia aut parum differentia” are indicated with the notation ‘list A’, while those he describes as “cum nostra lingua non satis congruentia” are noted as ‘list B’. ‘List C’ indicates that section of Busbecq’s report which contains the CG numerals. Proposed on the basis of the analysis in Part I are a phonetic interpretation of the CG forms as the Greek informant may have pronounced them and a phonemic reconstruction of the underlying NCG forms. This introduction is followed by further discussion, which varies in length and in detail according to the difficulty of the form. Where applicable, reference is made to pertinent sections in the etymological studies by Feist (1939), Kluge (1967), and Seebold (1970).

Ada ‘Ououn’ (‘egg’), list B, = CG [‘ada] for NCG */ada/ (*/adda‘?). The most striking CG form in terms of its importance for linking CG to BG is CG Ada. CG (d) in Ada corresponds to PGmc *źa-, which elsewhere in Germanic has dental reflexes only in BG: cf. BG twaddje, ON tveggja, OHG zweio ‘of two’ (gen. pl.) < PGmc *twɔazzi(n) (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§18, p. 37). It is possible that NCG had a geminate dental here corresponding to the development in BG, but the Greek informant would have reduced it to a single consonant (cf. 5.4.2.2). The lack of a double consonant symbol in this word suggests that Busbecq perceived preceding stressed CG [a] ([a’]: cf. 5.4.1.5) as a long vowel (cf. 6.6.1.1).

As a possible explanation of the BG-like consonantism of CG Ada, Loewe (1896:155) suggests that this form may represent a borrowing into NCG from Gothic. Schwarz (1951:163) considers such a possibility unlikely “bei einem Bauernworte,” this in spite of Engl egg, which has been borrowed from Scandinavian (cf. ON egg). As there is no evidence that CG Ada might have been borrowed into NCG from another Germanic dialect, it is assumed here to reflect a NCG form inherited from Proto-Germanic.

Von Grienberger (1898:126f) and Schwarz (1951:163) explain CG Ada as a nom. pl. form corresponding to unattested BG *adda ‘eggs’, whereby *j has been lost in CG Ada as in CG Lachen, Ano. I believe with Loewe (1903:9) that CG Ada can just as easily correspond to an unattested nom. sg. form, BG *addi ‘egg’, whereby final CG (a) represents CG [a] for unstressed NCG */a/ (cf. 5.4.1.3). If we assume that CG Ada reflects earlier *addi(i), it is noteworthy that initial CG (a) (< PGmc *a) shows no evidence of i-umlaut (cf. also CG Lachen, Ano).


Ael ‘Lapis’ (‘stone’), list B, = CG [a] for NCG */al/.

Diefenbach (1851 vol. 2:521) suggests that CG Ael has been borrowed from Tartar aeļa ‘rocky ridge’. However, it is possible to link this form to BG hallus ‘stone, rock’. Initial PGmc *χ has been lost here as in CG Ano, eel, Jeltsch. Assuming that CG Ael is not misprinted for *All, initial (ae) would appear to indicate a long vowel as it does in Middle Netherlandic (cf. 6.6.1.2). Perhaps Busbecq perceived stressed CG [a] ([a’]: cf. 5.3.3.3) as a long vowel. Another explanation for CG (ae) here is that Busbecq may simply have modeled this word after noncorresponding MNethl ael ‘eel’, which in phonetic structure approximated CG [a].

Related forms in Germanic: BG hallus, Runic halaR, ON hallr, OE heal ‘rock, stone’ <
PGe*χαλ- < PIE *kol- with various formations (e.g. BG hallus [masc. u-stem] < PGe *χαλος < PIE *κολύς). Cf. Feist (1939/2, ael; 241 hallus).

Alt 'Sexen' ('old'), list A. = CG [alt] for NCG */alt/.

Busbecq apparently used ENHG alt 'old' as an orthographic model for this CG form. CG (*t) in Alt stands in 'grammatischer Wechsel' with *b in corresponding BG/albris 'old'. CG Goltz with *(tż) for PGe *śb shows that *(t) in CG Alt reflects PGe *śd and does not represent a secondary development *śd > *śd in Pre-NCG such as occurs in Old English, Old Frisian, Old Saxon (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:79).

Related forms in Germanic: BG/albeis, ON alðar (rare), OE eald, OFrisalde, OS alð, OHeG alt 'old'. CG Alt and the West Germanic forms can be derived from PGe *alda 'old' < PIE *alb. BG albeis with *b may be derived from PIE *allos, or *b may come from the comparative, BG alpica (cf. ON eltri, aeltrir). Cf. Feist (1939:40, albeis), Kluge (1967/16f, alt).

Ano 'Gallina' ('chicken, hen'), list B. = CG [ano] for NCG */ano/.

Initial PGe *χ in CG Ano is as it is in CG tel, Ietlsch, Ael. It is surprising that Busbecq did not associate this word with one of the related forms in Netherlandic or German (cf. MNethl haben, MNethl haan, ENHG han 'cock'), particularly since initial [h] had been lost in Middle Flemish also (cf. 6.6.2.8). Possibly Busbecq intended the Latin gloss 'Gallina' to specify 'hen' in particular, rather than 'chicken' in general (this is suggested by the form immediately preceding in Busbecq's list, CG Ada 'egg'). With the meaning 'hen' CG [ano] was apparently too divergent from MNethl henne, hoen, ENHG henne, hun 'hen' for Busbecq to include it in his list of familiar vocabulary (list A).

CG (a) in Ano shows no evidence of i-umlaut, which suggests that it corresponds to BG hana, OE have 'cock', rather than to OE henn 'hen'. However, since BG shows no evidence of i-umlaut, we should not necessarily expect it in CG (cf. also CG Ada, Lachen, Thurn, v. Buren). This CG Ano may correspond directly to OE henn, OHeG henna 'hen'.

Related forms in Germanic: BG/hana, ON hana, OE hana, OFrisa hana, OS hana, OHeG hanna 'cock' (the West Germanic forms stem from PGe *χανί < PIE *κανό 'cock, while ON hane has developed from PGe *κανέν < PIE *κανύ 'canion: BG hana can be derived from PGe *χανόν < PIE *κανόν or from PGe *χανέν < PIE *κανέν: cf. Kiekebusch 1928:81.41h); OE henn, OHeG henna, hanin, henni, hennina 'hen' < PGe *χανόν or *χανέν (cf. Brugmann 1917:251). Cf. also OS hōn, OHG huan, MNethl hien, ON pl. hāns, hānn, hōnn 'hen' < PGe *χων, which, according to Hamp (1974/6, fn. 2), are noncognate with BG hana, OE henn, etc. Cf. Feist (1939:243, hana); Kluge (1967:282, Hahn).

~ Apel 'Pomum' ('apple'), list A. = CG [apel] for NCG */apel/.

The single (p) (< PGe *p) in CG Apel is interesting, since it contrasts with the corresponding West Germanic forms, which regularly show gemination of PGe *p which stood originally before *t. Assuming that CG Apel has not been misspelled for *Appel, it is possible that Busbecq modeled this form after MNethl apel 'apple', which occurs next to oppel. Otherwise the single (p) would suggest that Busbecq heard the preceding vowel as long, since (pp) would have been used to indicate a preceding short vowel (cf. 6.6.2.24). The informant presumably substituted his single Gk /w/-phoneme here, which Busbecq may have perceived as a long vowel in stressed syllable (cf. 5.3.3.3). In any case, the single (p) in CG Apel is not proof that there was no gemination of consonants in NCG before *t as there is in the West Germanic languages (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:85). A possible underlying NCG */pp/ here would probably have been reduced to a single consonant in the speech of the Greek informant (cf. 5.4.2.2). It is also possible that the NCG form underlying CG Apel was derived from a Pre-NCG form in which an epenthetic vowel had separated *p from following *t prior to the gemination of consonants before *t (cf. OE ecer next to OS akkar, OHeG ackar: Krahe and Meid 1969a:§85). An epenthetic vowel is reflected by CG (e) in Apel.

Related forms in Germanic (BG *apel is not attested): ON apalli, OE æpel, OS æppel, MNethl æppel, OHeG æpful, æppf < PGe *apel < (masc. a-stem) 'apple'. The Germanic word for 'apple' is of non-Indo-European origin. From the same source are derived the Celtic, Baltic, and Slavic forms for 'apple'; cf. Ol rabbal, OCS *japjiko, OPrusswible. Cf. Feist (1939:54, apel); Kluge (1967/27, Apel).

Athe 'eight', list C, = CG [ate] for NCG */atul/.

CG Atule indicates the original PGe *atul before *t (cf. the loss of preconsonantal *t in CG Rinck, Ringo, Varhatalv/varhattha, seis).

Related forms in Germanic: BG ahtau, ON áta, OE eahete, OFrisa aht, MNethl ahtul, OHeG ahto 'eight' < PGe *atul < PIE *aksou. Cf. Feist (1939:18, ahtau); Kluge (1967/6, acht).

Atocha 'Malum' ('bad'), list B, = CG [atotak] for NCG */atotak/.

Diefenbach (1851 Vol. 1, p. 89) links CG atocha to BG hatan 'to hate', but also suggests its possible relation to OE atel 'terrible'. It appears that the stem At- in CG Atocha can be satisfactorily explained by either of these etymologies. CG At- may correspond to stems in OE atel, atul, atul, eatol 'terrible, dire' (cf. von Griesenber, 1898:127), ON atall 'quarrelsome', Latin odio 'I hate', or by assuming the loss of initial PGe *x as in CG Ano, tel, Ietlsch, to stems in BG hatan, hatjan, OE hatian, OFrisia 'to hate', OS hatan 'to lie in wait for', OHeG házzon, házzen 'to hate', OE heitan, OHeG hezzon 'to pursue'.

Tomaschek (1881:65), who links CG Atocha to BG hatian, proposes Pre-NCG *hataugata with the meaning 'gehäßiges', i.e. 'hateful, odious'. This suggests a masc. nom. sg. *hataugs. Von Griesenber (1898:127), who connects CG Atocha to OE atel, assumes an underlying *atugata from *atugs, which he compares to BG handags 'wise' with the suffix PGe *aga-. A formation with the suffix PGe *iga- or *aga- is also possible (cf. BG mahteigs 'mighty', modsags 'angry'; Krahe and Meid, 1967:§144), since the vowels in all these unstressed suffixes would have been reduced to NCG *g/ (cf. 7.1.3). Final CG -ta in Atocha appears to correspond to the BG neuter nom./acc. pronominal adjective ending -ata as in blinda 'blind' (cf. CG Gadelitha, VVichtgata). It should be noted that Busbecq has glossed CG Atocha with a Latin neuter form, 'Malum'.

The above analysis suggests NCG */atotak/ from earlier */atayat/ (or */atokata/). Sycope of the second */a/ in the latter form caused the original */ya/ to stand before */u/ where it was devocalized to */u/. The informant, it appears, reproduced the first */a/ in NCG */atotak/ as */o/, and the second as */a/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).


Baar (for *ba(ā)m?) 'Puer' ('boy'), list B. = CG [bar] for NCG */bar/; CG [bar] for NCG */barm/.

CG Baar has been linked to BG barn 'child' by most CG scholars since Förstemann (1875:165). Schröder (1910:15) assumes that CG Baar has been misspelled for *Barn. It is possible that a final (t) in the printer's Vorlage was misread and misset as CG (t) (cf. CG Kor). Loewe (1896:171) also links CG Baar with BG barn, but believes that *n in final *rn has been lost in the NCG forms for CG Baar and Kor. Cf. also Hamp (1973), who assumes the regular loss of consonants in final position after *r in NCG. But CG Stein (for *Stern) shows *n in the final Pre-NCG cluster *-rn preserved as NCG *-rn, though an originally
following vowel may have prevented the loss of this nasal here (cf. corresponding OHG sterne [weak], next to stern [strong]). (In CG Thurn the final cluster is not original.)

Another explanation for the absence of final (n) in CG Baar is to link this form with BG baar ‘son, child’, ON barr, OE byre ‘son’. CG Baar would then show (aa) as a reflex of the PIE *ab-luat grade, such as occurs in BG barn, etc., but a formation paralleling BG baar, ON barr, etc., which show no nasal extension. (Compare the zero-grade /*a*/ ofgrade alternants OHG trunktrank ‘drink’.) The spelling (aa) may have been influenced by an orthographic model which approximated the phonetic structure of the CG form. A possible model is NNEthl. baar ‘in cash’. Otherwise the spelling (aa) would appear to indicate that Busbecq perceived CG [a]: cf. 5.3.3.2] here as a long vowel (cf. 6.6.1.2).

Related forms in Germanic: BG barn, ON barn, ON barn, OE barn, OFris barn, OS barn, OHG barn ‘child’; CG baar ‘son, child’, ON barr, OE byre ‘son’. These forms are derived from the root PGmc *ber- ‘to bear, carry’ < IE *bher- < found in BG bairan ‘to carry, suffer, bear’, ON bera, OE beran, OFris bera, OS, OHG beran ‘to carry’. Cf. Feist (1939-73, baar; 75, bairan; 82, barn; 84, baar); Kluge (1967:44, Bahre; 237, gebären); Seebold (1970:104ff, BER-4).

Bars (for *Bart). ‘Barba’ (‘beard’), list A, = CG [bart] for NCG *bart/; CG [bars] for NCG *bars?/Loewe (1896:162) links CG Bars to forms in Ossetic, an Iranian language. bars, barč (a dialect variant) ‘mane’. He suggests that CG Bars has been borrowed by the Crimean Goths from the (Iranian) language of the neighboring Alani. Feist (1993:82) suggests that CG Bars might be derived from the root PIE *bher/s (cf. Lith bardža, Latvian hards ‘beard’). Such etymologies are superfluous, however, since CG Bars is easily and more logically linked to the attested words for ‘beard’ in Germanic, OE bead, OHG bart, etc.

Much (1898:197) suggests that CG Bars corresponds to unattested BG *bars/, in which case we might expect underlying NCG *bars/. The missing dental stop in the CG form must be explained. It is unlikely that CG Bars is misprinted for *Bart, because Busbecq indicates final CG [ts] elsewhere as (tsch) (cf. VVintosh [for *Vintscht], leitscht, Rintscht, Borrotsch: 6.6.2.17). But, as Much suggests, it is possible that the informant pronounced an underlying NCG *bars/ as CG [bars], which Busbecq would have transcribed as Bars (cf. CG Fers). If this is the case, then final CG (s) in Bars would correspond to final PGmc *s/ from the nom. ending PIE *s (cf. CG VVintosh [for *Vintscht], leitscht, Fers).

Hamp (1973) assumes the final sibilant in CG Bars and in CG Fers is indeed the nominative inflection and explains the missing dental in CG Bars according to a general rule whereby final Pre-NCG consonants are lost after *r. CG VWingart (cf. BG weinagards) does not agree with this formulation (cf. also CG Stein [for *Stern]), but Hamp believes it possible that the dental was preserved in this form under the influence of connected forms in other languages, e.g. Slavic vinojradu ‘vineyard’, itself a loan from Germanic.

An obvious ad hoc solution to the problem of the missing dental in CG Bars is to assume that this form is misprinted for *Bart. The CG nouns cited by Busbecq’s informant were not necessarily given in the nominative, and indeed some CG forms show no final CG [s] where we might expect it (cf. CG Tag, Stud, VWaghen, VVingart). Thus, a misprint here is a good possibility. CG *Bart, then, would represent an underlying NCG form without a reflex of PIE *s and CG (t) here would reflect PGmc *red/ exactly as it does in CG VWingart.

Related forms in Germanic (BG *bars/ is unattested): Late ON bardr (from MLG bardr?), OE bead, OFris berd, MNethl. baerd, OS -bard- (in unbardodd ‘beardless’), OHG bart ‘bardr < PGmc *bardra/ (masc. a-stem) < PIE *bharrdh-. Cf. Feist (1939:82, bars); Kluge (1967:54, Bart).

Boga *Arcus (’bow’), list A, = CG [boya] for NCG *borya/. CG Boga is a particularly interesting form, because CG (o) here indicates the (Common Germanic) a-umlaut of PGmc *u to *o, which elsewhere in Germanic is seen only in the North and West Germanic languages (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:36). This development is also shown by CG Goltz, Kor, Schuos (for *Schnos), Borrotsch. Final (a) in CG Boga represents underlying NCG *a/ (cf. 7.1.3), for which the informant substituted a full vowel (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic (BG *boga is not attested): ON bogi, OE boga, OS boga, OHG boga ‘bow’ < PGmc *bugō (masc. n-declension), which is derived from the root PIE *bheugh- ‘to bend’. Cf. Feist (1939:96, biugan; 102, boga); Kluge (1967:74, biugen; 88, Bogen); Seebold (1970:110f, BEUG-A).

Borrotsch ‘Voluntas’ (’wish, desire, will’) for Voluptas (’pleasure, enjoyment, delight’), list B, = CG [borrots] for NCG *borrats/.

Tomaschek (1881:64) suggests that Ossetic (Iranian) baras, bara ‘will’ (which connects to Skt vara ‘choice, will, wish’) may have been the source for this CG form. Van de Meulen (1956:8-9) concludes that CG Borrotsch probably represents a loan word from Turkish hortoji or Tartar burotsj ‘debt, obligation’. It is more likely, I think, that this word is Germanic.

Massmann (1841:361) links CG Borrotsch to BG ga-bauroiobus ‘pleasure’ and suggests that the Latin gloss should read Voluptas ‘pleasure, enjoyment, delight’. Perhaps no emendation of the Latin gloss is necessary. It is possible that in NCG this form had developed (secondary) meaning ‘wish’ from the original meaning ‘pleasure’. Compare Engl what’s your pleasure?, which can mean ‘what is your wish?’, and NHG Lust, which can mean both ‘pleasure’ and ‘wish’.

To connect CG Borrotsch with BG ga-bauroiobus phonologically one may propose Pre-NCG *boriid < PGmc *buriyid-uz without the *ga/- prefix found in BG and with *d < PGmc *d, which has been dissimilated to voiceless *h in BG ga-bauroiobus (cf. Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:79, Ann. 4). CG (o) in the first syllable of Borrotsch indicates that PGmc *u has become NCG *o/ as in CG Goltz, Bora, Kor, Schuos (for *Schnos) (a-umlaut: cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:36). The spelling (r) suggests the possibility of gemination before original (i) (cf. BG ga-bauroiobus), which was then lost as in CG Lachen (cf. also CG Ano). However, the Greek informant would probably have reduced NCG long consonants to single consonants (cf. 5.4.2.2), so that the doubled consonant symbol (r) in all likelihood simply indicates that the preceding vowel is short (cf. 6.6.2.24). CG (o) in the second syllable of CG Borrotsch apparently represents CG [i]. It is doubtful, however, that this indicates the preservation of original PGmc *i/ in this unstressed syllable as NCG *i/o, since unstressed PGmc *i appears as (i) in CG Oeghene. Unstressed CG (o) in Borrotsch is probably a substitution for NCG *i/o < PGmc *e (cf. 7.1.3; 5.4.1.3). PGmc *d appears here (before (sch)) as CG (t), which indicates CG [t] for NCG *t/ (cf. CG VVintosh [for *Vintscht], Rintscht). PGmc *u is lost in final unstressed syllable as in CG Fers. Final PGmc *z, the sign for the nominative < PIE *s, has been preserved in the NCG form underlying CG Borrotsch as a sibilant, devised in final position as NCG *s/ (cf. CG VVintosh [for *Vintscht], Ies, leitscht, Rintscht, Fers). Busbecq writes (sch) for final CG [s] after (t) (cf. CG VVintosh [for *Vintscht], Rintscht, leitscht, 6.6.2.17).

Related forms in Germanic: BG ga-bauroiobus ‘pleasure’, BG gaburjaba ‘gladly, willingly’, OE byre, gebyre ‘favorable situation’, ON byrga ‘to be suitable’, OE byrian ‘to happen, to fit’ < PGmc *baryj- which is connected to PGmc *ber-/, which appears in BG bairan ‘to carry’: cf. also CG Baar. Cf. Feist (1939:103, borrotsch; 175, gaburjaba).
Crimean Gothic

Brewn 'Assare' ('to roast'), list A, = CG ['brewn'] for NCG */bre:n/ (<*bre:nə/). Tomasevich (1881:61) and Loewe (1896:149) link CG Brewn to OHG braten 'to roast'. Von Grienberger (1898:133) rejects this etymology, proposing instead a correspondence to MHG braten 'to smell, be fragrant', which stands in ablaut with MHG bräuen 'to singe, scorched'. This is the more satisfactory solution phonologically. PGMc *ei in Pre-NCG *brœan stood in hiatus position and therefore becomes NCG *ie or *ei rather than *i as it does regularly. For this reason, PGMc *ei appears as (e) in CG Breun (also in CG Geen) and not as (i) or (y) as in CG Mine, Schlipen, Mycha. The dual development of PGMc *ei in NCG thus parallels that in BG. CG Breun, Geen would correspond to unattested BG *braut, *giœn, as seen by BG saian, waiian with (ai) (= [ei:]) for (e) versus (e) (= [ei:]) for *ei as in BG mena, slepan, meki (cf. von Grienberger 1898:133; Schwarz 1951:165).

Related forms in Germanic: MNEithl brœyn 'to smell, be fragrant', broyen, broyen, broen 'to scorched, burn, brood, scald', MHG braten 'to be fragrant', MLGr βρζειν 'to singe, scorched', ENHG (Upper) aus-brœun 'to hatch, incubate' (class i weak verbs). The PGmc root is *bɾœ-/brœ-. < PIE *bʰrœ-/bʰrœ- 'to warm'. Cf. Feist (1939:104f, breuen); Kluge (1967:104, Břeú; 195, Brut).

Broen (for *Broen) 'Panis' ('bread'), list A, = CG [broen] for NCG *bro:u/ (<*bруː); CG [brōu] for NCG *bro:/?*

CG (oe) in Broen is a reflex of PGmc *au, which also appears as (oe) in CG Hoef, Oegheine. This spelling could represent a diphthong, but it is more likely that Busbeq intended it to indicate [œ] (cf. 6:6.1:11), though the informant probably pronounced a shorter vowel here, CG [ɡ] or [ɛ] (cf. 5:3.3:3; 5:4.1.5). Busbeq may have been influenced by a Netherlandic orthographic model: cf. MFlem broede 'breads' (Jacobs 1911:110), which occurs next to MNEithl broot, broot 'bread'.

The absence of a final dental consonant in CG Broe (cf. OE bread, OHG brōt 'bread') prompted Feist (1939:106) to suggest that it was never present in this form. He links CG Broe to Germanic forms without the dental extension: MHG brei(e) 'bröth', breien, breien 'to scorched', MNEithl brei(e)n 'to warm, brood', ON brugga, OE brawan, NNEithl brawen, OHG briaun 'to brew'. Holthausen (1929:33) suggests that CG Broe may be mistranscribed for *Bro, which could then be linked to BG gabruka 'crumb'.

In spite of the missing dental, CG Brøe is obviously cognate to OE breader, OHG brōt, etc. Krüger (1911:13) observes that PGmc *d has been lost in NCG as indicated also by CG Hoef. But CG Plut, VVingart with final (d) for PGmc *d argue against this. The loss of PGmc *d is easily accounted for by assuming with Schröder (1910:139f) and Streiberg (1920:282) that CG Brøe is mistranscribed for *Bro.

Related forms in Germanic (the BG word for 'bread' is noncognate hlaips): ON broáð, OE břeóð, OFris broðr, OS bőr, OHG broät 'bread' < PGmc *brœuda- (neuter-a-stem): related to PIE *ph(e)re- 'to bubble, ferment'. Cf. Feist (1939:106, broe); Kluge (1967:103, Brot).

Bruder 'Brotier' ('brother'), list A, = CG ['bruder'] for NCG */bro:der/

Busbeq has apparently modeled this form after ENHG bruder 'brother'. CG (u) occurs here for PGmc *o as in CG Plut, Stat. CG (d) reflects PGmc *b as it does as in CG furdeithun.

Related forms in Germanic: BG brōar, ON bróðr, OE brōðr, OFris bróðer, MNEithl broder, OS bōr, OHG bruder < PGmc *brôr (mas.-stem) < PIE *phrō-t 'brother'. Feist (1939:106, broār); Kluge (1967:103, Bruder).

Brunna 'Fons' ('spring, fountain'), list A, = CG ['brna'] for NCG */brnə/.

CG Brunna is striking in its resemblance to corresponding BG brunna. The spelling (n) does not indicate a geminative consonant as in BG, however, as the Greek informant would probably not have pronounced such a sound (cf. 5:4.2.2). Busbeq may have intended to indicate a short preceding vowel by doubling the consonant symbol in this word (cf. 6:6.2.24), but it is more likely that this spelling has been influenced by ENHG (Upper German) brunnen. Final CG (a) indicates CG [a] for underlying NCG */*a/ (cf. 5:4.1.3).


Cadariou (for *Cadarioun?) 'Miles' ('soldier'), list B, = CG ['kadar, ju:] for NCG */kadar, ju:n?/, CG [kadarju/] for NCG */kadarju:/?*

CG Cadariou is one of the obscure words in Busbeq’s lists. Massmann (1841:363) proposed connecting this form to BG gadauka 'companion' or BG gadauthus 'soldier'. Kluge (1911:112) proposes a correspondence to unattested BG *gadruings from driguan 'to serve as a soldier', and Holthausen (1929:331) suggests that the CG form should read *gahorgun (cf. BG harjus 'army'). Höftler (1957:246), who sees a "Medienverhärtung" of initial PGmc *g in CG Cadariou, suggests the possibility that the first two syllables, CG Cadur, are equivalent to unattested BG *gadar- 'comrade', which he reconstructs on the basis of BG gaddigus 'cousin', OE gading 'comrade', OS gadonia, or OE gading 'cousin', OHG gatuling 'cousin'. The presence of initial CG (g) for PGmc *g in CG Golte, Geen, Gadelthu argues against a "Medienverhärtung" of an initial *g < *g in CG Cadariou, and thus against all the etymologies proposed above. A misprint of initial CG (g) for (g) in this form is of course a possibility, but the lack of an attested direct correspondent with the meaning 'soldier' cautions against making such an assumption.

If we can assume that CG Cadariou has not been erroneously introduced by Busbeq’s Greek informant, there is a strong possibility that this form represents a non-Germanic loan in NCG: military terms pass readily from one language to another.

Menner (1937) proposes Lat centurio as the source for this word, which he emends as *cadarion (cf. (u) for (n) in CG Schaau). He believes it is possible that the Goths borrowed this word directly from the Latin in its Late Latin pronunciation as *kēntuˌrion, or Vulgar Latin pronunciation *kēnuˌrion. The Pre-NCG form would have been, according to Menner, *kedriuon (= BG kedriuon or -jion). However, he thinks it more likely that the word was borrowed through the intermediary of Gk κεντρικός, since Gk ντιρικός became [ndi] and even [d] in some dialects. Menner postulates a Late Gk κεντρικός as the source form, which "Gothic would borrow in the form kṛdnio, by-form *kṛdnio, which, with the shifting of stress to the first syllable, would become kādariuon (-jion), Busbeq's cadariou." But the form- and the shift in stress to the first syllable are not necessary to explain the CG vocalism. Unstressed vowels in the first two syllables would have become NCG */a/, which the informant could have pronounced as [a] (cf. 5:4.1.3), i.e. CG [kadarju] for NCG */kadarju:n/ (with */-ju:/ < Pre-NCG */-jou/). In support of his proposed etymology for CG Cadariou, Menner cites military terms which have been borrowed from Latin, in some cases through the Greek, e.g. MG milion 'to do military service' < Lat militare, BG laigaion 'legion' < GK λεγειων < Lat legio. He suggests that the degeneration in meaning from 'centurion' to 'soldier' may have been a late development which took place during the two centuries separating Busbeq’s recording of the CG data and the time of the first contacts of the Goths on the Black Sea with the Greek and Roman world.

Powkes (1946) is convinced that CG Cadariou is derived from a Celtic stem and cites early Welsh kadur 'warrior', cetwyd, kedwir 'warriors', OBreton cattaur, OCornish cadvir
soldier'. He suggests that final CG -ariu may be from the Latin suffix -arius, which was borrowed by both Germanic and Celtic. If on the basis of Fowke's arguments we assume an underlying (Pre-)NCG *kad-arius ‘warrior, soldier’, the phonetic and semantic correspondences to CG Paradurus are clear. In support of the feasibility of a Celtic loan in NCG, Fowke cites a number of Celtic loans in BG, including the military term *brunjo ‘burnie’, but he cannot say when, nor does he indicate how this Celtic word, unattested elsewhere in Germanic, might have come into NCG. Dienben (1851, Vol. II, p. 436) had also suggested Welsh as one of several possible sources for CG Paradurus: he cites Welsh cadwr ‘soldier’, OCS kotornī ‘pugnans’, and Hungarian Katonat ‘soldiers’. Tomaschek (1881:65) lists the Turkic forms Chuvash kadaraz, Altai kadary ‘zur Seite befindef’, here perhaps in the sense ‘auxiliary’. Von Grienberger (1898:129-30) emends the CG form as *kadaron (cf. i) for (t) in CG Steinh, assuming NCNG *kadaron (> BG *kadarons) ‘auxiliary’ < Altai kadary.

Feist (1939:112) adds Turkish askadi ‘commande’ and kardas ‘brother’ to the list of possible sources for CG Paradurus, but neither of these seems a likely candidate. Another possibility should be suggested here: the NCG form underlying CG Paradurus may have been a corruption of Lat catervarius ‘of or pertaining to a crowd or troop’, or of the noun from which it is derived, Lat caterva ‘a body of soldiers, a troop, a company, band’, a term which was applied to the soldiers of barbarian nations. But CG (d) for intervocalic Lat -t- is problematic.

Of the etymologies which have been suggested, that proposed by Menner (1937) seems to have the greatest merit. Cf. Feist (1939:111f, cadarior, 177, gadauka; 178f, gadilizga; 179, gadraukhs).

*Criten: cf. Ernten.

dorzbba: un glossed form in the cantilena (cf. 10.)
ea: un glossed form in the cantilena (cf. 10.)


It is certain that initial CG (e) here is an error. It is also clear that Busbeq linked this verb with MNeth kriten, criten, or NNetth kriten, ‘to scream’, since he classifies it as ‘nostriata aut parum differentia’. What is not certain is what the initial letter in this word should be. The traditional emendations (C) and (K) were first made by Netherlands. Vulcanus' (1597) extract shows CG Criten, the Munich edition of 1620, Criten, and the Leiden edition of 1633, Criten (cf. Schudder 1910:8f, 11). In reference to the generally accepted emendation of CG Criten as Criten, Feist (1939:112) states: ‘Zu [BG] greten [‘to cry, lament’] stimmt der Anlaut nicht.’ Höfler (1956:302) cites CG Criten, which he links to BG greten, as evidence supporting his theory of a Gothic ‘Medienverbürtung’. However, these convictions are based on a proposed emendation for misprinted (e). It seems to me that it is just as likely that CG Criten was misprinted for Busbeq’s CG *Criten (also suggested by Hsö [1971:80], which he would still have linked with (non cognate) MNeth kriten, NNetth kriten. The emendation CG *Criten would then easily correspond to BG greten (cf. initial (g) for PGMC *g in CG Golt, Geen, Geadenla; (i) for PGMC *e in CG Mine, Shipen; intervocalic (t) for PGMC *e in CG Sichte). If initial (e) in CG Criten is misprinted for (e) or (k), this form is cognate to MNeth kriten, MHGkrieten ‘to scream’ (cf. initial (k) for PGMC *k in CG Kor, Komen; (i) for PGMC *e in CG Vingart).


CG Fers has been described as an loan word from Hungarian ferj ‘man’ (cf. Feist 1939:148), but it appears that it can be justified as Germanic. Förster (1875:165) connects CG Fers with BG *wair, ON veir, OE *fiers, OS, OHG wer ‘man’. This is doubtful, however, since initial PGMC *w appears elsewhere in CG as (wv) (cf. CG Vvaghen, Vvignat, Vvintch). Von Grienberger (1898:128) believes CG Fers has an exact correspondence in OE ferh, ferh ‘mind, spirit’, but in this case we should expect CG *Fersz, with CG (t) for PGMC *b (cf. CG Golt, Statz). Tomaschek (1881:63) linked CG Fers to OSs折仕, OEferys, fers, ‘men, people’, which are related to BG fairus ‘world’. I believe with Schwar (1951:168) and Hopp (1973) that this is the best solution.

CG Fers and BG fairus can be derived from PGMC *ferywaz. Hopp (1973) explains the loss of PGMC *waw (< *waw) in CG Fers as a regular phonological development. Pointing to CG Baar, Kor, where he assumes the loss of final *h, Hopp formulates a general rule for the loss of final consonants in (N)CG after *r (* < cognate *h, *waw, *kaw, *swaw). He then explains the final (s) in CG Fers as a nom. inflection, assuming the same development in CGBars. I propose the following development of CG Fers from PGMC *ferywaz: PGMC *v is lost before unstressed *u (cf. also the loss of the labial element of the labio-velars in CG Kommen, Singhen); PGMC *u is lost (by way of *o following a long syllable); PGMC *e from the nom. ending PIE *e has been preserved as a sibilant in NCG, evidenced in final *s in NCG Fairus (cf. PGMC *vVintch, Rintch, Borsrotch, Jelitsch, les, Schouos [for Schouos]); PGMC *h has been lost as in CG seis, Ahe, Varhatha/Varhatha.


It appears that CG (*c) in Fisc is an error by copyist or typesetter for (s). Initial CG (t) here suggests that Busbeq has modeled CG *Fisch after corresponding ENNG fisch = [fis] rather than Neth vissch = [vits], which thus indicates the sound value ([v]) for final (s) in this form (cf. CG (s) in Schwester, Schuetz [for Schuetz], Schuhes, Schipen, Sichte). It is possible, however, that final (s) (for (sch)) represents [s] as in Neth (cf. CG (sch) in VVintch [for VVintsch], Jelitsch, Rintch, Borsrotch; 6.6.2.17). CG (sct) (for (sch)) in Fisch reflects PGMC *sk (cf. (sch) for *sk in CG Sichte).


CG furdei- in furdeiheit can probably best be linked to the ordinal numbers, ONfuru, OE forbo, ON foro, OHG heudo ‘fourth’. CG (d) in furdeiheit reflects PGMC *b (cf. (d) for *b in CG Bruder), but the correspondence of CG (u) to the vocalism of the other
Germanic forms is unclear. Perhaps (u) is misprinted here for (ii) as it is in CG thunetwa, *thunetria*. The emendation CG *furdeithiun would indicate (ii) = CG [i] for NCG *i/i/ for PGMc *eu (cf. NCG *u/-u/ for PGMc *eu in CG Schieit). CG (ei) in furdeithiun is problematic (compare CG treithien). CG -thien in furdeithiun is apparently equivalent to CG thiine 'ten'. This permits the interpretation of CG furdeithiun as 'fourth ten'.

For further discussion compare CG fyder, thiine, treithyen. Cf. Feist (1939:150, fidwor-tiguar).

fyder 'four', list C, = CG ['fidr'] for NCG *fydar/.

CGfyder best corresponds to BG fydar- 'four' (used in compounds), in which case we can propose Pre-NCG *fydar/ < PGMc *fydar- (cf. *i > *u before *u: cf. Krake and Meid 1969b:§35). A correspondence to the cardinal BG fydar 'four' (with *w of *vw in NCG) is also possible, but in this case we might expect CG *feder. (Vocalism in the NCG word for 'four' influenced by that in the word for 'five'? Cf. CG fyfar [for fyfar]). The possibility of this correspondence is interesting, for only BG and CG show a dental in the cardinal for 'four'. (For an explanation of the lacking dental in the North and West Germanic cardinals for 'four', cf. Hamp 1976:1.)

CG (d) in fyder (= CG [d] for NCG *d) appears to reflect PGMc *d, which is shown by BG fydar- (orm-Gd here for PGMc *b in analogy to in fidyar?) and fidwar (cf. (d) for *d in CG Handsa), but could also reflect PGMc *p, which appears in OE feoror- fyder- 'four' (cf. (d) for *b in CG Bruder). It is possible that Busbecq intended CG (y) in fyder to represent a long vowel, though the Greek informant presumably used his single CG ky-phoneme here (cf. 5.3.3.3; 6.6.1.5).


fyuf (for *fyuf) 'five', list C, = CG [finf] for NCG *fyuf/.

Massmann (1841:363) assumes that this form is misprinted for *fyuf/. Loewe (1866:161, 170; 1903:149), who insists that this form is correctly printed, believes that CG fyuf shows loss of the nasal sound and lengthening of the preceding vowel. He assumes that CG (u) here represents a transitional sound which developed between the palatal vowel and the labial fricative: CG fyuf from *fyuf. Von Grienberger (1898:132) also accepts CG fyuf as correct, but interprets it as *fyuf, i.e. *fjuf. It appears to me much more likely that (u) in CG fyuf has been misprinted or misspelled for (n) as assumed by Massmann (1841:363), Munch (1898:202), Schröder (1910:11, 13f) (cf. (u) for (n) in CG Schuss for *Schnos).

CG (y) in fyuf (for *fyuf) is a variant of CG (i) (cf. 6.6.1.15) and represents CG [i] for NCG *y/i/ < Gmc *i in *fynf < PGMc *fynf(e). CG (u), i.e. (n), suggests that PGMc *m has been assimilated to *n before a labial-dental.


Gadelitha 'Pulcrum' ('beautiful'), list B, = CG ['yadelta] for NCG *yadelta/.

Massmann (1841:362) suggests that CG Gadelitha is equivalent to BG gatil-ata from gatils 'suitable, fit'. Loewe (1896:176) rightly rejects this correspondence, for in no other CG form does PGMc *i occur as (d). He suggests instead that CG Gadelitha is linked to MNetth gadelijk 'comfortable', NHH gatlich 'tolerable, convenient'. Loewe proposes Pre-(NCG) *gadelikata and assumes syncope of those sounds which are missing in the CG form.

A phonologically more satisfying explanation, which assumes a different formation of the root found in MNethl gadelijk, NHG gältich, is proposed by von Grienberger (1898:127). He suggests that CG Gadelitha corresponds to unattested BG *gadilata from *gadilts, which he links to BG gadilgys 'cousin', OHG gegan 'connected with', MNethl gaden 'to suit, fit', gading 'liking', and, with ablaut, BG gobs 'good'.

It is clear that final -tha in CG Gadelitha corresponds to the neuter nom./acc. pronominal adjective ending BG -atha (cf. BG blindaata) as does -tha in CG Atochha, and -atha in CG Wichtsgata. The Latin gloss here, it should be noted, is also a neuter form. In the Pre-NCG form underlying CG Gadelitha this ending has been weakened to *-atha and the first *a has been syncopated. The stem, CG Gadel- can easily be derived from PGMc *gadilts-. PGMc *g- becomes NCG *y/, *-a- becomes NCG *y-d/. The vowel of the second syllable would have been weakened to NCG *y/ (cf. 7.1.3). This yields NCG *yadalats/. The Greek informant accurately reproduced all the consonant sounds, but substituted full vowels for NCG *y/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).


Gaaktivou: un glossed form in the cantilena (cf. 10).

Geen 'tre' ('to go'), list A, = CG ['yenne] for NCG *y/en/ (*/y/en/).

Loewe (1903:7) believes that CG Geen is monosyllabic, with (e) for (e) as in MNethl (cf. 6.6.1.5). However, since CG Geen and the immediately following form, CG Breen 'to roast' always occurs in Busbecq's list in a sequence of verb infinitives, I believe that CG Geen and Breen are best interpreted as disyllabic forms, i.e. Ge-en, Bree-en, whereby final -en corresponds to NCG *an/ as in CG Schiet, Schilpen, Kommen, Singhen, Lachen, Erihen.

It appears that the first (e) in CG Geen corresponds to PGMc *ei, as Schwarz (1951:164) suggests that CG Geen is a formation from PGMc *gen < PIE *ghe- 'to go' which was restructured in Pre-NCG from *gen to *gëan in analogy to the other strong verbs with the infinitive ending -an. In hiatus position PGMc *ei becomes NCG *i (*/[e]/) and thus does not appear as CG (i) or (y) as it does in CG Mine, Schilpen, Mycha. Schwartz compares this development of PGMc *ei: to the in the BG forms saian 'to sow', wiaian 'to blow', where PGMc *ei, which regularly appears as BG (e) (= [e]), occurs as (a) (=[a]): (cf. Geen (e) for PGMc *ei in Breen is explained by the same rationale.

The significance of CG Geen for the placement of the CG discourse is discussed under 9.3.

Related forms in Germanic (in BG the verb for 'to go' is noncorresponding gaggoun): Late ON gá, OE gán, OS gän, MNethl gaen, OHG gän, gän 'to go' < PGMc *gë- (athematic root verb) < PIE *gëh-'. Cf. Feist (1939:181f, gaggoun); Kluge (1967:241, gehen); Seebold (1970:216f, Gë-).

gira: un glossed form in the cantilena (cf. 10).

Goltz 'Aurum' ('gold'), list A, = CG [yolb] for NCG *yolb/.

CG (e) in Goltz shows (Common Germanic) a-umlaut of PGMc *ae (cf. Krake and Meid 1969b:§36) in contrast to (u) in corresponding BG gulph (cf. also CG Boga, Kor, Schao for [Schnas], Borrotsch). CG (ze), which reflects PGMc *b (cf. also CG Tdo, Stutz) represents an attempt by Busbecq to transcribe the dental fricative CG (z) (cf. 6.6.2.20).

Related forms in Germanic: BG gulph (dat. gulpha), ON gull, goll, OE gold, OFris gold, OS gold, OHG gold 'gold' < PGMc *gulpha- (neut. a-stem) < PIE *gulbo- 'gold'. Cf. Feist (1939:224f, gulph); Kluge (1967:264, Gold).

Handa 'Manus' ('hand'), list A, = CG ['anda] for NCG *yanda/.

Initial CG (h) appears to have been introduced here for CG (h) by Busbecq as a result of
the influence of Netherlandish and German orthography (cf. Nethl hand, ENHG hand; 6.6.2.8), since the CG forms Ano, Iel, Ielsch, Ael suggest that initial prevocalic PGmc *z* had been lost in NCG. Final CG (a) represents underlying NCG *a/*a/ (cf. 7.1.3.), for which the informant substituted a full vowel (cf. 5.1.4.3).


hazer 'mille' ('one thousand'), list C, = CG ['zaxer] for NCG */sazel/.

Unless it has erroneously been introduced by the informant, the CG hazer, like CGsada 'one hundred', represents a loan in NCG from an Iranian dialect. Feist (1939:252) suggests that this form was borrowed by way of Turkish from Middle Persian hazar 'one thousand'. This form in hazer would appear to indicate CG [h], but this sound was not available to the informant in his native CG (cf. 5.3.4, Fig. 2), nor does it appear to be present in NCG (cf. CG iel, ielsch, Aono). It is possible that initial Persian (Turkish) [h] in this borrowing was pronounced as *[x]* in NCG, and that the informant accurately reproduced it as *[x]* (cf. 5.4.2.4).


Hof (for *Hoef*) 'Caput' ('head'), list A, = CG [oxt] for NCG */o:ft/ */o:ft/; CG [oxt] for NCG */o:st/.

Busbecq may have used MFlem hoef* 'head' (cf. Jacobs 1911:205) or ENHG hoef* 'head' (in Cologne printings of the 16th century: cf. Moser 1929:178) as a model for CG *Hoef*. I believe that initial (h) in this form has been influenced by the spelling of the corresponding forms in Netherlandish and German and that it stands here and in CG Handa, Hus for CG *[h] (cf. 6.6.2.8). CG (oe) corresponds to PGmc *aua as in CG Broe, Oechene. On the sound value of CG (oe) (cf. 6.6.1.11).

Schwarz (1951:164) believes that the final dental has been lost in this form and in CG Broe according to a sound law. Lamp (1973) suggests that the final dental in CG Hof may have been lost under influence of the preceding spirant. But the presence of final (t) in CG Plut, WVinart, Alt argues against the possibility of a loss of the final dental in the NCG word underlying CG Hof. I think we can assume with Schröder (1910:140) and van de Velde (1964:112) that CG Hof is misprinted for *Hoef*. CG (t) here indicates that PGmc *z* was devoiced to NCG */f/ when it came to stand before */j/* Pre-NCG */d/ < PGmc */d/.

Related forms in Germanic: BG hauib (gen. haubis), ON hauði, OE hæafod, OLF hôvid, OS hôbid, OHG houhit, -pit < PGmc *hauða-, -ida (neut. a-stem) 'head' < Pre-Gmc *kaupit, -i. Cf. Feist (1939:248, hauib; 266, hoe); Kluge (1967:293, Haup).

Huis 'Domus' ('house'), list A, = CG [u] for NCG */uw/.

As in CG Handa, Hoef, initial (h) in CG Huis has apparently been introduced by Busbecq for CG *[h] under influence of the spelling of the corresponding forms in Netherlandish and German (cf. MNethl huus, NNethl huis, ENHG haus, hus; 6.6.2.8), because CG Ano, Ael, Iel, Ielsch indicate that initial prevocalic PGmc *z* is lost in NCG. CG (u) in Huis is the only certain reflex of PGmc *u* in CG.

Related forms in Germanic: BG -hus in hudus 'temple' (the PG words for 'house' are razen and gards), ON hus, OE hús, Ofris hús, OS hús, OTHelhús 'house' < PGmc *žusa- (neut. a-stem). Cf. Feist (1939:223f, gudhus); Kluge (1967:294, Hau).

Ich in Ich maltha 'Ego disco' ('I say'), list B, = CG [ix] for NCG *[ik]/. CG Ich is included in list B only because of the accompanying verb form, CG maltha.

While CG maltha was unfamiliar to him, Busbecq clearly associated CG Ich with the pronouns for the first pers. sg. in Netherlandish and German and in fact used ENHG ich 'I' as a model for his transcription of this word.

Busbecq's digraph (ch) in CG Ich and in CG Mycha represents the voiceless velar fricative *[x]* as it does in CG Lachen (cf. 6.6.2.3) and not the palatal fricative *[j]* (in spite of the preceding palatal vowel in both CG Ich and Mycha), for of these two sounds only *[x]* occurred in the informant's CGk (cf. 5.3.4.8).

The appearance of CG *[x]* for PGmc *k* in CG Ich and Mycha (cf. BG ik, meki) suggests a development of PGmc *k* in NCG paralleling that in High German. Otto Höfler, who seeks a development of CG Ich, Mycha to palatalization by the preceding vowel plus aspiration (Höfler 1957:250-SI). In a forthcoming note on CG Ich Eric P. Hamp explains this form by proposing a rule for the development of Gmc *k* before following initial consonants (e.g. in verb forms) to NCG *[x]*.

It is my opinion that the development of PGmc *k* to a fricative in CG Ich, Mycha took place not in NCG, but rather in the speech of the informant. PGmc *k* had probably become a voiceless fricative stop in NCG, having (in most positions) aspirated allophones. Busbecq's informant, whose CGk had no aspirated kʰ sound (cf. 5.3.4.3), perceived postvocalic Gmc *kʰ* as *[x]* and therefore reproduced it by substituting his CGk *[x]*-phoneme (cf. 5.4.2.9).


Iel (noun), Iel (adj), Ielsch:

Iel 'Vita sue sanitas' ('life, health'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Iel in Iel vurit 'Sit sanum' ('may it be well, healthy'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Ielsch 'Viusue sanus' ('alive, healthy, well'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Ielsch 'Viusue sanus' ('alive, healthy, well'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Ielsch 'Viusue sanus' ('alive, healthy, well'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Ielsch 'Viusue sanus' ('alive, healthy, well'), list B, = CG [je] for NCG */e:/ */e:/; */j:/ */j:/ (cf. below).

Massmann (1841:362) correctly linked CGIelsch 'alive, healthy' to BG hails 'healthy', and CG Iel 'life, health' to OS heil, OHG heil 'luck, fortune' (and to unattested BG hail 'fortune, health'). The correspondences of CG Iel (noun), Iel (adj.), and Ielsch to cognates in Germanic can be explained as follows.

Initial PGmc *z* is lost in the underlying NCG forms for these CG words as it is in those underlying CG Ano, Ael (compare also Epigrammatic Gothic eils = BG hails 'healthy, well').

It appears that PGmc *ai* became a monophthong in NCG as it did in Old English, Old Saxon, Old Frisian, and probably also in BG (cf. Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:52). I believe that the NCG reflex of PGmc *ai* as *i:/ or */i:/ (although CG (ie) here also suggests NCG */i:/ (cf. 6.6.1.8). For NCG */i:/ (or */e:/) Busbecq's Greek informant substituted his CGk */e/-phoneme, which in its position acquires a j[-]on-glide, so that it occurs as *[je]* (cf. 5.4.1.2). Busbecq transcribed initial CG (je-) in these forms and in CG Ies as *[je]* (or possibly as *[je]*) (cf. 6.6.2.9 and fn. 24). Another solution would be to assume that a result of areal accentual development such a j[-]on-glide developed in NCG, paralleling the development in other languages in CG's Sprachbund: cf. CGk, East Slavic, Bulgarian.

CG Iel 'life, health' can be considered as a noun (neut. a-stem) corresponding directly to
OS hēl, OHG hīlf. CG Ielisch is explained as an adjective (masc. a-stem, strong declension), having an exact correspondent in BG hails (note that the Latin glosses for CG Ielisch, 'Viuus' and 'sanus', have masc. endings). Final (sch) in CG Ielisch reflects PGmc *s- from the nom. ending PIE *s- (cf. also CG Vintosh for *VVintosh), Rintisch, Borrochtes, Fers) and represents CG [s] for NCG *s-/s/ (cf. 6.6.2.17). CG (t) here, if not a misprint, may represent a connective sound between [l] and [s], as suggested by Loewe (1896:162), and may have been introduced by the informant. CG Iel 'well, healthy', which is glossed with a Latin neuter form, 'sanum', can be interpreted as the neuter form of CG Ielisch, i.e. as a neut. a-stem adjective, nom. sg. strong declension, uninflexed (cf. BG blind next to blindata). Another possibility is that CG Iel interl vobrt is a noun, i.e. identical to CG Iel 'life, health', so that CG Iel vobrt might be interpreted as 'let there be health'.

Other etymologies for these CG forms have also been advanced. Feist (1939:290) suggests linking them to Hunq-élés, élét 'life', élétes, élées 'alve'. For CG Ielisch Loewe (1896:162) proposes an original *halitis. Von Grienberg (1898:125) sees the pretetive participle BG hālithīs from hāljān 'to heal' as a correspondent to CG Ielisch. Kluge (1911:114) and Schwarz (1951:169) believe that the glosses for CG Iel 'life, health' and Ielisch 'alive, healthy' have been reversed, so that Iel should be the adjective, and Ielisch and BG *haļīna 'health' (cf. OE hēlī, OHG helīda 'health').


Les in les Varthatha 'Ile fecti' ('he made'), list B, = CG [jes] for NCG *[es*[/jes*]]. Tomasek (1881-65) connected CG les 'be with BG jains, OHG jener 'that one', whereby he assumes the loss of the original nasal. I believe with Massmann (1841:362) that CG lees corresponds to BG is 'he'. Von Grienberg (1898:131) interprets CG [e] here as long [i], assuming secondary lengthening of PGmc *iz in *iz 'he', but I think that this form can be explained from PGmc *ez 'he' (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:353, p. 57). PGmc *ez is preserved in NCG in this form as a sibilant, but devolved in final position to NCG *iz (cf. CG Schuus [for *Schnos], Vintosh [for *VVintosh], Lintisch, Rintacht, Fers).

PGmc *ez is preserved as NCG *ez, but the CG ele-phoneme substituted for this vowel by the informant acquires a (j)-on-glide in initial position as (5.4.1.2) and thus occurs as [e], which Busbecq transcribes as (e) in CG les and in CG leel, leelacht (cf. 6.6.2.9). It is possible, of course, that such a (j)-on-glide had developed in NCG as well.

Related forms in Germanic:—BG is, Runc er, ir, iar (relative particles), ONes, is, er, ir (relative particles), OFris -er(e) (enclitic), OHG er, ir 'he' < CGm *iz, *iz, *ec (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:34, p. 57) < PGmc *iz. Cf. Feist (1939:290, les; 296, iz); Kluge (1967:169f, er).

ingdolou: unglossed form in the cantilena (cf. 10.).

Ita 'one', list C, = CG ['ita] for NCG *ita/.

Although CG Ita is a somewhat peculiar looking form, it is unlikely that it has been misprinted, since it appears again as -ita in CG thiinnia 'eleven'. Massmann (1841:362) suggests that CG Ita may correspond to BG ainaata neut. nom. acc. 'one'. To link CG Ita to BG ainaata Tomasek (1881:65) assumes the loss of an original nasal in the (N)CG form.

He justifies this assumption by citing CG Getes, which he links to BG jains, and in which he also assumes a lost nasal. Von Grienberg (1898:131) concurs in this analysis and proposes NCG *ita. However, it is by no means clear under what circumstances the nasal might have been lost in this form (cf. CG (n) in VVingar, VVinich, Mine, Handa, Oegehen, VVaghen, Schilpen, Menus, Ano, ano, thine, etc.).

Feist (1917:22) cites ON etit 'one' as a correspondent to CG Ita, but does not include it in his (1939) etymological dictionary of Gothic.

A connection of CG Ita with BG ita, 3rd pers, prounon, neut. nom. sg., 'it', another possibility suggested by Massmann (1841:362), would seem to present insurmountable semantic difficulties. However, in a forthcoming article on CG numerals, Eric P. Hamp argues convincingly in favor of this etymology by explaining in the context of CG as an East European language. He suggests that there was a restructurung of the Pre-NCG numeral for 'one' after the model shown by Baltic, Slavic, and Albanian, originally a phrase of the shape THAT IN one. Hamps proposes Slavic *ed-inu- (masc.) and *ed-inu- (fem.) 'one' and the parallogressing restructured Pre-NCG compound *ita+aina/-ina -> *ita/(a)ina (cf. BG aina, ain, aina, aina 'one'). Later the redundant (a)ina- was lost: *ita/(a)ina -> *ita (< NCG *ita/)

Cf. Feist (1939:24, ains; 296, is, ita); Kluge (1967:157f, ein; 169f, er, es).

Kilemschkop (for *Kilemschkop?) 'ebbe callix' ('drink up your cup'), list B, = CG ['kilems kop] for NCG */kilems kop/.

CG Kilemschkop is one of the obscure words in Busbecq's lists. Massmann (1841:363) linked CG -schkop to OFris skap, MNethl schap, OG skap 'tub, vat, barrel', OHG skap, skaf (cf. NHG Schaf) 'vessel, container for liquids'. Forstmann (1875:166) suggests that final CG -skop might be connected to OHG kapf, chöpf, ON cappr, OE cep 'cup' from Middle Lowcappa 'cup'. Tomasek (1881:65) sees in final CG -schkop a verb form, which he connects with NHG schöpfen 'to ladle, dip, scoop out'. He takes initial CG Kilem- as a noun, which he links to ON kyll 'leatheren bottle', OE cille 'bag, skin, bottle'. Massmann (1841:363) suggests that CG Kilem- (for *Kinim-) may correspond to a verb form, NCG *ganim (cf. BG niam to 'take, ganiman to 'take up').

Von Grienberg (1898:130) interprets CG Kilemschkop as NCG *kilemskop, equivalent to BG kilaime weis kup 'let us gulp down the cup'. BG *kilaime would represent the 1st pers. pl. present optative of unattested *kilan, which he links to OHG chela, kela, OE ceole 'throat' (cf. Skt gilami, Arm klanem, OL german 'Igulp down'). BG weis is the pronoun for the 1st pers. pl. 'we', and *kup 'cup' the direct object.

Siebs (1922) assumes that final CG -kop corresponds to OHG coph, etc. and proposes that CG Kilemsch- corresponds to BG *gilimpai pus 'es bekomme (glück) dir', i.e. 'may it do you good, bring you luck', or to BG *galimpip pus 'es bekommt (glück) dir', i.e. 'it does you good, brings you luck'. BG *gilimpai would be the 3rd pers. sg. present optative, *gilimpip the 3rd pers. present indicative of unattested BG *gilimpan 'to proceed, succeed, have luck' (cf. OE geiliman 'to happen', gelipmap 'event, stroke of luck'). BG pus is the pronoun of the 2nd pers. dative sg. Siebs believes that the sound correspondences here are not difficult, and attempts to explain them by comparing phonological developments in other CG forms. His arguments are unconvincing, however. For example, he justifies initial CG (k) in Kilemschkop for corresponding PGmc *g (cf. OE gelimpan) by citing CG 'criten', which he links to BG gretan. The fact is, Sieb's 'criten' appears as CG Eriten in Busbecq's list.
BG fragílidan, uggíldan ('to repay'). He interprets CG Kilémshchop as kilyschkop for underlying *goldín skop 'Weiche deinen Becher', i.e. by drinking. Höfler believes that CG (k) in Kilémshchop reflects PGeMc *g and attributes this development to a late Gothic "Medienverhàrten," which he calls the "Krimgotische Lautverschiebung."

Scardigli (1964:305; 1973:260-61) believes that CG Kilém represents a loan in CG, not from Lat calix 'cup', but possibly from Gk nýξ 'wine cup'. He explains the *n as influenced by the Latin acc. ending, e.g., in calicum, and like Tomaschek (1881:65) links -skhop to NHG schöpfen.

None of the above etymologies proposed for CG Kilémshchop is entirely convincing, though it seems likely that the final element CG -kop can be separated and linked to OHG coph, ON corp, OE cop 'cup' (CG Schièt with initial (sch) for PGeMc *sk- speaks against a correspondence of CG -skhop with initial (shk) to OS skop, OHG skahp, skaf). It is not unlikely that the informant perceived this two-word sentence as a single word and reproduced it as such. Otherwise we would expect Busbecc to have segmented it as CG * Kilémsh kop. It is also possible that Busbecc actually did segment it, in which case a copyist or the composer was responsible for running these two words together.

CG Kilémshchop is glossed as a 2nd pers. imperative, but could represent a 1st pers. pl. form. Final-ensch in CG * Kilémsh might be connected with the 1st pers. pl. endings OHG -amés, -enés found in the present indicative, optative, and imperative (cf. Braune and Mitzka 1967:§307, 311c, 313).

Correspondences of CG Kilémshchop to other forms in Germanic are uncertain: cf. Feast (1939:161, fragílidan; 311, kilyschkop; 375f, níman); Kluge (1967:245, gelè; 361, Kèhle; 393f, Kopf; 631, Schaff); Seebold (1970:330f, Lèmpa; 375f, Nèm-a).

Knaun, knaun: Knaun in Knaun tag 'Bonus dies' ('good day') and knaun 'bonum' ('good'), both in the paragraph introducing list B, = CG [knaun] for NCG *knaun/ náun, or CG [knaun] for NCG *knaou.

Tomácshek (1881:62) linked CG Knaun to OE (ge)k anewan 'to know', ON kná 'to know how, be able', ONknár 'capable, brave', and (incorrectly) to Lat (ge)navas 'energetic, busy'. Von Grienerberg (1898:124) points out that CG Knaun tag obviously represents an accusative form and that the Latin gloss should therefore read 'Bonum diem'. He proposes corresponding unattested BG *knavana dag whereby *knavana would be the acc. masc. sg. of *knaus < *knawaz. He also derives ON knár from *knavaz, thus linking CG Knaun to the Old Norse form. Much (1898:198) follows the same line of reasoning, deriving ON knár from *knavar. He links CG Knaun further to Ir gno, Breton gnoù 'evident, distinct' from *gnauvo 'excellent', which may explain the meaning of the CG form.

Busbecc's use of (u) in Knaun may suggest that PGeMc *w has become a labio-dental fricative here (cf. CG Sliur, seuwen), i.e. CG (u) for CG (v) (cf. 6.6.2.21) for NCG */w/ < PGeMc *w. However, it is also possible that PGeMc *w became the second element of a NCG diphthong here (cf. NHG blau < MHG bìa, blàwer), in which case CG (au) here might represent CG [aw] (cf. 6.6.1.3) for NCG */aw/ < PGeMc *aw.

Related forms in Germanic: ONknár 'capable, brave', ON kná 'to know how, be able', OE (ge)newan 'to know'. Cf. Feast (1939:313, knau); de Vries (1962:320, knár); Seebold (1970:302f, KNÁ-).

Kommen 'Venere' ('to come'), list A, = CG [kommén] for NCG */kóman/.

CG Kommen may have been modeled after MFlem kommen (cf. van Loey 1962:§82, n. 3) or ENHG komen 'to come'. Otherwise (mn) in this form could only mean that Busbecc intended to short preceding vowel (cf. 6.6.2.8), since his Greek informant would not have pronounced a long consonant here (cf. 5.3.4.3).

Von Grienerberg (1898:133) suggests that CG Kommen is a denominative weak verb derived from the word for 'arrival', cf. BG qums. It is more logical to assume with Feast (1939:387) that CG Kommen corresponds to the infinitives ON koma, OE cuman, OFris kuna, koma, OS cuman, OHG cuman, cuman 'to come' < PGeMc *kuanm- < Pre-Gmc *gum- with zero ablaut grade (cf. BG qíman, OHG qeuman 'to come', which show the *e-ablaut grade expected for the 'infinitive form' of this verb of the 4th ablaut class). However, kó- in OHG koma has been explained as a secondary development from earlier que- (cf. Wright 1907:§505). A similar development may have occurred in NCG, or perhaps the vocalism in the NCG form underlying CG Kommen has been influenced by other forms of the paradigm of this verb of the 4th ablaut class (e.g. the past participle).

Related forms in Germanic: BG qíman, ON koma, kuma, OE cuman, OFris kuma, OS kuma, OHG queman, cuman, cuman (kuman, koman). Cf. Feast (1939:387f, qíman); Kluge (1967:390, kommen); Seebold (1970:315f, kwén-).

Kor (for *Korf) 'Triticum' ('grain'), list A, = CG [korn] for NCG *korn/; CG [kor] for NCG *kor/.

The Germanic correspondents to CG Kor (BG kaurn, ON korn, OHG korn, etc.) all show final-ñ. Hamp (1973:61) believes that final Pre-NCG *ñ has been lost here and in CG Baar (cf. CG Barrn) according to a general rule: "C > zero for #. However, final (n) in CG Stein (for *Stiern) disagrees with this formulation. (Final (rn) in CG Thurn does not reflect an original cluster.)

Alternatively, one can interpret the lack of final (n) in CG Kor as an informant distortion, or as the result of a miscopying or misprint. Perhaps this form appeared in a manuscript as *Korb (cf. CG Schièt for *Schièten). If so, the copyist or composer working with such a Vorlage could easily have overlooked the diacrite. If we assume an original manuscript form *Korn, Busbecc's model for this transcription may have been ENHG korn 'grain'.

CG (o) in Kor shows (Common Germanic) a-umlaut of PGeMc *u to o (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§36), just as it does in CG Boga, Goltz, Schuus (for *Schnos) (cf. also CG Borrotsch), and does not reflect a development paralleling the 'breaking' ('Brechung') of PGeMc *u before *r to BG (au) (cf. corresponding BG kaurn). This is seen by CG Thurn and vburt (for *vurt), both of which show CG (ur) for PGeMc *ur.


*Krèten: cf. Erten.

Lachen 'Ridere' ('to laugh'), list A, = CG [laxen] (['læyen']?) for NCG */laxan/ (*/læyan/?).

It appears that Busbecc modeled this form after Nethlachen or ENHG lachen. CG (a) here shows no evidence of i-umlaut, which might be expected before originally following *y (cf. BG hìahjan). However, this *y, if originally present, may have been lost in Pre-NCG before it could produce phonemic umlaut. Otherwise NCG *i/a may have been introduced from the infinitive from another form of the verb in which an originally following *y did not occur.

The digraph (ch) in CG Lachen may represent the only reflex of PGeMc *x in the CG data (cf. 7.2.3.2). The presence of medial CG (ch) here for PGeMc *x is in contrast to its absence in CG thiene 'ten' (cf. BG tìhun, OHG zëhan 'ten'). Tomaschek (1881:61) suggested that the preservation of PGeMc *x in CG Lachen was due to the influence of an originally following *y (cf. BG hìahjan). Perhaps they was a gemination of PGeMc *x before this *y as in West Germanic, or an assimilation of *y to the preceding *x as suggested by Loewe (1896:174).
Another possibility is that PGmc *χ was lost in the Pre-NCG form for CG Lachen and that *χ/ was introduced in the NCG form by analogy to other forms of this verb. If NCG preserved final PGmc *χ as a velar fricative, the preterite singular of this (originally) strong verb of the 6th ablaut class could have been shown as */χu/ with */χ/ < PGmc *χ. (cf. MNGehl loechen, preterite sg. of lachen). This verb shows 'grammatischer Wechsel' (cf. MNGehl loeghen, preterite pl. of lachen: Schönfeld and van Loey 1959:25), so that there is also the possibility that NCG */χ/ < PGmc *χ was generalized throughout the paradigm of this verb (cf. NHG schlagen - schlag - schlagen - geschlagen for OHG slash - slash - slashum - gislagen), although the preterite singular would still show NCG */χ/ < PGmc *χ due to devolving in final position (cf. CG Tag, Atochha). Busbecq could have transcribed a hypothetical CG *[ləχan] for NCG */χalan/ as CG Lachen under the influence of the Netherlandic and German forms.

Related forms in Germanic: BG hlahjan, ON hlēja, OE hlēhhan, OS hlāhhian, MNGehl lachen, OHG hlāhan 'to laugh', strong verbs of the 6th ablaut class < PGmc *gwasjan- < Pre-Gmc *glak-. Weak verbs derived from the strong verb: ON hlakka, OFris hlakka, MNGehl lachen, OHG hlāhen 'to laugh'. Cf. Feist (1939:259, hlajjan); Kluge (1967:417, lachen); Seebold (1970:257f, hlajja-).

**LISTA** 'Parum' ('too little'), list B, = CG [lista] for NCG */l̥isːa/.
Loewe (1896:136) believes that CG Lista is borrowed from Ossetic (Persian) listag 'narrow, thin' as had already been suggested by Tomaschek (1881:64). Massmann (1841:362) connected CG Lista with BG leitila 'small'. Von Grienberger (1898:128) recognizes CG Lista as a superlative form and derives it from *l̥isːata < *l̥isːita, which he links to unattested BG *leitisa, superlative of lei (small) (as the attested superlative, BG ministe).

Much (1898:200) considers final CG -ta in Lista a neut. nom. ending as in CG Atochha, Gadelinha, Vichtigata, ita. Loewe (1903:11) also suggests the neut. ending and proposes CG Lista < */l̥isːita/-sta < */l̥isːi-sta. It should be noted, however, that in BG the neuter ending -ata was seldom used for the strong declension of superlative adjectives (cf. Braune and Ebbinghaus 1973:137, Anm. 2), and in West Germanic the strong declension is rare for superlative adjectives (cf. Braune and Mitzka 1967:624, Anm. 1). I believe with Schwartz (1951:63) that CG Lista can best be linked to OE leást, which is the superlative of OE lētel ( = BG leitils) 'small', although from a different root (cf. Moore and Knott 1965:367). This root also occurs in OFris leêt 'smallest'. Linking CG Lista to OE leést, OFris leêt allows us to derive CG *i from PGmc *ei (cf. CG Mine, Schipen). Final CG (a) may represent an inflectional ending (weak neut. nom./acc. sg.: cf. BG blindo and probably corresponds to NCG */l̥ı/, for which the informant substituted a full vowel (cf. 5.4.1.3).


**malathata** in ICH malathata 'Ego dico' ('I say'), list B, = CG [malatata] for NCG */m̥alatā/.

Because the last five letters of CG malathata are identical to those of the two immediately preceding verb forms in Busbecq's list, CG Varthata and Varthata in Tz Varthata 'you made', Jes Varthah 'he made', Förstemann (1875:160) suggested that the gloss 'Ego dico' ('I say') should be emended as 'Ego dixi' ('I said'). Most scholars since then have concurred in this and like Förstemann have connected CG malathata with BG malbijan 'to speak'.

Von Grienberger (1898:1300) assumes that CG malathata is a preterite form and links the

segment maltha- to BG malbida, 1st pers. sg. preterite indicative of malbijan, by proposing assimilation of PGmc *b to *β and syncope of *-a, which would yield Pre-NCG *malad-. To this stem he adds the assumption of another *-da preterite suffix, a new formation in NCG in analogy to a disyllabic preterite plural (cf. the disyllabic preterite plural ending of BG weak verbs, e.g. BG nasi-dedan, nasi-dedup, nasi-dedun, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd pers. pret. pl. of nasjan 'to say').

Loewe (1894:372f; 1896:155f, 171) also sees a disyllabic preterite ending in CG malthata- and in CG Varthatha/Varthatha and links and CG -atha to the preterite singular of OS dōn, OS dōn, OHG uonu 'to do', i.e. OE dyde, OS deda, OHG rēta ('I, he, she') did'. For CG malathata he proposes Pre-NCG *mαl-đeda-

The interpretations proposed by von Grienberger and Loewe are difficult to justify phonologically. CG (th) in malathata, Varthatha/Varthatha for PGmc */d/ (i.e. [CG t] for NCG */g/) = */d:/ (cf. CG Tag, Tharth) is possible after a morpheme boundary, but medial CG */t/-/θ/- in -atha can only represent CG */t/ for underlying NCG */d/ < PGmc */t/ (cf. CG Schietit, Ersten, Atochha, VeVichtgata), since medial PGmc */d/ appears as CG */d/ ( = CG */g/) in CG fyder, Hanla.

Much (1898:2018) believes that CG malathata is a present tense form. He links CG Maltha to BG mabla 'I speak', assuming metathesis of */bl/ as in NNGehl nuald, OHG nālād next to nādā 'needle' < PGmc *nēbla (cf. BG *nēbla 'needle') and loss of */f/ (cf. CG Lachen). He interprets final -ga as an enclitic pronoun object which he connects with BG ita 'it', 3rd pers. neut. acc. sg. This yields the reading CG maltha-'ta I say it' (cf. also Kluge 1911:13).

Much's interpretation satisfactorily explains CG */t/ in malathata as CG */g/ for NCG */d/ < PGmc */t/, but CG (th) for PGmc */b/ in maltha- is unexpected in view of CG Bruder with */d/ for */b/. If we were to assume that final CG -ta in malathata represented the enclitic pronoun, we might interpret */b/ in malthata- for Pre-NCG */malb/ (cf. CG Gottz, States), though a merger of */b/ with */d/ as NCG */d/ could have occurred here before the loss of an original verbal inflection. In final position (before a morpheme boundary) NCG */d/ is replaced by */l/, so that one could interpret CG malthata- as NCG */mal/ < */mal/ < */mal/< */mal/.

Braun (1890:59) assumes that CG malathata represents a preterite form and proposes an original */k mahalada thata/ 'I said that' (cf. OS mahalan 'to speak', OHG mahelau 'to take as a wife'; BG jata 'that'). This interpretation is also phonologically problematic, for we might expect the underlying forms proposed here to yield CG Ich *maladlatha.

The most satisfying solution phonologically is to interpret CG mal- in malathata as a present indicative form and -thata as an enclitic pronoun-object. CG mal- reflects the Proto-Germanic stem *mahlž found also in BG mabijan, ON móla, OE mæblan, OS mahalan 'to speak', OHG maheilan 'to speak, promise, marry' (on these divergent reflexes of medial PGmc */h/, cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:105) as was suggested by Braun and Much (cf. above). CG mal- probably represents NCG */mal-/ in which */b/ has been lost as in Old Norse (perhaps after assimilation to the following */i/, or by way of */y/: cf. the Old Saxon and Old High German corrodents), and the inflectional ending apocopated. A possible NCG */d/ < */bl/ or compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel with the loss of */b/ would have been obscured by informant distortion (cf. 5.4.2.2; 5.4.1.5).

Enclitic -thata easily corresponds to BG jata. CG thro, the show that initial PGmc */b/ merges with PGmc */d/ in these unaccented articles (cf. 7.2.2.1). This applies to the enclitic demonstrative pronoun CG -thata in malathata, Varthatha/Varthatha as well. Initial NCG */d/ is realized as a voiceless lenis, NCG */g/ (cf. 7.2.2.5), which the Greek informant interpreted as NCG */d/ and reproduced as CG [i] (cf. 5.4.2.6; 5.4.2.7). Busbecq in turn transcribed this sound as (th) in CG -tha as he did in CG the, tho, Tharth, thine. By
assuming enclitic -thata, the identical endings in present tense CG maḥalata and the preterite forms Varθata/Varθaraθa are explained, and an emendation of Busbecq’s gloss ‘Ego dico’ to ‘Ego dixi!’ for CG Iχ maḥalata is unnecessary.

Related forms in Germanic: BG maḥbjan, ON mēlka, OE meλjan, meλjan, meλian, OS mahalian ‘to speak’, OHG mahalen, mahalon ‘to speak, promise, marry’, which are connected to BG maḥi ‘gathering place, market’, OE meλel ‘gathering, speech’, ON māl ‘language’, OS mahal, OHG mahal ‘gathering, court of law’ < PGmc *maλba-; BG pāta, ON pāt, OE pāt, OFris pēth, OS that, OHG daz ‘that’ < PGmc *pāt < PIE *pēd; cf. also BG ita, OE hit, OS it, et, OHG ic, ez ‘it’ < PGmc *i < PIE *i’d. Cf. Feist (1939:296, s; 343, maθlata; 350, maθbjan; 490f, pāta); Kluge (1967:246, Genmai).


CG Marzus is one of the obscure CG words. Förstermann (1875:165) linked this form to Lith marži ‘fiancée’ (cf. also Pokorny 1959:739). Kuun (1880:242) proposed that CG Marzus could be connected to Arabic ma’rīd ‘female slave, maiden’. Tomasek (1881:628) suggests that CG Marzus is misspelled for *Marzus. He links CG *[marz- < *mar-] to Lith mariatis and to Cretan Grk μαρία ‘bride’. In final CG -a- Us Tomasek sees an original -es-, which he connects to ON kjor ‘choice’, BG kiaσ ‘to choose’. This, according to Tomasek, would yield the original meaning ‘Brautwahl’, i.e. ‘the choosing of the bride (fiancée)’.

Von Grienberger (1898:125) proposes that CG Marzus represents a verbal abstract, which he links to MHG merven ‘to unite; to become related by marriage’. He assumes a plural form, original *marwĕs, with the meaning ‘the marriage performance and wedding celebration’. He explains the CG form as being composed of *wi- and a raising of *o to *u, with possible shortening of *u to *u, i.e. CG Marzus < *marwĕs < *marwĕs.

Much (1898:198) believes with Tomasek (1881:621) that the first element of CG Marzus is related to Lith mariatis, Cretan Grk μαριά ‘bride’ and links it further to OHG mardar ‘pine marten’. He connects the second element to BG-hua ‘house’ (cf. BG gudhus ‘temple’, CG Hus) and proposes that CG *Marzus would correspond to an unattested BG *marphus ‘bride house’.

Scardigli (1964:305; 1973:260) suggests that CG Marzus may come from Lat maritus ‘March’, a month he believes must have been popular for weddings in the Black Sea area. None of the ingenious etymologies proposed above is entirely convincing. The lack of an attested direct correspondent to CG Marzus in another Germanic language suggests that it may represent a loan word from a non-Germanic language, but distortion by the Greek informant, by Busbecq, or by the copyist or typesetter may have obscured correspondences within Germanic.

Cf. Feist (1939:348, marzus); Kluge (1967:461, Marder).

Menus (for *Memons?; *Memns?) ‘Caro’ (‘meat’), list B, = CG [mims] for NCG */*mims; CG [mins] for NCG */*mins; CG [meˌnas] for NCG */*menas?

CG Menus may be connected to Hung mén-hus ‘horse meat’ (cf. Feist 1939:355). This is supported by Torquatus’ report, which indicates the use of the Hungarian language by the Crimean Goths (cf. 1.1), and by Busbecq’s description of the custom among the Crimean Tartars of eating raw horse meat (cf. 1.2). In spite of this it seems much more logical to link this CG form to BG mig ‘meat’.

BG mig is derived from PGmc *mema-, < Pre-Gmc *memo-, where *e has been shortened from *e in PIE *mēno- (cf. Sanskrit māṃ ‘meat’). If CG Menus has the same derivation, final (s) ( = CG [s] for NCG */s) shows the preservation of PGmc *e in NCG as a sibilant, devoted to */s/ in final position (cf. CG Schus [for *Schus], VVInsch [for *VVinscht], Ies, Ielsch, Rintsch, Fers).

Loewe (1896:171) explains (u) in CG Menus as an epenthetic vowel, which presumably developed only after the partial assimilation of the bilabial nasal *n to the following dental *s ( < *z) as the dental nasal *n. Schröder (1910:12) believes that CG Menus is misspelled for *Memns, which also assumes the development of an epenthetic vowel, but with the preservation of the bilabial nasal in NCG. Massmann (1841:362) suggests that CG Menus is misspelled for *Memns, which would indicate no epenthetic vowel and no assimilation of *n to *n, or for *Memns (cf. CG muf with (u) for (n)), which would indicate no epenthetic vowel, but assimilation of *n to *n.

CG (e) in Menus is problematic. The PGmc form *memna shows *e before a nasal plus consonant. In this position PGmc *e merges in all Germanic dialects with PGmc *i, and we should therefore expect (i) instead of (e) in CG Menus (cf. CG Rinck, Singhen, VVInscht). If we were to assume that the CG form is derived from a Proto-Germanic form in which PIE *e had not been shortened to *e, we should still expect CG (i) or (y) here, since PGmc *e regularly occurs as (i) or (y) in CG (cf. CG Mine, Schlipen, Mythca). Perhaps CG (e) in Menus can be explained as interference by Busbecq’s phoneme system and/or by a Middle Flemish orthographic tradition. Before m-clusters Middle Flemish tended to replace MNethl (i) (e) with (e) (e) (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:789), e.g. MFM flem embedded ‘to swim’ (cf. NNNethl wemmen ‘to swim’), clemmen ‘to climb’ (cf. NNNethl klinmen ‘to climb’). If we interpret CG Menus as a misprint for *Memns or *Menus, it is possible to suggest that Busbecq wrote (e) for CG [i] before an m-cluster in this form: thus CG *Menus is for CG [mims] ( = NCG */mims/). MNethl (e) sometimes occurs for MNethl (i) before n-clusters as well (cf. Le Roux and Le Roux 1969:79), e.g. MNethl veneden next to veneden ‘to find’, kent next to kint ‘child’, so that an interpretation of CG Menus as a misprint for *Menus is also a possible explanation for (e) here: CG *Menus for CG [mins] ( = NCG */min/).

The only cognate to CG Menus attested in Germanic is BG mümz ‘meat’. Cf. Feist (1939:355, menus; 361, mimmz).

Miera ‘Formica’ (‘ant’), list A = CG [mira] for NCG */mira/. Busbecq’s CG Miera appears to have been influenced by the spelling of a corresponding form in Netherlands: cf. MNethl miere, MNethl mier ‘ant’. CG (e) here probably reflects PGmc *eu as it does in CG Schietel (or PGmc ?; see below) and presumably represents a monophthong as in Netherlandic (cf. 6.6.1.8), i.e. CG [i] (for NCG */i/). Final CG (a) indicates that the informant substituted a full vowel for NCG */a/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic (no corresponding BG form is attested, but Much [1898:197f] suggests BG *mierjo ‘ON maurr m.’, Swedish, Norw dial. maur, Swedishmyra f., Danish myre (MEmyre is borrowed from Scandinavian), MLGmire, MNethl miere, mire pl. ‘ant’. Proto-Germanic forms: *mauro-, *mierūn-, *miron. Cf. Feist (1939:357, miera); Kluge (1967:18, Aeneis).

Mine ‘Luna’ (‘moon’), list A, = CG [mire] for NCG */miːra/.

CG Mine nicely corresponds to BG mene, ON mäne, OHG männo etc. ‘moon’. CG (i) in Mine reflects PGmc *e as it does in CG Schlipen, Lista (cf. also CG Mythca with (y) for (*e).

Mycha 'Ensis' ("sword''), list B, = CG [\'mixa] for NCG *\[mik\]a = \[mik\]a.
Busbeec could not recognize this CG word as Germanic, but it is clearly related to BG meki acc sg "sword".

CG (y) in Myecha reflects PGmc *\[e\]i, and can be considered as a variant of CG (i) (cf. 6.6.1.15) which also reflects *\[e\]i in CG Mine, Schlipen, Lista, and possibly in CG Erienn.
CG (ch) in Myecha is a reflex of PGmc *k*, its only intervocalic reflex in CG. CG (ch) indicates CG [k] as in CG Lachen (cf. 6.6.2.3). In final position PGmc *k* also occurs as CG (ch) in Icch, but elsewhere it appears as CG (k) (cf. CG Kor, Kommen). Tomaszek (1881:64) explains (ch) in CG Mycha as a development from *\[k\]. Loewe (1896:144, 172) believes that PGmc *k* in CG Mycha and Icch has become the palatal fricative [\[z\]] due to influence of the preceding palatal vowel. Schwarze (1951:170) suggests strong aspiration or palatalization of original *k* in these forms: similarly, Höfler (1957:250).

I believe that CG (ch) (= CG [k] for PGmc *\[k\]*) in Mycha can best be explained as informant distortion. Busbeec's Greek informant, whose phonological system had no aspirated stops (cf. 5.3.4.5), perceived aspirated postvocalic *[\[k\]] = *[\[l\]] in the NCG forms underlying CG Mycha and Icch as NCG *[\[l\]] and reproduced it accordingly as CG [k] (cf. 5.4.2.9). It can be assumed that the informant pronounced the velar fricative [\[k\]] and not the palatal fricative [\[z\]], since only the former sound was available to him in CGk (cf. 5.3.4.8).

Related forms in German: BG mekei m. or meki n. (mekei acc sg attested), Runic moki, ON meker, OE mece (possibly a loan word, or \[e\] of Anglic or Kentish origin), OS mik, or n. "sword". Related forms in non-Germanic languages are possibly loans from Germanic, or they and the Germanic forms may have a common source: cf. Finn miekkia, OCS mechii, Serbo-Croatian meč 'sword'. Cf. Feist (1939:352f, meki).

nuye 'nine', list C, = CG [\'niue] for NCG *[\[n\]]nu:

CG nuye represents an underlying NCG form which developed from Gmc *\[n\]iu < *n\]nu < PGmc *\[n\]un < PIE *\[ne\]gu 'nine' (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§335, 71, p. 96; 1969b:§62, p. 90). Pre-NCG *\[n\]iu probably merged with PGmc *\[i\]u (cf. CG Schieter), \[i\] (cf. CG Mine, Schlipen), and *ei (cf. CG Vingart) as NCG *[\[i\]]/ *[\[e\]]/ *[\[i\]]. There is a possibility, however, that Pre-NCG *\[i\]u became NCG *[\[i\]]/ *[\[e\]]/ *[\[i\]], a high front rounded vowel (cf. MHG niu 'nine' with [\[i\]] for *[\[i\]]). The informant's CG had no front rounded vowels, and thus he has may have substituted CGk *[\[i\]] for NCG *[\[i\]]/ *[\[i\]] in the form underlying CG nuye (cf. 5.4.1.8).

Final CG (\[e\]) in nuye, which represents underlying NCG *[\[a\]]/ *[\[a\]] is explained by von Grienberger (1898:137) as a neuter plural ending corresponding to that of unattested Gmc *\[n\]iua. It is possible, however, that no inflectional ending is present here, but that a final vowel has been introduced in NCG in analogy to other numbers with final *[\[a\]]/ *[\[a\]]: cf. CG Iga, tua, tria.

Related forms in German: BG niun, Runic niu, ON niu, OE niu, OFris ni\[u\]en, OS nign, MNethl neghen, OHG niun 'nine'. Cf. Feist (1939:378f, niun); Kluge (1967:509, neun).

Oegheone 'Oculi' ('eyes'), list A, = CG [\'eyen] for NCG */\[\v\]e\[g\]an/ *[\'\v\]e\[g\]\[\v\]an/; CG [\'\v\]e\[g\]\[\v\]en] for NCG */\[\v\]e\[g\]\[\v\]a\[\v\]na?/

Busbeec may well have modeled CG Oegheone after MFIlem oeghen 'eyes'. CG (oe) reflects PGmc *au here as it does in CG Broe, Hoeaf, and probably represents a monophthong, CG [\[a\]] or [\[e\]] (cf. 6.6.1.11). Final CG *-ene appears to correspond to the nom./acc./ voc. pl. ending for the neut. n-declension, PGmc *-\[\v\]n which is reflected as -ona in BG augona 'eyes' (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:§28).

Related forms in German: BG aug, ON auga, OE eage, OFris åge, OS åga, OLF òga, OHG auga 'eye' < PGmc *augon/augô (neut. n-declension with *aug- for *ög- (under influence of PGmc *aucaun-lausun 'eat?') cf. Lithakis, OCS oko, Lat oculus 'eye'. Cf. Feist (1939:64f, augo); Kluge (1967:38, Auge; 521, Ohr).

Plut 'Sanguis' ('blood'), list A, = CG [plut] for NCG *[\[l\]]vut = *[\[l\]vut. Unless it is a misprint for (b) as suggested by Uhlenbeck (1900:30), CG (p) in Plut clearly indicates a voiceless bilabial stop for initial PGmc *b*, which occurs elsewhere in initial position as CG (b), e.g. Bruder 'brother', Boja 'bow'. CG (p) here can be explained by proposing a bilabial lenis stop NCG *\[b\]*, with voiced and voiceless allomorphs, *[\[b\]] and *[\[b\]]. It appears that NCG *\[b\]* occurred as voiceless *[\[b\]] initially before *l/ as evidenced by CG Plut in the form underlying CG Plut as NCG *[\[b\]*p and reproduced it as CG [p] (cf. 5.4.2.5). Busbeec clearly heard this sound as [p] and thus transcribed it as CG (p)

CG (u) in Plut reflects PGmc *\[d\]* as it does in CG Bruder, Stul. Final CG (t) in this form is a reflex of PGmc *d*, which also occurs as (t) in CG Vingart, Altr. CG (t) < PGmc *d* in CG Plut stands in 'grammatischer Wechsel' with (b) < PGmc *b* in corresponding BG blop (gen. blophus) 'blood' as it does in CG Alt vs. BG aldom (compare final (t) for PGmc *t* in CG Goetz, Satz).

Related forms in German: BG blop, ON bloð, OE bloð, OFris bloð, OS bloð, OHG blut < PGmc *blop-blop- 'blood' (neut. a-stem), related to PIE *bhô- 'to gush', perf. part. *bhô- 'that which has gushed up'. Cf. Feist (1939:101, blop); Kluge (1967:87, blot).

Reghen 'Pluvia' ('rain'), list A, = CG [\'reyen] for NCG */\[\v\]re\[\v\]an/

Busbeec probably modeled this word after corresponding MNethl reghen or ENHG reghen (cf. Moser 1929:§37). CG (e) in the first syllable of CG Reghen reflects PGmc *e* in contrast to BG rign with (i) for (e) (cf. also CGSchauesterg. vs BW'stuar). Presumably the second (e) in this second forms represents an epenthetic vowel (cf. BG rign), NCG */a/, for which the informant substituted [\[e\]] (or perhaps [\[i\]], [\[a\]], [\[u\]], or [\[o\]] (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in German: BG rign, ON regn, OE regan, OFrisrein, OS reigan, regan, MNethl regen, OHG rigan 'rain' < PGmc *regna- (a-stem) < Pre-Gmc *regna < PIE *rek- 'damp, rain, to water'. Cf. Feist (1939:397f, rign); Kluge (1967:590, Regen).

Rinck, Ringo 'Annullus' ('ring'), list A, = CG [\'ri\[k\]] for NCG */\[\v\]r[\[k\]b]/ *[\'ri\[k\]] = *[\'ri\[k\]] = *[\'\v\]ri\[\v\]an/.

It appears that these two CG lexemes represent two forms of the same word in NCG, perhaps singular and plural. Initial preconsonantal PGmc *\[k\]* has been lost in CG Rinck, Ringo (cf. ON hringr, OE hring) as in CG Lachen, Vvichgata. CG (i) in these forms, as in CG Vinch, Singhen, Rintsch, reflects PGmc *e*, which before nasal plus consonant merges with PGmc *i* in all Germanic dialects (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:§35). The alternation between medial (ng) and final (nek) in CG Ringo, Rinck points to the values CG *[\[g\]] and [\[k\]] respectively, which the informant pronounced for NCG *[\[g\]]/ *[\[k\]] (cf. 5.4.2.8). Final CG (a) in Ringo probably represents NCG *[\[a\]]/ for which the informant substituted a full vowel, CG [\[a\]] (cf. 5.4.1.3, 7.1.3).

Related forms in German (BG hriggs is not attested): ON hringr, OE hring, OFris hring, OS hring, MNethl rin, OHG hring, ring 'ring' < PGmc *\[\v\]rings < PGmc *\[\v\]renga- (masc. a-stem) < Pre-Gmc *\[\v\]renho-. Cf. Feist (1939:398, rinck, ringo); Kluge (1967:601, Ringo).
Rintsch 'Mons' (‘mountain’), list B, = CG [rints] for NCG *rints/.

CG Rintsch has been linked to Norw dial. *rind, rinde, rende ‘ridge, crest, ridge of hills’ (cf. Feist 1939:399) and further to ON *rönd, OE *rand, OHG *rant ‘edge, border, edge of shield, shield’, which show a different ablaut grade. Much (1898:200) connects CG Rintsch to these words for ‘edge’ by suggesting the original meaning ‘Ufersteilrand’ (‘steep edge of the shore’).

CG *i/ in Rintsch reflects PGmc *e before nasal plus consonant as in CG *Vvinch, Singhen, Rinck, Ringo. CG *e (n) here indicates the partial assimilation of an original PGmc *e (shown by related OE *rima ‘edge, border, coast’, ON *rimi ‘ridge of hills’) to the following dental as NCG */i/. CG *i (t) reflects PGmc *a, which has been devoted to NCG */i/ before */s/ as in CG *Vvinch (for *Vvinches), Boroscht. CG (sch) represents CG [s] (cf. 6.6.2.17) for NCG */s/ < PGmc */z/ from the nom. ending PIE *-s: CG *Vvinches (for *Vvinches), Boroscht, Jeltsch, Fers. 


sada ‘centum’ (‘one hundred’), list C, = CG *[sada] for NCG */sada/.

Unless it has been erroneously introduced by the informant, CG sada, like CG hazer ‘one thousand’, represents an Iranian loan word in NCG (borrowed via another language?). Cf. Ossetic (Iranian) sada, Persian sad ‘one hundred’. CG sada is therefore non-Germanic, though ultimately cognate to BH hung, ON hung-rad, OE hung, OFris hung-red, OS hung, OHG hung ‘one hundred’: all are reflexes of PIE *kwata ‘one hundred’. Cf. Feist (1939:275f, hundra, 403, sada); Kluge (1967:321, hundert).

Salt ‘Sal’ (‘salt’), list A, = CG [salt] for NCG */salt/.

CG Salt corresponds perfectly to BG salt, ON salt, OE zealt, OFris salt, OS salt, MNethl sour, OHG salz ‘salt’ < PGmc *salt- (neut. a-stem) < PIE *sal- (cf. Feist 1939:409, salt); Kluge (1967:622, Salt).

Schedit ‘Lux’ (‘light’), list B, = CG *[skedit] (I’sed, I’sed, I’eder) for NCG *[sked/(*se:; se:; di:; t)u]?

CG Schedit is one of the obscure CG forms. Massmann (1841:363) believes that this word may be connected with BG skéin ‘to shine’, skéma ‘light, lamp’, or skádan ‘to divide, separate’. Tomaschek (1881:64) suggests that CG Schedit may be linked to OE swéctol ‘clear, manifest, distinct’, whereby CG (sch) represents NCG */í/ from PGmc *sw- (but cf. CG Schauerst, Schuauth).

Von Grienberger (1898:129) believes that CG Schedit is ‘zweifellos’ related to NHG scheiden, BG skádan and has the same (zero) ablaut grade as MHG schit ‘parting’ (but cf. CG *i, *y for PGmc *i in Fischt, Silaur, fyder). He proposes a correspondingly unattested BG *skídes and explains the semantic development from ‘parting’ to ‘light’ by assuming an original meaning of this form to be ‘Morgendämmerung’. This would happen in the case of ii, which is the time when day and night part. Certainly this etymology must be rejected as far-fetched. To connect CG Schedit to BG skádan semantically it would seem more logical to look to related OHG skir ‘stick of (fire) wood’ (NHG Scheit). Perhaps the NGC form underlying CG Schedit was equivalent in meaning to Russ lučina ‘splinter (used to furnish light)’.

Lowe (1903:110) considers the first element of this form, CG Sched-, to be a loan from the Iranian dialect of the Alani, and cites Persian šed ‘brightness, gleam’ to support this theory. He links the second element, CG *iit to OHG eit, OE át, OS *é ‘fire’, and suggests an original meaning ‘Glanzbrand.’

The etymology of this word remains unclear. The above proposals present phonological and/or semantic difficulties. As in the case of some of the other CG forms, e.g. Klemschopp, Cadariou, a misprint may have obscured correspondences to related forms in other languages.


Schiétt ‘Mitternacht’ (‘to shoot an arrow’), list A, = CG *[síten] for NCG */síten/.

Although this form has been modeled after corresponding MNethl schieben ‘to shoot’, CG (sch) here probably represents CG [s] for underlying NCG */s/ as it does in CG Schauerst, Schuauth, Schlipen, Schuos (for *Schnos) (cf. 6.6.2.17). CG (sch) in Schric next to others, which is unknown, which also occurs in CG Fischt (for *Fische). CG (sch) here indicates a monophthongization of PGmc *eu to NCG */i/, which the informant probably reproduced as a suffix vowel, CG [i] or [i] (cf. 5.3.3.3). Final CG (e) stands for (en) as shown by the other verb infinitives in Busbecq’s report, e.g. CG Kommen, Singhen, Lachen, and represents underlying NCG */an/.


Schlipen ‘Dormire’ (‘to sleep’), list A, = CG *[slípen] for NCG */sli:pan/.

CG (sch) in Schlipen represents CG [s] for underlying NCG */s/ as in CG Schuauth, Schauerst, Schuos (for *Schnos) (cf. 6.6.2.17). CG (sch) reflects initial PGmc *st-: CG (i) in Schlipen indicates the raising of PGmc *éi to NCG */i/: PGmc *éi also occurs as NCG */í/ in CG Mine, Mycha, Lista (but cf. (e) for *éi in CG Breen, Geen).

Related forms in Germanic: BG sLEEP, OE slápan, OFris slep, OS sLEEP, MNethl släpen, OHG slépjan (familiar belonging to the class of originally reduplicating verbs without ablaut) ‘to sleep’. No corresponding verb form is attested in North Germanic, but a related noun form is ON slípr ‘indolent person’. These forms are derived from PGmc *slep- ‘to sleep’: cf. also MNethl slap, LG slap, OHG sláfja ‘loose, slack, weak’ < PGmc *slápa with different ablaut grade. Cf. Feist (1939:437f, sLEEP); Kluge (1967:651f, Schlaf, schlaff); Seebold (1970:434f, slÉP- A).

Schuos (for *Schnos) ‘Sponsa’ (‘fiancée’), list B, = CG [snos] for NCG */sños/.

It is apparent that the differences in phonetic structure and in meaning were too great for Busbecq to connect CG [snos] with corresponding MNethl snöre, snöre, snorre, ENHG schnur ‘daughter-in-law’.

CG (schu) in Schuos is clearly misprinted for (schu), in spite of suggestions to the contrary (cf. Tomaschek 1881:63; von Grienberger 1897:126). CG (schu), which represents CG [s] (cf. 6.6.2.17), indicates the development of NCG */s/ < PGmc *s/ before */n/ (cf. CG Schauerst, Schlipen, Schuauth). CG (s) in Schuos (for *Schnos) shows the (Common Germanic) a-umlaut of PGmc *u to *a shown also by North and West Germanic (cf. Krabe and Meid 1969a:336): this a-umlaut is also seen in CG Boga, Goltz, Kor, Borrochts. Final CG (s) in Schuos shows that PGmc *s, in contrast to its development in North and West Germanic, has been preserved in NCG as a stable, deprived in final position to */s/ as seen also in CG Ies, Ieltch, Fers, VVinches (for *VVinches), Rintsch, Borrochts.
seuene 'seven', list C, = CG [*seven] for NCG */sevenə/; CG [*seven] for NCG */sevenə/?

Busbecq notes that this word is pronounced as it is in Flemish ('prorus, ut nos Flandri') and contrasts this pronunciation to the Brabantine pronunciation 'Seuyn'. However, it is unlikely that this form as pronounced by the Greek informant was phonetically identical to the corresponding form in 16th century Flemish. It is clear that Busbecq's comment here refers specifically to the occurrence of a final vowel in this form, which in the corresponding Flemish form would have been [a]. However, the Greek informant probably pronounced full vowels in place of underlying NCG */e/ in the last two syllables of this word (cf. 5.4.1.3). Von Gienberg (1898:131) explains the final vowel in CG seuene as a neuter plural ending and proposes corresponding unattested BG *sibunja. Final CG e (e here and in CG nyne, thine may correspond to an original inflectional ending, but it is also possible that this final vowel has been introduced in NCG in analogy to other cardinal numbers with final /ə/; cf. CG Iata, tua, tria, Athe.

Busbecq's (e) in the first syllable of CG seuene reflects PGmc *e in *sebun 'seven'. This reflex is unexpected in light of CG thine and fyder where (ii) and (γ) appear to represent underlying NCG */i/ < Pre-NCG */i/ < PGmc *e before *u (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:35). It is possible that the informant actually pronounced CG *[sivene] for NCG */sivana/ and that (e) here has been influenced by the spelling of the corresponding Netherlandic form: cf. MNethen seven. If, on the other hand, the first (e) in CG seuene does represent CG [e] for NCG */e/, this NCG sound may have resulted from a restructuring of Pre-NCG *sibun (< *sebun) with NCG */e/ for */i/ under influence of */e/ in the preceding cardinal number, NCG */es/ 'six' (< CG seis). Otherwise NCG */e/ instead of */i/ for */e/ in CG *sibun might be due to the following labial PGmc *B (cf. Engl seven < OE seofon; Krahe and Meid 1969a:38.2). Busbecq's (u) in CG seuene (cf. 6.6.2.21) indicates that PGmc *B has been preserved in this sense as a voiced fricative in medial position: cf. also CG Siluir, but Broe, Bruder, Plut, Hof.


Siluir 'Argentum' ('silver'), list A, = CG *[silivir] for NCG */silvər/.

CG (u) in Siluir indicates as it does in CG seuene that PGmc *B has been preserved in medial position as a voiced fricative in NCG (cf. 6.6.2.21) (but see CG Hoef, Bruder, Boga, Plut). The Greek informant has introduced CG [i] for NCG */ai/ in the second syllable of CG Siluir (cf. 5.4.1.3). It is possible that this [i] was influenced by the vowel of the preceding syllable as suggested by Loeve (1896:141).

Related forms in Germanic: BG sibilbru, ON silfr, OE sealbur, siolfr, sealur, OS silbar, MNethsilbr, silver, sulver, OHG silbar, silbar 'silver' < Gmc *silbra (neu. a-stem). This word is of non-Indo-European origin (cf. Assyrian sarpu 'silver'). It replaced the Indo-European word for silver (cf. Lat argentum, Skt rajatam) in Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic (cf. OPruss spirala, Lith sidabrus, OCS sirebro 'silver'). Cf. Feist (1939:421f, siblbru; Kluge (1967:708, Silber).

Singhen 'Canere' ('to sing'), list A, = CG *[singen] for NCG *(sg)anem = *sin'yaun. Busbecq appears to have modeled this form after MNethl singhen 'to sing'. CG (i) in Singhen reflects PGmc *e before nasal plus consonant as in CG Rinck, Ringo, Venitch. CG
Stap (for *Skap?) 'Capra' ('she-goat'), list B, = CG [stap] for NCG */stap/; CG [skap] for NCG */skap?/. CG Stap is one of the obscure words in Busbecq's lists. Massmann (1841-39) suggested the emendation scap, which would connect the CG form to OHG scäft 'sheep'. Diefenbach (1851 Vol. II, p. 318) and von Grienberger (1898:126) point out, however, that CG Stap cannot be easily connected to OHG scäft, since we should expect CG *Schip as a correspondent to the West-Germanic forms, which Kluge (1967:631) derives from *skęp- (cf. CG Schieten with [sch] for PGmc *sk-; Schipen, Mine with [i] for PGmc *fi-).

According to Feist (1939:450) CG Stag is non-Germanic and is identical to Hungarian csap and is linked further to Albanian cap, Polish, Slovene, Ukrainian cap, Czech cap 'ram, he-goat', all of which seem to have a common source, possibly an Iranian dialect (cf. Modern Persian čapit 'ram, he-goat'). Diefenbach (1851 Vol. II, p. 318) cites Albanian skap 'goat' as a correspondent for this form, but Loewe (1896:176) questions how this word could have come into (NCG. Cf. also Pol skop 'ram, wether' which has been borrowed into Old Prussian as skɔps 'wether' (= OPruss stups for *stubs in the Elbing vocabulary: cf. Levin 1974:98).

None of the proposed etymologies for CG Stag is convincing. Cf. Feist (1939:450, stap); Kluge (1967:631, Schaf).

Statz 'Terra' ('land'), list B, = CG [ťat] for NCG */staf/; CG [ťat] for NCG */staf?/. Busbecq apparently did not connect CG [ťat] (cf. *ťat) 'land' with corresponding ENHG (Upper German) gestat (cf. NHG Gestade) 'bank, shore, beach'. The semantic connection between 'shore' and 'land' is clear: in a sea-faring community, such as the Crimean coast, 'shore' is as much as 'terra firma'.

It is uncertain whether initial CG (st) here and in CG stega, Stein (for *Stern), Stul, which reflects PGmc *st-., represents underlying NCG */st/ or */st/. (cf. 6.6.2.18). CG (ťz) in Statz is an attempt by Busbecq to transcribe the informant's CG [Ī] (cf. 6.6.2.20), which the latter accurately pronounced for underlying NCG */勃/. CG (ťz) reflects PGmc *b as it does in CG Tso, Goltz.

Related forms in Germanic: BG staba (dat. sg.) 'land, shore', Norw dial. stadh 'river bank', OE stæf, OPris sted, OS stad, OHG stadō, stado m. 'shore' < PGMc *sta- 'bank, shore' < Pre-Gmc *st-, which is derived from PIE *st-asta- 'to stand, place' (cf. Pokorny 1959:1006). Cf. also ON stóð f. (< *stóða) 'landing place'. Cf. Feist (1939:450, staba); Kluge (1967:254, Gestade).

Stega 'Viginti' ('twenty'), list C, = CG [steyya] for NCG */steyya/; for NCG */steyya/ (< *ste:ya?); CG [st] for NCG */st-/. CG stega is apparently cognate to OPris stige, NHG Stige, dial. Steige ('a score, zwanzig Stück', and may be further connected to OHG stiega 'stairs' and thus also to BG steigan, OHG stigen 'to climb'.

There are a number of ways to explain the vocalism in the CG form. Much (1898:202) assumes that CG (c) in stega corresponds to Gmc *fēz (cf. 7.1.2.5; 7.1.2.10) as in OHG stiega (cf. Seebold 1970:467). Another possibility is that the vowel in CG stega represents a zero ablaut grade, i.e. PGmc *stig-ā, whereby CG (c) (= CG [c] for NCG */c/) can be explained as a-umlaut of PGmc *fēz to *fē before *ē (cf. Krabe and Meid 1969a:36) as in OHG stiega 'stairs, ladder' (cf. Seebold 1970:466). A third possibility is that CG (c) for CG [(c) represents NCG */č/ (< *č/) from PGmc *či as CG ĺlej, Ielisch (cf. 7.1.2.7; 7.1.2.10).

Related forms in Germanic: OPris stige, MNethil stige, MNethil stič, NHG Stiege, dial. Steige ('a score, twenty-count, zwanzig Stück'). Cf. also OHG stiega 'stairs', stēga 'stairs, ladder'; BG steigan, ON stiga, OE stigan, OPris stiga, OS stigen, MNethil stigen, OHG stigen 'to climb'. Cf. Feist (1939:415f, stega; 452, steigian); Kluge (1967:743, steigen; 749, Stiege); Seebold (1970:466f, STEIG-A-).

Stein (for *Stern) 'Stella' ('star'), list A, = CG [stern] for NCG */stern/; CG [stern] for NCG */stern/.

CG Stein is clearly misprinted for *Stern, for otherwise Busbecq would not have included this form in the list of familiar vocabulary. He appears to have modeled CG *Stern after ENHG stern 'star', which suggests the value [st] for initial CG (st), though MNethil sterne 'star' with [st] for (st) also resembles the CG form (cf. 6.6.2.18). CG Stein (for *Stern), whose correspondents in Germanic show both weak and strong forms, apparently represents an underlying strong noun in NCG: compare CG Ano, Bogo, Brunna, Mine, Sune, whose final vowels appear to correspond to those of the weak nominal denclension in Germanic.

Related forms in Germanic: BG staiorno, ON sījarana f.; OE steora, OPris stīra, MNethil sterre, sterre, OS sterre, MLG sterre, OHG stero, stern, sterro m. 'star'. All are formations of PGmc *stér- < PIE *ster- 'star'. Cf. Feist (1939:448, staiorno); Kluge (1967:746, stern).

Sul (for *Sedex) ('chair'), list A, = CG [stul] for NCG */stul/; CG [stul] for NCG */stul/.

Busbecq may have modeled this form after ENHG stul 'chair'. As in CG Stag, Stutz, Stein (for *Stern), it is not certain whether initial CG (st) here represents underlying NCG */stul/ or */stul/ (cf. 6.6.2.18). CG (st) in Stul stands for CG (u) (cf. 6.6.2.14), which the informant pronounced for NCG */stu/ (cf. 5.4.1.5). CG (u) here reflects PGmc *b as it does in CG Bruder, Plut (cf. 7.1.2.4; 7.1.2.11).

Related forms in Germanic: BG stols 'chair, throne', ON stóll, OE stōl, OPris stōl, OS stōl, MNethil stoel, OHG stōul 'chair' < PGmc *stōlaz (mas. a-stem) < Pre-Gmc *stal-, which is derived from the root PIE *stal-asta- 'to stand, place' (cf. Pokorny 1959:1007). Cf. Feist (1939:455f, stools); Kluge (1967:760, Stuhl).

Sune ('Sol') ('sun'), list A, = CG [sun] for NCG */suna/.

Much (1896:198) believes that CG Sune is misprinted for *Sunne. This is possible, especially if Busbecq intended to model his transcription of this word after ENHG (Upper German) sune 'sun' (cf. CG Brunna). However, although CG (n) here corresponds to PGmc *nun, the Greek informant probably would not have pronounced long [n] here, even if this sound was present in the underlying NCG form (cf. 5.4.2.2). Perhaps Busbecq perceived close tense CG (u) (cf. 5.3.3.3) here as a long vowel and thus transcribed this word with a single (n). CG (nn) in *Sunne would merely indicate a short preceding vowel (cf. 6.6.2.24).
Related forms in Germanic: BG sunno (BS swul 'sun' also occurs), ON sunna, OE sunne, OS sunna, OLF sunna, MNE nthelg, OHG sunna f., OS sunno, OHG sunno m. 'sun' < PGmc *sunno-, which is derived from PIE *su- 'sun' with the suffix *-en. Cf. Feist (1939:460, sunno); Kluge (1967:716, Sonne).

Tag, tag: Tag 'Dies' ('day'), list A, and tag in Knaunen tag 'Bonus dies' ('good day'), in the paragraph introducing list B, = CG [tax] for NCG *[dax] = *da:].

Busbecq apparently modeled this word after ENHG tag 'day'. Initial CG (t) here reflects PGmc *d and represents CG [t] for NCG */d/. The Greek informant, whose CG sound system contrasted voiced and voiceless consonants, misinterpreted initial NCG */d/ = */d/ in the underlying word for CG Tag as NCG */d/ and reproduced it as CG [t], which Busbecq transcribed as (t). The appearance of (th) for PGmc */d/ in CG Thurn and for PGmc */b/ in CG the, tho, -thata (in malhata, Varthalatharvarthara) can be explained in the same manner (cf. 5.4.2.6; 5.4.2.7) (compare also (p) for PGmc */b/ in CG Plut). The (g) in CG Tag, tag is a reflex of PGmc *g and probably represents CG [x] (cf. 6.6.2.7 for underlying NCG */x/(cf. 7.2.3.3). Compare CG Atochta with (ch) (= CG [x] for NCG */x/) for PGmc */g/.


tc: unglued form in the cantilena (cf. 10.).

Telich 'Stulus' ('foolish'), list B, = CG ['telix] for NCG */[telak]/ = */telak/; for NCG */[telak]/ = */telak/.

Gräter (1796:129) connected CG Telich with LG tellen 'to talk nonsense'. Massmann (1841:360) suggested that final CG-ich in this form represents an adjective-forming suffix corresponding to that in BG-egs (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:37). Förrstemann (1875:166) links CG Telich to BG dwals 'foolish' by proposing a corresponding unattested BG *dwala-leiks. Tomasech also advances this etymology and rejects the possibility that CG Telich represents a loan from Turkish telq or dwelq 'mad, insane'. However, Braun (1890-59), Loewe (1896:146), Feist (1939:131), and Scardigl (1964:305) have assumed that CG Telich indeed represents a borrowing from Turkish. While this etymology is by no means certain, it provides a satisfactory explanation for this form. The sound correspondences to Turkish telq, dwelq are clear and the meaning of the Turkish word is close enough to that of the CG form. The initial dental in NCG could have been */d/ or */t/, for both would have been pronounced as the informant as CG [t] (cf. 5.4.2.6; 5.4.2.7). CG (ch) in Telich could correspond to underlying NCG */k/, i.e. */k/, which the informant misinterpreted as */x/, reproducing it as CG [x], as in CG Ich, Mycha (cf. 5.4.2.9).


The, tho 'the', in that section of Busbecq's report which introduces the CG vocabulary, = CG [te], [to], both for NCG */[da]/ = */da/.

In the Latin text of his report, Busbecq tells us that his informant used the article *t* or *the* before all words ('omnibus vero dicenobus praeponebat articulum *t* aut *the* . . . '). If these CG forms represent underlying NCG articles (demonstratives), clearly the informant supplied them not before all words, but rather before all nouns. However, there is a possibility that these forms are not Germanic. In a forthcoming note on CG those, the, Eric P. Hamp suggests that these forms may actually represent the Greek neuter article *o*.

Hamp believes that we can take Busbecq at his word, reasoning that the Greek informant proposed this article to all CG vocabularies (regardless of part of speech) in order to nominalize the citation.

Von Grienberger (1898:134) compares CG tho, those to the BG paradigm for the demonstrative pronouns, so masc., hata neut., so fem., and concludes that CG tho is a new formation for the masc. nom. sg., while CG tho corresponds to BG ho fem. acc. sg. (replacing so in the nominative) and probably also to BG ho neut. nom./acc. sg.

I believe that CG tho, those represent two variants of the same underlying NCG form, which was used for all genders and all cases in the singular and plural as is Eng the. Initial (th) in CG tho, those reflects PGmc *p and indicates CG [t] (cf. 6.6.2.19), which Busbecq's Greek informant substituted for initial NCG */[d]/ = */d/ as he did in CG Thurn, thara, -thata (in malhata, Varthalatharvarthara) (cf. 5.4.2.6; 5.4.2.7). The underlying NCG word for CG tho, the was probably */dla*. Variation in the phonetic quality of the vowel in this word appears to be evidenced by CG the vs. CG tho. Loewe (1896:142) suggests that the vocative quality may have been influenced by the phones of the following noun. However, this probably took place not in NCG, but rather in the speech of the informant, who substituted full vowels for NCG */a/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).


thiine 'ten', list C, = CG [tine] for NCG */tin[u]/ */tin[u]/; CG [tine] for NCG */tin[u]/

The CG stem thiine appears also as CG-thiene, -thyen in CG furdethein 'forty', treithein 'thirty' (its occurrence as CG thine- in thunetwa 'twelve' and thunetria 'thirteen' appears to be the residue of a miscepyonic or a misspelling for *thine-*). The digraphs (ii), (ie), (ye) represented monophthongs in Middle Netherlandic (MNE nthelh (ii) = [i-], (ie) and (ye) = [i]), but there is the possibility that Busbecq intended to indicate a diphthong here, (ia), (ie) or (ei) (cf. 6.6.1.8; 6.6.1.9).

CG thiine with (ii) (= NCG */ii/ or */ii/? for PGmc *e can be derived from Pre-NCG *ti,*iun < Gmc *ti,*iun < PGmc *ti,*iun < PIE *dekən as can BG tainhun, OE reyn, eyn 'ten' (compare OS thain, OHG zehan 'ten' < Gmc *ti,*iun < PGmc *ti,*iun < PIE *dekəm) (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:62, p. 90). Medial PGmc *e appears to have been lost in Pre-NCG, so that a Pre-NCG *ti,*iun < *ti,<*iun could have merged with PGmc *e (cf. CG Vingart), *ei (cf. CG Mine, Mycha, Schlipen), and *eu (cf. CG Schietre) as NCG */i/ (cf. also NCGyne). One might think of a Pre-NCG weakening of vowels in unstressed syllable to */a/ (before loss of medial */x/), in which case CG thiine could represent CG *[tine] for NCG */tin[u]/ < Pre-NCG */ti,*iun/.*

Final (e) in CG thiine is explained by von Grienberger (1898:131) as a neuter plural ending corresponding to that of unattested BG tainhunja. However, it may simply represent a */a/-ending added in NCG in analogy to other numbers with final */a/: cf. CG tna, tna, tria.


thinita 'eleven', list C, = CG *[tin'u]/ for NCG */tin[u]/ */tin[u]/; CG [tiin'ita] for NCG */tin[u]/

Remarkably, the CG numbers thinita 'eleven' (i.e. 'ten-one'), thunetwa 'twelve' (i.e. 'ten-two'), thunetria 'thirteen' (i.e. 'ten-three') do not correspond in structure to the same numbers in other Germanic languages. Compare, for example, OHG einilf 'eleven', zwelf 'twelve', driezehan 'thirteen'. In NCG these cardinal numbers have apparently been restructured after the cardinal numbers of a Turkic or perhaps a Greek dialect as suggested by
Loewe (1903:15). Compare Modern Turkish onbir 'eleven' (i.e. 'ten-one'), oniki 'twelve' (i.e. 'ten-two'), onici 'thirteen' (i.e. 'ten-three'); MGK dekateria 'thirteen' (i.e. 'ten-three'), dekateria 'fourteen' (i.e. 'ten-four'), etc., but jende 'eleven', jodeka 'twelve' (cf. Sergeijskij 1934:557).

For further discussion see CG thine, Ita. Cf. Feist (1939:476, thin-ita).

tho: cf. the.

thunnetria (for *thiunetria) 'thirteen', list C, = CG ['tine'tria] for NCG */ti:nə'traia/ ('*tına'tria)?; CG ['tine'tria] for NCG */ti:nə'traia/.


thunetau (for *thiunetau) 'twelve', list C, = CG ['tine'tua] for NCG */ti:nə'tua/ ('*tına'tua)?; CG ['tine'tua] for NCG */ti:nə'tua/.


Thurn (for *Thur?, *Thura? 'Porta' ('door'), list A, = CG [tunr] ([tträ]?, [tltr]?) for NCG */dur/ = */dura/?; */dur/ = */dura/.

CG (th) in Thurn reflects PGmc *ð̣∂ and represents CG [t], which Busbecq's Greek informant pronounced for underlying NCG */g̊u/ = */ḍæ/ as he did in CG Tag, theo, theo, -tha in (malhata, Varthalva, Varvatha) (cf. 5.4.2.6, 5.4.2.7). CG (u) in this form, which is a reflex of a PGmc *u, distinguishes CG from BG, for it shows nothing like the 'breaking' (Breuchung) of *u to BG (au) before r (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969a:36). Neither does it show umlaut as does CG (o) for PGmc *au in Gots, Boga, Kor, Borratsch. This suggests that CG Thurn corresponds neither to BG daur 'door', OHG tor 'gate', which are neuter a-stems, nor to BG daurons, fem. on-declension nom. pl. 'door, gate', as suggested by Loewe (1896:153), nor to the accusative singular of this form, BG dauros, as proposed by von Grienberger (1898:133), but rather to OHG turi 'door', a feminine i-stem.

If CG Thurn represents an i-stem, the presence of final CG (n) must be explained. Perhaps the NCG form underlying CG Thurn was originally a plural which came to be used as a singular: compare ON dyur, pl. 'door opening'. If this is the case, final (n) here could reflect a nominative plural ending in NCG which was generalized from other noun classes (cf. NHG Türen pl. of Tü 'door'), or possibly an accusative plural ending (cf. BG westens, fem. i-stem, acc. of ast. 'grace').

Schröder (1910:14 and fn. 2) explains the presence of (n) in CG Thurn by suggesting that this form is misspelled for *Thuran or that final CG (n) here was misset for (u). CG *Thuran would represent CG [t草原] for underlying NCG */ḍου/ = */dana/, whereby the informant would have substituted CG [u] for final NCG */o/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG daur 'single' door, gate, daurons 'double' door, gate; entrance', ON dyrr pl. 'door, opening door', OE dor 'gate', dura 'door', OFris dure, dore 'door', OS dor 'gate', duri 'door', OFLdur 'door', OHGGror 'gate', tura 'door'. All are formations of PGmc *dur- < PIE *dhur- with the zero ablaut grade of PIE *dhūro-. Cf. Feist (1939:117f, daur; 470, thurn); Kluge (1967:797, Tür).

treithyren 'triginta' ('thirty'), list C, = CG ['trei,tin] for NCG */trei,tin; CG ['trei,tien] for NCG */trei,tian/.

CG treithyren 'thirty' and furdeithienn 'forty' do not correspond to the words for 'thirty' and 'forty' in other Germanic languages. Compare, for example, OE prítig, OS thritig, OHG drizzig 'thirty'; OEgweartig, OS forgig, OHG forzig 'forty'. It appears that the CG forms have been restructured in NCG, whereby the element -thyn, -thien is equivalent to CG thine 'ten'. CG trei- is not reinterpreted for trei- or tri- or ifi. However, the appearance of (ei) in CG furdeithienn argues against this. Von Grienberger (1898:132) believes that CG treithyren can be derived from a form corresponding to unattested NCG *prōdaitahun 'the third ten' (similarly, Loewe 1903:18). While the phonological correspondences are not entirely clear, an interpretation of CG treithyren as 'third ten' (or 'three tens?') appears to be the most satisfactory solution.


tria 'three', list C, = CG ['tira] for NCG */tirə/ = */'diira/.

Initial CG (i) in tria reflects PGmc *i- and clearly represents CG [t]. It might be suggested that the informant's pronunciation of the CG form was influenced by the CGK word for 'three' (cf. MGK trija, ModKG tria 'three'). But although PGmc *i- is reflected initially as (iz) in CGTzo 'you', it appears as CG [th] (= CG [t]) in theo, the- and as CG (t) not only in tria 'three', but also in CG thunnetria 'thirteen' and CG treithyren 'thirty'. In the NCG words underlying CG tria, tho, tho-, -thata in (malhata, Varthalva, Varvatha), initial PGmc *i- had merged with *d as NCG */d/ (cf. 7.2.2.1). In initial position NCG */d/ occurred as *[ḍ], which the informant misinterpreted as NCG */u/, reproducing it as CG [t] in these forms as he did in CG Tag, Thurn (cf. 5.4.2.6, 5.4.2.7). Final (a) in CG tria reflects CG [a] for NCG */o/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG *preis m., f., CLAIM, ON PRIE M., JRIAR, fir, birr a, n., OE PRIE m., frio f., n., OFris thri m., thri a, thri n., OS thri a, m., thri n., MNethl dri, dri, OHG dri m., drio f., driu n. 'three' < PGmc *prei-li-ri- < PIE *treti-ri-iti-. Cf. Feist (1939:480, tria; 502, *preis); Kluge (1967:141f, drei).

tua 'two', list C, = CG ['tua] for NCG */tua/.

CG (u) intua, which reflects PGmc *u̯, represents a vowel and not a consonant, since we would otherwise expect CG (u) here for nonsyllabic CG [g] for (NGC */u/) as in CG Schauesteuer, Schauualth (cf. 6.6.1.4, 6.6.2.2). It is unlikely that CG tua has been misspelled for *tua, because this morpheme occurs again as -tua in CG thunetua 'twelve'. The development of */u/ from PGmc *u̯ in NCG */tua/ apparently took place in Pre-NCG and may have resulted from influence of the stress pattern of the following cardinal number. A nonsyllabic Pre-NCG *twu 'two' (cf. GRwua) could have become dissyllabic in analogy to the word for 'three' (cf. CG tria, BG fria 'three'), whereby nonsyllabic *u̯ became syllabic. CG tua finally appears in tua represents CG [a] for NCG */u/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG twai m., twa, twos f., ON twir m., twar n., twir f., OEtwigen m., twa n., f., OFriswne m., twa n., f., OSzwene m., twne n., twa, twa f., OFF Luene, OHG zwene m., zwel n., zwu, zwo f. 'two' < PGmc *twe < PIE *djeu, *d(ou)jeu(u), *djeilo-, *djoit-noi. Cf. Krahe and Meid (1969b:61, p. 88); de Fries (1971:755, twee); Feist (1939:484, twai); Kluge (1967:894, zwo).

Tzo in Tzo Vvaratha 'tu fecisti' ('you made, did'), list B, = CG [bq] for NCG */bø/ (*/bø/).

It is probably that Busbecq associated CG [bq] with MNethl du, ENHGH du 'you, thou'. We can therefore assume that Busbecq included this form in list B because it occurs in connection with the verb form CG Vvaratha, which he did not link to a related form in Netherland or German. (CG ICH I in ICH malihata 'I say' also appears in list B, though Busbecq certainly associated it with Nethl ik, ENHGH ich 'I'.)
CG (tə) in Tzo, which reflects PGmc *þ as it does in CG Goltz. Statz., represents an attempt by Busbeq to render the informant’s CG [θ] for NGC *θ/θ' (cf. 6.6.2.20). Final CG (ο) = CG [ο] for NCG *o/*o' is not expected here, since it reflects either PGmc *u, which occurs as CG (υ) in Hus, or PGmc *u, which occurs as CG (υ) in Sune, Brunnak, Thurn: both *þu and *þu 'thou' are reconstructed for Proto-Germanic. Perhaps NCG *o/*o', here represents a development in final position, or outside of main stress: cf. suffixal ON þo ‘thou’. Loewe (1896:143) suggests the possibility that the quality of this vowel was influenced by the following lobial in CG Varthata. Perhaps this occurred not in NCG, but rather in the speech of the informant. Thus CG Tzo might represent CG [θe] for NCG *θu/ or *θu/.


Varthata, Vvarthata:

Vvarthata (for *VVarthata) in Tzo Varthata ‘tu fecisti’ (‘you made, did’), list B, = CG [vartata] for NCG *[vartata] = *[vartata].

Schröder (1910:12) points out that these CG forms should be identical: both are misprinted for *Varthata. Tomasek (1881:65) would like to read (th) here as a misprint for (ch), in order to link this form to CG Bauwarta, pret. ind. 1st and 3rd persons sg. of Bauwartan ‘to work, make’. But since (th) appears both in Varthata and in Vvarthata, the emendation *VVarthata is not justified. However, the first syllable of CG Varthata/Vvarthata most probably does correspond to CG Bauwarta. In the NCG words underlying the CG forms PGmc *χ has been lost before * as it has in the word underlying CG Athis ‘eight’. This parallels similar developments in Old Norse and English: cf. corresponding ONorton ‘(I, he) made’, OE worhtre > Engl werhtre (1931). (PGmc *χ appears to have been lost in most positions in NCG: cf., for example, ANgo, Anick, seis, thiine; but Lachen.)

Schwarz (1951:165) suggests that the vowel of the first syllable, CG (α) (= CG [a] for NCG */a/), reflects a PIE *a-ablaut grade and cites for comparison OS wartha, OE (Anglic) warhte ‘(I, he) did, made’. Since this verb shows various ablaut grades in Germanic (see below), the reflex of PIE *a in CG Varthata/Vvarthata is a good possibility. This would appear to be Pre-NCG *warga. Otherwise one might think of the introduction of NCG */a/ here (in place of *o < *u: cf. CG Boga, Goltz) in analogy to the stem vowel of the preterite singular of the strong verbs of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th ablaut classes in Germanic (cf., for example, OHG fand ‘found’, steh ‘stole’, gab ‘gave’). Such a development might have occurred after loss of the final syllable in Pre-NCG. Another possible explanation for the first (a) in CG Varthata/Vvarthata is that Busbeq misheard CG [wər-] (for NCG */wər-/) as OE worhte, OHG warhto ‘(I, he) did, made’ as [wər-]. In Middle Netherlandish a sometimes appears for o before r-clusters, e.g., MNethl wert for wort ‘word’, antwerten ‘to answer’ (cf. Franck 1910:54). This feature of Middle Netherlandish phonology may have influenced Busbeq’s perception of these CG forms.

Final CG (th)ata in Varthata/Vvarthata remains to be accounted for. Loewe (1894:372; 1896:1555) takes up the theory first suggested by Förstemann (1875:166), which explains CG *-tha in Varthata/Vvarthata (and in CG malitha) as a dissyllabic preterite ending parallel to those of the preterite indicative dual and plural and the preterite optative of weak verbs in BG (cf. Braunie Ebbinghaus 1973:184). In such a case CG -tha would correspond to the preterite indicative singular of OEðin, OSðin, OHG tuon ‘to do’, just as the BG weak preterite plural endings correspond to the preterite plural of these verbs. Thus CG -tha would be a correspondent of OE dyde, OS deda, OHG reta ‘(I, he) did’ and/or OS dadi, OHG tati ‘(you) did’ (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969b:§§90, 99). Since CG -tha in Varthata/Vvarthata does not distinguish between the 2nd and 3rd persons, it would appear that one form came to be used for both persons in CG (presumably also for the 1st person singular) and that the distinction between these forms was neutralized by the weakening of the vowels in final syllables to NCG */a/. If Loewe’s theory is correct, the development of such endings in the singular of the preterite indicative may have been influenced by forms of the preterite optative (cf. BG gawawhetti, 3rd pers. sg. opt. pret. of gawawkian ‘to bring about’). However, the theory of a dissyllabic preterite ending in NCG is unconvinging. Aside from CG Varthata/Vvarthata only one CG form can be cited as possible evidence for such an inflection, namely CG malitha ‘I say’, which is glossed as a present tense form (‘Ego dico!’). More importantly, the sound correspondences are unsatisfactory. Medial CG (i) in -itha would have to reflect PGmc *d (cf. medial d for *d in OE dyde, OS deda). Elsewhere between sonorants PGmc *d appears in CG as (d) = (CG [d] for NCG *[d] = *[d] as in CG Hands, fyder (cf. 7.2.2.2; 7.2.2.5).

A rather unlikely explanation for final -tha in CG Varthata/Vvarthata is suggested by von Griesinger (1898:130). He proposes that final CG -ta in these forms represents an additional preterite ending which has been suffixed to the preterite stem.

The most satisfactory solution phonologically is to interpret CG Varthata/Vvarthata as preterite verb forms with enclitic pronoun objects, a theory first proposed by Förstemann (1875:166). Much (1898:201) believes that final CG -ta in these forms corresponds to CG ita, personal pronoun, neut. acc. sg., ‘it’. He considers CG Tza Varthata equivalent to BG ba warhertes ita ‘you made it’ and CG les Varthata to BG is warhita ita ‘he made it’. This would seem to be a satisfactory explanation for final CG -(a)ta, though it leaves unanswered the question whether the final vowel of the verb form has been lost, or the first vowel of the enclitic object pronoun. However, in view of CG malitha ‘I say’, in which final -tha is best explained as a correspondent to BG pata, demonstrative pronoun, neut. acc. sg., ‘that’, it appears that CG -tha in Varthata/Vvarthata represents the same morpheme. Enclitic CG -tha shows initial (th) for PGmc *þ as do the articles CG the, tho. In unaccented demonstratives, such as these CG forms represent, initial PGmc *þ had merged with *d as NCG */d/, which was realized in initial position as a voiceless lenis, NCG */d/.

The Greek informant mistook this sound for NCG */v/ in the forms underlying CG the, tho- thetha as he did in those underlying CG Tag, Thurn and thus reproduced it as CG [t], which Busbeq transcribed as (th) (cf. 5.4.2.6; 5.4.2.7); CG malitha). NCG *[t] in *[var-, data] was reproduced not as a geminate or long CG [t], but rather as CG [t], for the Greek informant had no geminate consonants in his CG sound system (cf. 5.4.2.2).

Related forms in Germanic: BG warkwjan - waarthar, ON yrkja - orta, OE wyrçan - worte (Anglic warhte), OS werykan, wirkan - warhta, warahta, MNethl werken - wrochte, OHG warchen, warken, wirken - worhta, worahta, MHG wyrken, wyrken - worte, wartha, infinitive and preterite (1st and 3rd sg.) forms respectively, ‘to work, do, make’; BG bata, ON bat, OE þare, OFris thet, OS that, OLF that, OHG daz ‘that’ < PGmc *bat < PIE *to. Cf. Feist (1939:490f., bata; 552, waratha; 555, warrkat): Kluge (1967:862, wirken).

vburt (for *vburt) in lel vburt ‘Sit sanum’ (‘may it be healthy, well’), list B, = CG [vurt] for NCG */vurt/.
V Vichigata (for *VVitgata) 'Album' ('white'), list B, = CG [virțya] for NCG *virțya.

CG FVicht - in VVichigata appears to be cognate to BG heits, ON hvítr, OE hwit, OHG hwīz 'white'. However, CG (ch) here is problematic. Loewe (1896:173; 1903:99) proposes that initial PGmc *x in original *hwīz- was metathesized in Pre-NCG as *wīg-. He notes that this process must have taken place after the loss of *yw* where it originally stood before *t: cf. CG Varthata/Varthata, Athe. This also necessarily assumes that initial PGmc *x was still preserved in the cluster Pre-NCG *yw- at the time of the proposed metathesis: cf. the loss of initial PGmc *x in NCG demonstrated by CG Lachen, Rinck, Ringo, Ano, Ael, ile, Ielsch.

Von Griesenberge (1898:127) believes that CG VVichigata may have been misprinted for *VVihtgata. He notes, however, that the use of (h) as a length marker occurs nowhere else in CG and offers therefore another emendation as well, namely *VVietgata. This spelling is in keeping with that used elsewhere in the CG data (cf. CG (ie) in Schietet, (th) in Thurn, Ath), but would assume a double error on the part of the typesetter: (ht) for (th) and (c) for (e).

Much (1898:199) believes that the occurrence of (ch) in CG VVichigata may have been influenced by the immediately preceding form in Busbecq’s list, CG Atoctha, and/or by the immediately following form, CG Mychia. This analysis, which is accepted by Schröder (1910:13), appears to be the most satisfactory solution. CG *VViht- with loss of initial initial PGmc *x as in CG Lachen, Rinck, etc. corresponds nicely to BG heits, OHG hwīz, etc.

Although Busbecq probably associated CG [vit] - in [vītya] with Mnethl wit 'white', the ending [-yata] apparently dissuaded him from listing this word with those he considers *[notarīa parum differentia] (CG *-ga(-) in VVichigata (for *VVihtgata) appears to reflect a suffix, PGmc *-aga, *-iga, *-igaor*-aga (cf. Krahe and Meid 1967:144)). See also CG Atoctha. Final CG -ata corresponds to the BG neut. nom./acc. pronoun adjective ending -ata as in BG blindata 'blind': cf. also CG Atoctha, Gadelitha. Tomaschek (1881:65) proposed a corresponding, unstressed BG heitgata. The vowels of the suffix and inflectional ending were presumably reduced to *[a] in Pre-NCG (cf. 7.1.3).

Underlying NGC *vyt(yata) can be explained by assuming syncope of the first *[a] in Pre-NCG *[vītya]. The Greek informant pronounced this word as CG [vītya], substituting his CGK /v/ -phoneme for NGC */i/ (cf. 5.4.1.5) and CGK /l/ for NCG */l/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG wir in VVichigata (for *VVihtgata) appears to reflect a suffix, PGmc *-aga, *-iga, *-igaor*-aga (cf. Krahe and Meid 1967:144)); see also CG Atoctha. Final CG -ata corresponds to the BG neut. nom./acc. pronoun adjective ending -ata as in BG blindata 'blind': cf. also CG Atoctha, Gadelitha. Tomaschek (1881:65) proposed a corresponding, unstressed BG heitgata. The vowels of the suffix and inflectional ending were presumably reduced to *[a] in Pre-NCG (cf. 7.1.3).

Underlying NGC *vyt(yata) can be explained by assuming syncope of the first *[a] in Pre-NCG *[vītya]. The Greek informant pronounced this word as CG [vītya], substituting his CGK /v/ -phoneme for NGC */i/ (cf. 5.4.1.5) and CGK /l/ for NCG */l/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG wir in VVichigata (for *VVihtgata) appears to reflect a suffix, PGmc *-aga, *-iga, *-igaor*-aga (cf. Krahe and Meid 1967:144)); see also CG Atoctha. Final CG -ata corresponds to the BG neut. nom./acc. pronoun adjective ending -ata as in BG blindata 'blind': cf. also CG Atoctha, Gadelitha. Tomaschek (1881:65) proposed a corresponding, unstressed BG heitgata. The vowels of the suffix and inflectional ending were presumably reduced to *[a] in Pre-NCG (cf. 7.1.3).

Underlying NGC *vyt(yata) can be explained by assuming syncope of the first *[a] in Pre-NCG *[vītya]. The Greek informant pronounced this word as CG [vītya], substituting his CGK /v/ -phoneme for NGC */i/ (cf. 5.4.1.5) and CGK /l/ for NCG */l/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG wir in VVichigata (for *VVihtgata) appears to reflect a suffix, PGmc *-aga, *-iga, *-igaor*-aga (cf. Krahe and Meid 1967:144)); see also CG Atoctha. Final CG -ata corresponds to the BG neut. nom./acc. pronoun adjective ending -ata as in BG blindata 'blind': cf. also CG Atoctha, Gadelitha. Tomaschek (1881:65) proposed a corresponding, unstressed BG heitgata. The vowels of the suffix and inflectional ending were presumably reduced to *[a] in Pre-NCG (cf. 7.1.3).

Underlying NGC *vyt(yata) can be explained by assuming syncope of the first *[a] in Pre-NCG *[vītya]. The Greek informant pronounced this word as CG [vītya], substituting his CGK /v/ -phoneme for NGC */i/ (cf. 5.4.1.5) and CGK /l/ for NCG */l/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).

Related forms in Germanic: BG wir in VVichigata (for *VVihtgata) appears to reflect a suffix, PGmc *-aga, *-iga, *-igaor*-aga (cf. Krahe and Meid 1967:144)); see also CG Atoctha. Final CG -ata corresponds to the BG neut. nom./acc. pronoun adjective ending -ata as in BG blindata 'blind': cf. also CG Atoctha, Gadelitha. Tomaschek (1881:65) proposed a corresponding, unstressed BG heitgata. The vowels of the suffix and inflectional ending were presumably reduced to *[a] in Pre-NCG (cf. 7.1.3).

Underlying NGC *vyt(yata) can be explained by assuming syncope of the first *[a] in Pre-NCG *[vītya]. The Greek informant pronounced this word as CG [vītya], substituting his CGK /v/ -phoneme for NGC */i/ (cf. 5.4.1.5) and CGK /l/ for NCG */l/ (cf. 5.4.1.3).
v*urt) reflects PGmc *d. This indicates a devoicing of Pre-NCG *d < *d in final position in NCG to *v (cf. also CG Rintsch, VWintch, Borrosch; 7.2.2.2).

Related forms in Germanic: BG weingards, ON vin-gardr, OS win-gardo, OHG win-gard(o) 'vineyard', OE win-gard 'vine branch, vineyard'. BG weingard is compounded from two elements, wein 'wine' and gards 'house, yard, fenced-in property'. BG wein (a neut. a-stem) corresponds to ON vin, OE, OFris, OS, OHG win (masc. a-stems) 'wine', a Common Germanic loan from Lat vinum 'wine'; BG gards, a masc. i-stem, corresponds to masc. a-stems in the other Germanic dialects: ON gardr 'fence, fortified area, yard, garden', OE gard, OS gard 'field, enclosure, (pl.) dwelling', OHG gart 'district'. Cf. related weak masc. forms: BG garda 'yard', OS gardo, OHG garto 'garden'. PGmc *garda-gardi- can be derived from PIE *gher-ti- (cf. Gk ἐξωριον 'enclosed area, yard', Lat hortus 'garden') or from PIE *gherdh(i)-gherdh-o- (< *gerdh- 'to fence in' (cf. ON gjord, MNethl gherde, MLG gorde, MHG gart 'belt'); SKT gadh (< *gadhi-) 'house'; OCS gradi 'enclosure, city'). Cf. Feist (1939:90, bigairdan; 1851, gairda; 1971, gards; 558, wein; 559, weina-gards; 565, wingart); Kluge (1967:233f, Garten, 848, Wein; 861, Wingert).

VWintch (for *WVintch) 'Ventus' ('wind'), list A, = CG [vints] for NCG *vint/. CG (i) in VWintch reflects PGmc *e before nasal plus consonant as in CG Rinck, Ringo, Singben. Final CG (-tch) is surely a misprint for (-tch), as suggested by Massmann (1841:360). Final CG (-tch) can be interpreted as CG [ts] (cf. 6.6.2.17) for NCG *ts/. It appears then that the NCG word underlying this form has preserved final PGmc *z- (from the sinitmic nominative PIE *-s) as a sibilant, NCG *ts (cf. also CG Fers, Rintsch, Borrosch, Lettsch; 8.1.1.1). Loewe's (1898:162) proposed underlying *windan < wind 'wind' is rightly rejected by Much (1898:197).

Related forms in Germanic: BG winds, ON vindr, OE wind, OFris wind, OS wind, MNethl wint, OHG wint 'wind' < PGmc *wenda- (masc. a-stem) < Pre-NCG *wendo < PIE *weneto < PIE *weneto < *we- 'to blow'. Cf. Feist (1939:565, winds; 566, wintsch); Kluge (1967:860, Wind).
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