

Martin Findell
Phonological Evidence
from the Continental Runic Inscriptions

Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Heinrich Beck, Dieter Geuenich,
Heiko Steuer

Band 79

De Gruyter

Martin Findell

Phonological Evidence
from the Continental
Runic Inscriptions

De Gruyter

ISSN 1866-7678
ISBN 978-3-11-025934-6
e-ISBN 978-3-11-028925-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet unter <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 10785 Berlin/Boston

Satz: Dörlemann Satz GmbH & Co. KG, Lemförde
Druck und Bindung: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Acknowledgements

This work is revised and expanded from my doctoral thesis, *Vocalism in the Continental Runic Inscriptions* (University of Nottingham, 2009), which was supervised with patience and enthusiasm by Dr. David Parsons. The thesis was examined by Prof. Edith Marold and Prof. Richard Marsden, to whom I am grateful for their detailed feedback and support. Michelle Waldispühl at the Universität Zürich is also owed a debt of gratitude for kindly sharing with me the excellent photographs of many of the inscribed objects which have been taken as part of her own research.

Many academics lent their support, time, resources and advice. Thanks are especially due to Dr. Patrick Stiles, who helped me obtain some of the reading material and who lent encouragement; to Prof. Dr. Theo Vennemann, who offered his insight and discussion of topics both closely and distantly related to the project; to Dr. Christina Lee, who was unfailingly generous with her time, enthusiasm and patience; and to Dr. Sara Pons-Sanz, who was a constant source of information, advice and moral support.

The project was funded through the AHRC Doctoral Scheme. I am grateful for the support and assistance which I have received from the AHRC.

Finally, I must thank the countless friends and family members who have kept me tolerably sane (if not always entirely tolerable) – most especially my parents, Peter and Mary Findell; but also Adrian Czajkowski; Kate Haworth; Kelly Hughes; Shane McLean; Jack Nicholls; Kristen Sipper; Lydia Staniaszek; Wayne Stevens; and Marjolein Warbroek-Stern.

Prefatory note

The material discussed in this book is set out in the catalogue (Part II). Inscriptions are referred to throughout the text by their numbers in this catalogue (e.g., 1. Aalen). Where multiple transliterations are available in the literature, these are reproduced in the catalogue; in the main text, I use my own diplomatic transliteration, unless referring directly to that of a particular author.

Contents

Acknowledgements	V
Prefatory note	VI
Abbreviations	XXIII
Abbreviations for languages and linguistic terms	XXIII
Abbreviations for sources	XXIV

Part I: Text

1.	The Continental runic inscriptions	3
1.1	General introduction	3
1.1.1	The dialect(s) of the inscriptions	4
1.1.2	Chronology and dating	5
1.1.3	Reconstructing and representing PGmc	6
1.1.4	Orthography and phonology: the relationship of grapheme to phoneme	7
1.2	The corpus of runic inscriptions	8
1.2.1	Geographical and chronological context	8
1.2.2	Content and graphology	9
1.2.3	Authenticity	10
2.	Phonology and runic orthography	11
2.1	Introduction	11
2.2	The vocalic system of IPGmc	11
2.2.1	Short vowels	11
2.2.2	Long vowels	13
2.2.3	Diphthongs	13
2.2.4	On the distinction “front” vs. “back”	14
2.3	The vocalic systems of OHG and OS	15
2.3.1	Diphthongs	15
2.3.1.1	PGmc */eu/	15
2.3.1.2	The NWGmc monophthongisation of unstressed */ai/ and */au/	18
2.3.1.3	PGmc */ai/ in OHG and OS	19

2.3.1.3.1	Conditions for monophthongisation	19
2.3.1.3.2	Chronology	20
2.3.1.3.3	Phonetic development	21
2.3.1.4	PGmc */au/ in OHG and OS	22
2.3.1.4.1	Conditions for monophthongisation	22
2.3.1.4.2	Chronology	22
2.3.1.4.3	Phonetic development	23
2.3.2	Back vocalics	23
2.3.2.1	PGmc */u/	23
2.3.2.2	PGmc */ū/	24
2.3.2.3	PGmc */ō/	25
2.3.2.4	PGmc */w/	26
2.3.3	Front vocalics	27
2.3.3.1	PGmc */i/	27
2.3.3.2	PGmc */e/	28
2.3.3.3	PGmc */ī/	29
2.3.3.4	PGmc */ē ₁ /	29
2.3.3.5	PGmc */ē ₂ /	29
2.3.3.6	PGmc */j/	30
2.3.4	Low vowels	31
2.3.4.1	PGmc */a/	31
2.3.4.2	“Primary” i-umlaut	32
2.3.4.3	IPGmc */āx/ < PGmc */anx/	33
2.3.5	Anaptyxis	33
2.3.6	Summary	34
2.4	The consonantal system of IPGmc	35
2.4.1	Subcategorising the obstruents	37
2.5	The consonantal systems of OHG and OS	38
2.5.1	The obstruents	38
2.5.1.1	Early development of the PGmc obstruents	38
2.5.1.1.1	Reflexes of PGmc */b/	38
2.5.1.1.2	Reflexes of PGmc */g/	39
2.5.1.1.3	Loss of PGmc */z/	39
2.5.1.2	The Second Consonant Shift	40
2.5.1.2.1	Phonetic development: <i>Tenuisverschiebung</i>	40
2.5.1.2.2	Phonetic development: <i>Medienverschiebung</i>	42
2.5.1.2.3	Geographical distribution	43
2.5.1.2.4	Chronology	43
2.5.1.3	Spirantenschwächung and the despirantisation of /θ/	45
2.5.1.4	Other processes affecting the obstruents	46
2.5.1.4.1	<i>Notkers Anlautgesetz</i> and final devoicing	46

2.5.1.4.2	Deletion of /h/	47
2.5.1.4.3	Irregular(?) changes in consonant clusters	48
2.5.2	The sonorants	49
2.5.2.1	The “liquids” (PGmc */l r/)	49
2.5.2.1.1	The phonetic quality of OHG OS /r/	50
2.5.2.2	The nasals (PGmc */m n/)	51
2.5.3	Epenthetic (and prothetic) consonants	52
2.5.4	Summary	53
2.6	Runic orthography	54
2.6.1	Graphemic representation of the high vowels and the corresponding semivowels	54
2.6.2	Orthographic rules proposed in the runological literature	54
3.	The diphthongs	57
3.1	PGmc */eu/	57
3.1.1	Data	58
	6. Bad Ems fibula 58 7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 58 9. Beuchte fibula 59 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 59 20. Engers fibula 59 22. Ferwerd comb case 60 46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 60 50. Mertingen fibula 61 54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 61 55. Niederstotzingen strap end 62 56. Nordendorf I fibula 62 57. Nordendorf II fibula 62 60. Osthofen fibula 63 65. †Rügen stone piece 63 67. Schretzheim I capsule 63 68. Schretzheim II fibula 64 70. Schwangau fibula 64 73. Skonager III-C bracteate 64 79. Weimar I fibula 65 81. Weimar III buckle 65 82. Weimar IV bead 66 88. Wijnaldum B pendant 67	
3.1.2	Summary and discussion	67
3.1.2.1	Umlaut	68
3.1.2.2	UG consonant-conditioned variation	70
3.1.3	Conclusion: reflexes of */eu/ in the corpus	73
3.2	PGmc */ai/	74
3.2.1	Data: digraphs	74
	2. Aquincum fibula 74 15. Charnay fibula 75 23. Freilaubersheim fibula 77 42. †Kärlich fibula 77 44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 77 54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 78 61. Pforzen I buckle 78 62. Pforzen II ivory ring 78 70. Schwangau fibula 78 78. †Trier serpentine object 79 83. Weingarten I fibula 79	
3.2.1.1	Summary: digraphs representing PGmc */ai/	80
3.2.2	Data: monographs	81
	7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 81 12. Bopfingen fibula 81 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 83 42. †Kärlich fibula 83 46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 83 47. Lauchheim I fibula 83 53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 84 54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden	

	stave 84	56. Nordendorf I fibula 84	64. †Rubring stone piece 86
	83. Weingarten I fibula 86	85. †Weser I bone 88	87. †Weser III bone 89
	88. Wijnaldum B pendant 89		
3.2.2.1	Summary: monographs representing PGmc */ai/		89
3.2.2.1.1	Unstressed syllables: the NWGmc monophthongisation . .		89
3.2.2.1.2	Stressed syllables: the OHG/OS monophthongisation . . .		91
3.2.3	Conclusion: reflexes of */ai/ in the corpus		92
3.2.3.1	Unstressed syllables: the NWGmc monophthongisation . .		92
3.2.3.2	Stressed syllables: the OHG and OS monophthongisations		93
3.3	PGmc */au/		95
3.3.1	Data: digraphs		95
	12. Bopfingen fibula 95	31. Hailfingen II fibula 95	34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 95
	41. Igling-Unterigling fibula 96		
	47. Lauchheim I fibula 96	50. Mertingen fibula 96	56. Nordendorf I fibula 97
	59. Oettingen fibula 97	62. Pforzen II ivory ring 98	69. Schretzheim III spatha 98
	72. Skodborg-B bracteate 98	81. Weimar III buckle 99	
3.3.1.1	Summary: digraphs representing PGmc */au/		99
3.3.2	Data: monographs		101
	23. Freilaubersheim fibula 101	39. Hüfingen II <i>Kleinbrakteat</i> 101	
	48. Lauchheim II comb 102	49. Liebenau bronze disc 102	
	81. Weimar III buckle 102	82. Weimar IV bead 103	
3.3.2.1	Summary: monographs representing PGmc */au/		103
3.3.3	Conclusion: reflexes of */au/ in the corpus		103
4.	The back vocalics		105
4.1	Data		106
	1. Aalen neckring 106	2. Aquincum fibula 107	3. Arlon capsule 107
	6. Bad Ems fibula 108	7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 109	
	8. Balingen fibula 110	9. Beuchte fibula 110	10. Bezenye I fibula 111
	11. Bezenye II fibula 111	12. Bopfingen fibula 112	
	13. Borgharen buckle 113	14. Bülach fibula 113	15. Charnay fibula 113
	16. Chéhéry fibula 114	17. Dischingen I fibula 114	
	19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 114	21. Erpfting fibula 116	
	22. Ferwerd comb case 117	23. Freilaubersheim fibula 117	
	25. Friedberg fibula 118	27. Geltorf II-A bracteate 119	
	28. Gomadingen fibula 119	29. Griesheim fibula 119	30. Hailfingen I sax 120
	33. Heide-B bracteate 120	34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 121	35. Hitsum-A bracteate 122
	36. Hohenstadt fibula 123	37. Hoogebeintum comb 123	
	38. Hüfingen I <i>Kleinbrakteat</i> 123	39. Hüfingen II <i>Kleinbrakteat</i> 123	42. †Kärlich fibula 124
	43. “Kent” fibula 124		
	44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 125	45. Kirchheim/Teck II fibula 125	
	47. Lauchheim I fibula 126	48. Lauchheim II comb 126	
	49. Liebenau bronze disc 126	53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 127	
	54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 127	55. Niederstotzingen	

	strap end 128	56. Nordendorf I fibula 128	57. Nordendorf II fibula 130	58. Oberflacht spoon 131	60. Osthofen fibula 131
	61. Pforzen I buckle 131	62. Pforzen II ivory ring 134	64. †Rubring stone piece 134	65. †Rügen stone piece 134	
	66. Saint-Dizier sword pommel 135	67. Schretzheim I capsule 135	68. Schretzheim II fibula 135	69. Schretzheim III spatha 136	
	71. Sievern-A bracteate 136	72. Skodborg-B bracteate 137	73. Skonager III-C bracteate 138	75. Steindorf sax 138	
	76. Stetten pin-head(?) 139	78. †Trier serpentine object 140	79. Weimar I fibula 141	80. Weimar II fibula 141	81. Weimar III buckle 141
	82. Weimar IV bead 142	83. Weingarten I fibula 143	85. †Weser I bone 144	86. †Weser II bone 144	
	87. †Weser III bone 145	88. Wijnaldum B pendant 146	89. Wremen footstool 146	90. Wurmlingen spearhead 147	
4.2	Summary				148
4.2.1	Reflexes of */u/				148
4.2.1.1	Stressed/stem syllables				148
4.2.1.2	Unstressed syllables				149
4.2.2	Anaptyctic vowels				150
4.2.3	Reflexes of */ō/				151
4.2.3.1	Stressed syllables				151
4.2.3.2	Unstressed syllables				152
4.2.4	Reflexes of */ū/				153
4.2.4.1	Stressed syllables				153
4.2.4.2	Unstressed syllables				153
4.2.5	Reflexes of */w/				153
4.3	Conclusions				156
4.4	The nom. <i>ō</i> -stems: a problem in morphophonology				157
4.4.1	Sequences in -u				158
4.4.2	Sequences in -Ø				159
4.4.3	Sequences in -a				160
4.4.3.1	Co-textual evidence for the assignment of oblique case . .				160
	6. Bad Ems fibula 160	22. Ferwerd comb case 161	30. Hailfingen I sax 161	50. Mertingen fibula 161	67. Schretzheim I capsule 161
	83. Weingarten I fibula 162				
4.4.3.2	Summary of co-textual evidence				162
4.4.3.3	Putative nom.sg. <i>ō</i> -stems in -a				162
4.4.4	Sequences in -o				163
4.4.5	Conclusions on the nom.sg. <i>ō</i> -stem suffix(es)				164

5.	The front vocalics	167
5.1	Data	167
	2. Aquincum fibula 168 3. Arlon capsule 168 4. Aschheim II fibula 169 5. Aschheim III fibula 169 6. Bad Ems fibula 170 7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 170 8. Balingen fibula 171 9. Beuchte fibula 172 10. Bezenye I fibula 172 11. Bezenye II fibula 173 14. Bülach fibula 173 15. Charnay fibula 175 16. Chéhéry fibula 176 17. Dischingen I fibula 176 18. Donzdorf fibula 177 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 177 21. Erpfting fibula 178 22. Ferwerd comb case 178 23. Freilaubersheim fibula 178 24. Fréthun I sword pommel 179 25. Friedberg fibula 179 27. Geltorf II-A bracteate 180 28. Gomadingen fibula 180 29. Griesheim fibula 180 30. Hailfingen I sax 181 31. Hailfingen II fibula 181 32. †Hainspach pendant 181 34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 182 36. Hohenstadt fibula 182 37. Hoogebeintum comb 182 40. Hüfingen III fibula 183 41. Igling-Unterigling fibula 183 43. “Kent” fibula 183 44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 184 45. Kirchheim/Teck II fibula 184 46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 185 47. Lauchheim I fibula 185 49. Liebenau bronze disc 186 50. Mertingen fibula 186 51. München-Aubing I fibula 186 53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 188 54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 188 55. Niederstotzingen strap end 190 56. Nordendorf I fibula 190 57. Nordendorf II fibula 191 58. Oberflacht spoon 191 59. Oettingen fibula 192 60. Osthofen fibula 192 61. Pforzen I buckle 193 62. Pforzen II ivory ring 195 63. Pleidelsheim fibula 195 64. †Rubring stone piece 196 65. †Rügen stone piece 196 67. Schretzheim I capsule 196 68. Schretzheim II fibula 197 70. Schwangau fibula 198 71. Sievern-A bracteate 198 72. Skodborg-B bracteate 198 73. Skonager III-C bracteate 199 74. Soest fibula 199 75. Steindorf sax 200 76. Stetten pin-head(?) 200 77. Szabadbattyán buckle 200 78. †Trier serpentine object 200 79. Weimar I fibula 201 80. Weimar II fibula 202 81. Weimar III buckle 202 82. Weimar IV bead 204 83. Weingarten I fibula 204 84. Weingarten II fibula 205 85. †Weser I bone 205 86. †Weser II bone 207 87. †Weser III bone 207 88. Wijnaldum B pendant 207 89. Wremen footstool 208 90. Wurmlingen spear-head 209	
5.2	Summary	210
5.2.1	Reflexes of the short front vowels	210
5.2.1.1	Stressed syllables	210
5.2.1.2	Unstressed syllables	212
5.2.2	Reflexes of the long front vowels	214
5.2.2.1	*/ī/ in stressed syllables	214
5.2.2.2	*/ē ₁ / in stressed syllables	214
5.2.2.3	*/ē ₂ / in stressed syllables	215

5.2.2.4	Long front vowels in unstressed syllables	215
5.2.3	Reflexes of */j/	216
5.2.4	The “yew-rune” ʝ	217
5.3	Conclusions	219
6.	The low vowels	221
6.1	Data	221
	4. Aschheim II fibula 221 5. Aschheim III fibula 222 6. Bad Ems fibula 222 7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 222 8. Balingen fibula 222 10. Bezenye I fibula 223 11. Bezenye II fibula 223 12. Bopfingen fibula 224 14. Bülach fibula 224 15. Charnay fibula 224 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 224 23. Freilaubersheim fibula 225 24. Fréthun I sword pommel 225 26. Gammertingen capsule 225 27. Geltorf II-A bracteate 226 29. Griesheim fibula 226 30. Hailfingen I sax 226 31. Hailfingen II fibula 227 32. †Hainspach pendant 227 33. Heide-B bracteate 227 34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 227 35. Hitsum-A bracteate 228 36. Hohenstadt fibula 228 38. Hüfingen I <i>Kleinbraketeat</i> 228 42. †Kärlich fibula 228 43. “Kent” fibula 229 44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 229 45. Kirchheim/Teck II fibula 229 47. Lauchheim I fibula 229 48. Lauchheim II comb 229 52. München-Aubing II fibula 230 54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 230 56. Nordendorf I fibula 231 58. Oberflacht spoon 231 59. Oettingen fibula 232 60. Osthofen fibula 232 61. Pforzen I buckle 233 62. Pforzen II ivory ring 234 66. Saint-Dizier sword pommel 234 67. Schretzheim I capsule 234 68. Schretzheim II fibula 234 69. Schretzheim III spatha 235 72. Skodborg-B bracteate 236 73. Skonager III-C bracteate 236 74. Soest fibula 236 75. Steindorf sax 237 76. Stetten pin-head(?) 237 77. Szabadbattyán buckle 237 79. Weimar I fibula 238 81. Weimar III buckle 238 82. Weimar IV bead 238 83. Weingarten I fibula 238 84. Weingarten II fibula 239 85. †Weser I bone 239 87. †Weser III bone 239 89. Wremen footstool 240	
6.2	Summary	240
6.3	Conclusions	242
7.	The consonants	243
7.1	The obstruents	243
7.1.1	The “labials” (PGmc */p b f/)	244
7.1.1.1	Data	244
	6. Bad Ems fibula 244 7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 244 9. Beuchte fibula 245 11. Bezenye II fibula 245 13. Borgharen buckle 245 14. Bülach fibula 245 15. Charnay fibula 246 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 246 20. Engers fibula 246 21. Erpfting fibula 246 23. Freilaubersheim fibula 246 27. Geltorf II-A bracteate 247 34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 247	

	35. Hitsum-A bracteate 248	40. Hüfingen III fibula 248
	43. “Kent” fibula 248	44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 248
	46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 248	47. Lauchheim I fibula 249
	52. München-Aubing II fibula 249	53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 249
	54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 250	
	55. Niederstotzingen strap end 250	56. Nordendorf I fibula 250
	57. Nordendorf II fibula 250	58. Oberflacht spoon 251
	59. Oettingen fibula 252	60. Osthofen fibula 252
	61. Pforzen I buckle 253	65. †Rügen stone piece 253
	67. Schretzheim I capsule 253	68. Schretzheim II fibula 253
	69. Schretzheim III spatula 253	70. Schwangau fibula 254
	75. Steindorf sax 254	
	79. Weimar I fibula 255	80. Weimar II fibula 255
	81. Weimar III buckle 255	82. Weimar IV bead 255
	83. Weingarten I fibula 256	
7.1.1.2	Summary	256
7.1.1.2.1	PGmc */p/	256
7.1.1.2.2	PGmc */b/	256
7.1.1.2.3	PGmc */f/	257
7.1.2	The “dentals” (PGmc */t d θ s z/)	258
7.1.2.1	Data	258
	3. Arlon capsule 258	5. Aschheim III fibula 259
	6. Bad Ems fibula 259	8. Balingen fibula 259
	9. Beuchte fibula 260	10. Bezenye I fibula 260
	11. Bezenye II fibula 260	14. Bülach fibula 260
	15. Charnay fibula 261	16. Chéhéry fibula 262
	19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 263	21. Erpfting fibula 263
	23. Freilaubersheim fibula 263	25. Friedberg fibula 264
	26. Gammertingen capsule 264	29. Griesheim fibula 265
	30. Hailfingen I sax 265	31. Hailfingen II fibula 265
	32. †Hainspach pendant 265	35. Hitsum-A bracteate 266
	37. Hoogebeintum comb 266	39. Hüfingen I <i>Kleinbrakteat</i> 266
	41. Igling-Unterigling fibula 266	42. †Kärlich fibula 267
	43. “Kent” fibula 267	44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 267
	45. Kirchheim/Teck II fibula 267	46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 267
	47. Lauchheim I fibula 268	48. Lauchheim II comb 268
	49. Liebenau bronze disc 268	51. München-Aubing I fibula 268
	52. München-Aubing II fibula 269	53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 269
	54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 269	55. Niederstotzingen strap end 270
	56. Nordendorf I fibula 270	58. Oberflacht spoon 271
	60. Osthofen fibula 271	61. Pforzen I buckle 272
	62. Pforzen II ivory ring 273	64. †Rubring stone piece 273
	67. Schretzheim I capsule 273	68. Schretzheim II fibula 274
	71. Sievern-A bracteate 274	72. Skodborg-B bracteate 275
	73. Skonager III-C bracteate 275	74. Soest fibula 275
	75. Steindorf sax 276	76. Stetten pin-head(?) 277
	77. Szabadbattyán buckle 277	78. †Trier serpentine object 277
	80. Weimar II fibula 278	81. Weimar III buckle 278
	82. Weimar IV bead 278	83. Weingarten I fibula 279
	84. Weingarten II fibula 279	85. †Weser I bone 279

	87. †Weser III bone 280	89. Wremen footstool 280	90. Wurmlingen spearhead 280
7.1.2.2	Summary		281
7.1.2.2.1	PGmc */t/		281
7.1.2.2.2	PGmc */d/		282
7.1.2.2.3	PGmc */θ/		283
7.1.2.2.4	PGmc */s/		287
7.1.2.2.5	PGmc */z/		288
7.1.3	The “gutturals” (PGmc */k g x/)		289
7.1.3.1	Data		289
	2. Aquincum fibula 289	3. Arlon capsule 289	4. Aschheim II fibula 290
	7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 290	8. Balingen fibula 290	10. Bezenye I fibula 290
	11. Bezenye II fibula 291	12. Bopfingen fibula 291	14. Bülach fibula 291
	15. Charnay fibula 291	16. Chéhéry fibula 292	17. Dischingen I fibula 292
	18. Donzdorf fibula 292	21. Erpfting fibula 292	23. Freilaubersheim fibula 293
	24. Fréthun I sword pommel 293	25. Friedberg fibula 293	27. Geltorf II-A bracteate 293
	28. Gomadingen fibula 293	29. Griesheim fibula 294	30. Hailfingen I sax 294
	34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fitting 294	35. Hitsum-A bracteate 295	36. Hohenstadt fibula 295
	39. Hüfingen II <i>Kleinbrakteat</i> 295	42. †Kärlich fibula 295	43. “Kent” fibula 296
	44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 296	45. Kirchheim/Teck II fibula 296	46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscription 296
	48. Lauchheim II comb 297	49. Liebenau bronze disc 297	50. Mertingen fibula 297
	51. München-Aubing I fibula 297	53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 297	54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 298
	55. Niederstotzingen strap end 298	56. Nordendorf I fibula 298	57. Nordendorf II fibula 298
	58. Oberflacht spoon 299	59. Oettingen fibula 299	60. Osthofen fibula 299
	61. Pforzen I buckle 300	62. Pforzen II ivory ring 301	63. Pleidelsheim fibula 301
	64. †Rubring stone piece 301	65. †Rügen stone piece 301	67. Schretzheim I capsule 301
	68. Schretzheim II fibula 302	69. Schretzheim III spatha 302	74. Soest fibula 302
	75. Steindorf sax 302	76. Stetten pin-head(?) 303	77. Szabadbattyán buckle 303
	79. Weimar I fibula 303	80. Weimar II fibula 304	81. Weimar III buckle 304
	82. Weimar IV bead 304	83. Weingarten I fibula 305	85. †Weser I bone 305
	86. †Weser II bone 305	87. †Weser III bone 306	88. Wijnaldum B pendant 306
	89. Wremen footstool 306	90. Wurmlingen spearhead 307	
7.1.3.2	Summary		307
7.1.3.2.1	PGmc */k/		307
7.1.3.2.2	PGmc */g/		308
7.1.3.2.3	PGmc */x/		309
7.1.4	Conclusions on the obstruents		310
7.1.4.1	The Second Consonant Shift		310

7.1.4.2	Spirantenschwächung	312
7.1.4.3	Initial and final devoicing	313
7.2	The sonorants	313
7.2.1	The “liquids” (PGmc */l r/)	313
7.2.1.1	Data	313
	1. Aalen neckring 313 2. Aquincum fibula 313 3. Arlon cap- sule 314 6. Bad Ems fibula 314 7. Bad Krozingen A fibula 314 8. Balingen fibula 314 9. Beuchte fibula 315 10. Bezenye I fibula 315 11. Bezenye II fibula 315 14. Bülach fibula 315 15. Charnay fibula 316 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 316 20. Engers fibula 316 21. Erpfting fibula 316 22. Ferwerd comb case 316 23. Freilaubersheim fibula 317 24. Fréthun I sword pommel 317 25. Friedberg fibula 317 27. Geltorf II-A brac- teate 318 28. Gomadingen fibula 318 29. Griesheim fibula 318 30. Hailfingen I sax 318 32. †Hainspach pendant 319 33. Heide-B bracteate 319 34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I belt fit- ting 319 35. Hitsum-A bracteate 319 36. Hohenstadt fibula 319 37. Hoogeteintum comb 320 38. Hüfingen I <i>Klein- brakteat</i> 320 41. Igling-Unterigling fibula 320 42. †Kärlich fibula 320 44. Kirchheim/Teck I fibula 320 45. Kirchheim/ Teck II fibula 320 46. †Kleines Schulerloch cave wall inscrip- tion 321 49. Liebenau bronze disc 321 51. München-Aubing I fibula 321 53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 321 54. Neudingen- Baar II wooden stave 322 55. Niederstotzingen strap end 322 56. Nordendorf I fibula 322 57. Nordendorf II fibula 323 58. Oberflacht spoon 323 59. Oettingen fibula 323 60. Osthofen fibula 323 61. Pforzen I buckle 324 62. Pforzen II ivory ring 324 64. †Rubring stone piece 325 66. Saint-Dizier sword pommel 325 67. Schretzheim I capsule 325 68. Schretzheim II fibula 325 69. Schretzheim III spatha 325 70. Schwangau fibula 326 71. Sievern-A bracteate 326 72. Skodborg-B brac- teate 326 73. Skonager III-C bracteate 326 74. Soest fibula 326 75. Steindorf sax 327 76. Stetten pin-head(?) 327 77. Szabadbattyán buckle 327 78. †Trier serpentine object 327 79. Weimar I fibula 327 81. Weimar III buckle 328 82. Wei- mar IV bead 328 83. Weingarten I fibula 328 85. †Weser I bone 328 86. †Weser II bone 329 87. †Weser III bone 329 89. Wremen footstool 329 90. Wurmlingen spearhead 330	
7.2.1.2	Summary and conclusions	330
7.2.2	The nasals (PGmc */m n/)	331
7.2.2.1	Data	331
	1. Aalen neckring 331 2. Aquincum fibula 331 3. Arlon cap- sule 331 5. Aschheim III fibula 332 6. Bad Ems fibula 332 8. Balingen fibula 332 10. Bezenye I fibula 333 11. Bezenye II fibula 333 12. Bopfingen fibula 333 14. Bülach fibula 333 15. Charnay fibula 333 16. Chéhéry fibula 334 17. Dischingen I fibula 334 19. Eichstetten sheath fitting 334 22. Ferwerd	

	comb case 335	23. Freilaubersheim fibula 335	26. Gammertingen capsule 335	28. Gomadingen fibula 335	31. Hailfingen II fibula 336	36. Hohenstadt fibula 336	37. Hoogebeintum comb 336	41. Igling-Unterigling fibula 336	42. †Kärlich fibula 336	43. “Kent” fibula 337	47. Lauchheim I fibula 337	50. Mertingen fibula 337	53. Neudingen-Baar I fibula 337	54. Neudingen-Baar II wooden stave 337	56. Nordendorf I fibula 338	57. Nordendorf II fibula 338	61. Pforzen I buckle 339	62. Pforzen II ivory ring 339	63. Pleidelsheim fibula 339	64. †Rubring stone piece 340	67. Schretzheim I capsule 340	68. Schretzheim II fibula 340	69. Schretzheim III spatha 340	71. Sievern-A bracteate 341	72. Skodborg-B bracteate 341	73. Skonager III-C bracteate 341	74. Soest fibula 341	76. Stetten pin-head(?) 342	77. Szabadbattyán buckle 342	80. Weimar II fibula 342	81. Weimar III buckle 342	82. Weimar IV bead 343	83. Weingarten I fibula 343	84. Weingarten II fibula 343	85. †Weser I bone 343	86. †Weser II bone 344	89. Wremen footstool 344	
7.2.2.2	Summary and conclusions 344																																					
8.	The phonological system(s) of “Continental Runic” 347																																					
8.1	Vocalics 347																																					
8.1.1	Short vowels 347																																					
8.1.1.1	Stressed syllables 347																																					
8.1.1.2	Unstressed syllables 348																																					
8.1.1.3	Anaptyxis 348																																					
8.1.2	Long vowels 349																																					
8.1.2.1	Stressed syllables 349																																					
8.1.2.2	Unstressed syllables 349																																					
8.1.3	Diphthongs 350																																					
8.1.3.1	Stressed syllables 350																																					
8.1.3.2	Unstressed syllables 351																																					
8.1.4	Semivowels 352																																					
8.2	Consonants 352																																					
8.2.1	Obstruents 352																																					
8.2.2	Sonorants 354																																					
8.3	Theoretical and methodological considerations 354																																					
8.3.1	Grapheme and phoneme 354																																					
8.3.2	Phonological theory 357																																					

Part II: Catalogue

Notes on catalogue entries	361
Designation of items	361
Concordance	361
Find-site	361
Context	361
Provenance	362
Datings	362
Readings	362
Images	363
1. Aalen	365
2. Aquincum	366
3. Arlon	367
4. Aschheim II	369
5. Aschheim III	370
6. Bad Ems	371
7. Bad Krozingen A	372
8. Balingen	374
9. Beuchte	375
10. Bezenye I	377
11. Bezenye II	378
12. Bopfingen	379
13. Borgharen	380
14. Bülach	381
15. Charnay	383
16. Chéhéry	385
17. Dischingen I	387
18. Donzdorf	388
19. Eichstetten	390
20. Engers	392
21. Erpfting	393
22. Ferwerd	394
23. Freilaubersheim	395
24. Fréthun I	396
25. Friedberg	397
26. Gammertingen	399
27. Geltorf II	400
28. Gomadingen	401
29. Griesheim	402

30. Hailfingen I	404
31. Hailfingen II	405
32. †Hainspach	407
33. Heide	408
34. Heilbronn-Böckingen I	409
35. Hitsum	410
36. Hohenstadt	412
37. Hoogebeintum	413
38. Hüfingen I	414
39. Hüfingen II	416
40. Hüfingen III	417
41. Igling-Unterigling	418
42. †Kärlich	419
43. “Kent”	420
44. Kirchheim/Teck I	422
45. Kirchheim/Teck II	424
46. †Kleines Schulerloch	425
47. Lauchheim I	426
48. Lauchheim II	427
49. Liebenau	428
50. Mertingen	429
51. München-Aubing I	431
52. München-Aubing II	432
53. Neudingen-Baar I	433
54. Neudingen-Baar II	434
55. Niederstotzingen	436
56. Nordendorf I	437
57. Nordendorf II	440
58. Oberflacht	441
59. Oettingen	443
60. Osthofen	444
61. Pforzen I	445
62. Pforzen II	448
63. Pleidelsheim	450
64. †Rubring	451
65. †Rügen	452
66. Saint-Dizier	454
67. Schretzheim I	455
68. Schretzheim II	457
69. Schretzheim III	458
70. Schwangau	460

71. Sievern	461
72. Skodborg	462
73. Skonager III	463
74. Soest	465
75. Steindorf	466
76. Stetten	468
77. Szabadbattyán	470
78. †Trier	472
79. Weimar I	473
80. Weimar II	474
81. Weimar III	475
82. Weimar IV	477
83. Weingarten I	478
84. Weingarten II	480
85. †Weser I	481
86. †Weser II	483
87. †Weser III	484
88. Wijnaldum B	485
89. Wremen	486
90. Wurmlingen	487
Appendix 1: Handlist of Continental runic inscriptions excluded from the corpus	490
Inscriptions with find-sites in the study area, but dated before c.400 AD	490
Inscriptions with find-sites in the study area, but positively identifi- able as non-WGmc	490
Inscriptions outside the study area, possibly classified as WGmc, but excluded due to early date	490
Frisian inscriptions excluded due to use of additional runes	490
Inscriptions (or rune-like carvings) with find-sites in the study area, but of doubtful runic character	490
Inscriptions with find-sites in the area which are positively identified as runic, but have no linguistic interpretation	491
Inscriptions found in the area but consisting only of (partial) futhorks	492
Items known to be modern forgeries	492
Additional exclusion (see § 1.2.2)	492

Appendix 2: Suspect inscriptions. Possible forgeries and the assessment of authenticity	493
32. †Hainspach pendant 493 42. †Kärlich fibula 493 46. †Kleines Schulerloch rock inscription 494 64. †Rubring stone piece 495 65. †Rügen stone piece 496 78. †Trier serpentine object 496 85–87. †Weser I–III bones 496	
General comments	497
Appendix 3: The “Berlin” scabbard mouthpiece	498
Maps	503
Bibliography	509
Abbreviations for journals and corporate authors	509
References	509
Fonts	530
Index of inscriptions	531

Abbreviations

Abbreviations for languages and linguistic terms

abl. – ablative	IPGmc – late Proto-Germanic
acc. – accusative	masc. – masculine
act. – active	MDu – Middle Dutch
adj. – adjective	ME – Middle English
Alam. – Alamannic	MFrk – Middle Frankish
Av – Avestic	MHG – Middle High German
Bav. – Bavarian	MLG – Middle Low German
C – consonant	MG – Middle German
comp. – comparative	MN – male (personal) name
CLat – Classical Latin	modE – modern (standard) English
CRun – Continental Runic (see § 1.1.1)	modG – modern (standard) German
dat. – dative	N – nasal
dial. – dialect	neut. – neuter
dim. – diminutive	NFris – North Frisian
Du – (modern) Dutch	NGmc – North Germanic
du. – dual	nom. – nominative
EFrk – East Frankish	Norw – Norwegian
EGmc – East Germanic	NWGmc – Northwest Germanic
ePGmc – early Proto-Germanic	OCSl – Old Church Slavonic
fem. – feminine	ODan – Old Danish
FN – female (personal) name	OGoth – Ostrogothic
Fris – (modern) Frisian	OE – Old English
Frk – Frankish	OEN – Old East Norse
gen. – genitive	OHG – Old High German
Gk – Greek	OLF – Old Low Franconian
Gmc – Germanic	ON – Old Norse
Go – Gothic	opt. – optative
Hitt. – Hittite	OS – Old Saxon
imp. – imperative	Osc – Oscan
ind. – indicative	OWN – Old West Norse
inf. – infinitive	part. – participle
inst. – instrumental	PCelt – Proto-Celtic
It – (modern) Italian	pers.n. – personal name
Langob – Langobardic	PGmc – Proto-Germanic
Lat – Latin	PIE – Proto-Indo-European
LFrk – Lower Frankish	PItal. – Proto-Italic
LG – Low German	pl. – plural
LLat – Late Latin	p.n. – place name

PNorse – Proto-Norse	T – tenuis (voiceless) obstruent
pres. – present tense	Toch – Tocharian
pret. – preterite	UG – Upper German
R – resonant (i.e., liquid, nasal or semivowel)	Umb – Umbrian
RFrk – Rhine Frankish	V – vowel
RN – river name	Vand – Vandalic
sg. – singular	voc. – vocative
Skt – Sanskrit	W – (modern) Welsh
subst. – substantive	WFrk – West Frankish
	WGmc – West Germanic

Abbreviations for sources

An – Antonsen 1975.
 AZ – Arntz and Zeiss 1939.
 BR – Braune and Reiffenstein 2004.
 BT – Bosworth and Toller 1898.
 CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.
 DOE – *Dictionary of Old English* (University of Toronto).
 DR – *Danmarks runeindskrifter* (Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–1942).
 Graf – Graf 2010.
 Grün – Grünzweig 2004.
 IK – *Ikonographische Katalog* (Clavadetscher et al. 1984–1989).
 IRF – *Inscriptions runiques de France* (Fischer 2007).
 KJ – Krause and Jankuhn (Krause 1966).
 L – Looijenga 2003a.
 Ma – Martin 2004.
 O – Opitz 1987.
 OED – Oxford English Dictionary.
 RMR – *Runes, Magic and Religion* (McKinnell et al. 2004).
 Sch – Schwerdt 2000.
 SUR – *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften* (Krause 1971).
 Vulg. – Vulgate Bible

Part I: Text

1. The Continental runic inscriptions

1.1 General introduction

The object of study for this project is a corpus of 90 runic inscriptions produced on the Continent between the 5th–7th centuries A.D. These inscriptions, all of which (apart from the Kleines Schulerloch cave inscription) contain short texts on portable objects, provide us with some of our earliest data for the dialects from which the German language developed. The period of production occupies a significant position in the history of the Germanic language family, being (according to Klein 2001:579–580) the period in which the more-or-less unified NWGmc continuum broke up into the dialect groups which we classify as the distinct Gmc languages.

The runic inscriptions, then, constitute a body of data representing a set of dialects at some stage of development between a relatively homogeneous NWGmc (itself a daughter of IPGmc), and the dialects attested in mss. which are classified as OHG (attested between the 8th–11th centuries)¹ and OS (attested between the 9th–12th centuries). Some reference will be made to OLF, OFris and other Gmc dialects, as appropriate. Given the distribution of the epigraphical material in what is now southwestern Germany (Map 1), OHG (and especially UG) is of greatest relevance.

My goal is, so far as is possible, to reconstruct the phonological system(s) of the dialects attested in the inscriptions. If a dialect is understood to be, from a phonological point of view, a cluster of regular sound changes relative to the system of a pre- or proto-language, then the dialects of the inscriptions are likely to involve at least some of the sound changes which distinguish OHG and/or OS from NWGmc. Since we have more complete reconstructions of IPGmc than of NWGmc, the former will be our starting point. In § 2, I briefly describe the IPGmc phonological system and identify the major sound changes which produce the daughter systems in OHG and OS. The core part of the study (§§ 3–7) examines closely the epigraphical evidence for

1 The term OHG conventionally covers the set of dialects in which the Second Consonant Shift is active to some extent (§ 2.5.1.2). Within OHG are two major subgroups: UG (Alam., Bav.) and MG (the various Frk dialects) (BR §§ 4–7).

these sound changes. In the final chapter (§ 8), I bring the conclusions of the preceding analyses together in order to give an overview of the vocalic systems attested in the inscriptions.

1.1.1 The dialect(s) of the inscriptions

The choice of a label for the dialects represented in the Continental inscriptions has been a topic of some controversy (see Nedoma 2004a:12; 2006a:110–112). Various authors have described them as “South Germanic”, “Continental West Germanic”, “*Düdisch*”, or “pre-OHG/pre-OS”. None of these labels is without problems, and it might be prudent to avoid the use of a single term altogether. It is probably safe to allow that we are dealing with a set of closely-related WGmc dialects, while recognising that a few of the inscriptions (notably 15. Charnay) appear to show EGmc features; some are classified with greater or less certainty as PNorse;² and still others, while WGmc, may contain features associated with OFris and/or OE, rather than OHG or OS. Although the notion of an “Anglo-Frisian” dialect unity is now generally rejected, a distinction may be drawn between an “Ingvaeonic” (I would prefer to say “coastal”) as against an “inland” group of WGmc dialects (Parsons 1996; 1999:101–109; Stiles 1995). This is not to say that the two are entirely discrete, of course: OS shares features with OFris and OE, although it is more closely related to OHG.

Given the concentration of find-sites in southwestern Germany, we are (probably) mainly concerned with the “inland” dialect group, from which OS and OHG developed. Where there are indications that we may be dealing with features associated with the “coastal” dialects, these are discussed in the text. Inscriptions which are identifiably Frisian from a runological point of view have been excluded from the corpus (§ 1.2.2).

Where it is necessary to use a label to refer to the set of “inland” WGmc dialects represented in the inscriptions, I have opted for the term “Continental Runic” (CRun). This is an intentionally vague label created for the sake of convenience; it does not necessarily imply a discrete or complete linguistic entity.

2 I have followed convention in using the term “Proto-Norse” when referring to the language attested in the early Scandinavian runic inscriptions, in spite of the well-founded objections expressed by, e.g., Antonsen (2003:12–13). The term “Northwest Germanic” I reserve for a reconstructed stage of language.

1.1.2 Chronology and dating

Dating the Continental runic inscriptions to a period between the 5th–7th centuries is not controversial. However, the dating of finds is imprecise: different sources often give widely varying dates for a particular inscription, and in many cases fail to distinguish between the date of a grave and that of an inscribed item's manufacture, or to state explicitly the type of evidence on which the dating is based. I am therefore inclined to treat the matter with caution and avoid using chronology as a criterion for subdividing the corpus. Except where we have a more secure basis for dating, such as a *terminus post quem* gleaned from coin evidence or dendrochronology, I regard all dates as tentative. I shall, however, make reference to the suggested chronologies used in the literature. For further discussion of the problems surrounding the dating of the material, see Hills (1991:31–46); Roth (1981a; 1998).

Nedoma (2004a:183–184) lists the following inscriptions as relatively late: 3. Arlon; 7. Bad Krozingen A; 53. Neudingen-Baar I; 55. Niederstotzingen; 62. Pforzen II; 70. Schwangau; and 90. Wurmlingen. All of these have been assigned dates of c.600 or early 7th century. 76. Stetten stands out as being much later (c.680/690 – see catalogue), a date which in Nedoma's view (*ibid.*) argues against the runic character of this item.

Often in the literature, date-ranges are stated as a given, without further comment. Many datings rely on poorly-justified and questionable assumptions about sound changes. For example, Arntz (1937:8) assigns 65. †Rügen to the 5th century on the basis of a supposed link to the bracteate tradition, namely what he sees as a textual parallel between Rügen **giu** and 27. Geltorf II gwu (see entries in § 7.1.1.1). This parallel is at best speculative, and given the questionable authenticity of the Rügen item, the dating rests on very unsteady ground.

Even where we can be more confident of a dating, it is rare for the sources to narrow the date-range down to a period shorter than 50 years. When the entire period of runic activity on the Continent is at most 250–300 years (the earliest finds being c.400; the latest, Stetten c.680–690), and given the disagreements about dating in many cases, it is not possible to establish a clear relative chronology. Nevertheless, beside the list of items normally dated to the 7th century, we can compile a list of those normally dated before c.500. These are 1. Aalen; 49. Liebenau; 78. †Trier; 85–87. †Weser I–III.³ The corpus also includes a number of bracteates, for which the conventional date-

3 Here again, we are dealing with datings based on a wide range of criteria. The Weser bones, for instance, have been subjected to amino acid and ¹⁴C analysis, but these methods produce divergent results which Pieper (1989) attempts to reconcile using art-historical comparisons.

range c.450-c.550 is given: 27. Geltorf II; 33. Heide; 35. Hitsum; 71. Sievern; 72. Skodborg; 73. Skonager III. The remaining inscriptions, comprising the bulk of the corpus, are mostly assigned dates in the 6th century.

1.1.3 Reconstructing and representing PGmc

It is not my intention to become deeply involved in the problems surrounding the phonological reconstruction of PGmc. Individual authors use a variety of conventions in their representation of proto-forms, not least because the phoneme inventory is in dispute. Except where quoting from another source, I follow the reconstructions of Orel (2003). I represent the consonants as */p t k b d g f θ x s z m n l r/ (§ 2.4), the short vowels as */i e a u/, the long vowels as */ī ē₁ ē₂ ō ū/ and the diphthongs as */ai au eu/ (§ 2.2). Antonsen (1972:118) argues that it is impossible to determine whether the two subsystems traditionally labelled “short” and “long” were actually distinguished in terms of quantity, tenseness or a combination of the two. Although I prefer to adhere to the conventions of IPA notation in phonemic representations, I follow Antonsen’s practice of marking the long/tense vowels with a macron, rather than commit to the use of the IPA length marker, which would imply that quantity alone is the distinguishing feature of this subsystem. In the text, however, I retain the traditional terms “short” and “long” for the sake of simplicity and in deference to philological convention. The resulting compromise is less than satisfactory, but in a study which is primarily concerned with developments in a phonological system, rather than with phonetic details, its consequences are not significant.

When citing proto-forms for stems or whole words, I use italic script rather than a phonemic representation, in order to avoid making unwarranted assertions about the character of the consonants. Where it is necessary to discuss specific phonetic developments, I use IPA notation for individual segments. Inflected forms are based on the reconstructions of Lehmann (2005–2007) and Ringe (2006). When referring to a nom.sg. *n*-stem in discussions of etymology, I use Orel’s citation form in *-ōn*. The actual reconstruction of the *n*-stems is a point of disagreement among my sources; for further discussion, see Findell (2010); Ringe (2006:274–276).

1.1.4 Orthography and phonology: the relationship of grapheme to phoneme

Although this project focuses on forms attested in the epigraphical data, it is inevitably dependent on the tradition of philological work on the Gmc languages, and especially the work on the Continental dialects. In this tradition it is axiomatic that the phoneme is the fundamental unit of the linguistic system; that sound change is regular across a dialect area; and that orthographic variation is phonologically significant in most cases, allowing for such factors as scribal error, the interference of Latin and/or Gallo-Romance orthographic traditions, and analogy. While I have no intention of discarding these axioms, it is necessary to bear in mind the imperfections of the writing system both in principle and in practice. The notion of a “perfect fit” between the graphemic and phonemic systems might have some validity at the point of creation of the writing system (see, for example, Antonsen’s (1972) account of the runic vowel graphemes in relation to the lPGmc vowel system); but as spoken language changes over time and as the same set of graphemes is used to represent a variety of dialects, the writing system must either be adapted or become less intimately aligned with the sound system. Especially when dealing with vowels, we may well have a system in which two phonemes have allophones which are sufficiently similar to allow varying graphic representations. If, for example, /a/ has a raised front allophone [æ], and /e/ has a relatively open allophone [ɛ], and the only available graphemes for representing these sounds are <a> and <e>, it is to be expected that the data will show some apparently confusing alternations between the two.

The other issue is that of practice: when we are dealing with a tradition in which orthographic conventions are not rigidly enforced, there will inevitably be a certain amount of “noise” in transmission as individual language users make their own decisions about how best to represent a particular sound or group of sounds. Individuals are prone to idiosyncrasy and error, and may be operating in a culture where errors or incidental variations are not given much importance.

I am not at this stage primarily concerned with making statements about general phonological theory, or with testing particular theoretical models. If linguistics is to consider itself in any way scientific, then its theories must stem from the analysis of real data. When we come to deal with runic inscriptions, often we are faced with difficulties in deciding what the data represent, and it is impossible to read a text without making certain assumptions about how the language works. Nonetheless, I do consider some of the models which have been proposed to explain particular sound changes; and I discuss the matter of what constitutes evidence for or against a hypothesis, and whether such evidence exists in the inscriptions.

1.2 The corpus of runic inscriptions

Although it is well known that the set of runic inscriptions classified as “Continental” or “South Germanic” is concentrated in the region of the upper Rhine and upper Danube, individual authors differ in their view of the extent of that material. As was mentioned in the introduction, we are dealing almost exclusively with inscriptions on portable objects; it follows that the location of a find is not necessarily an indicator of where the object was manufactured, nor where the inscription was produced. Although geographical boundaries have been placed on the corpus (§ 1.2.1), it must be recognised that these boundaries are porous. I have therefore included some items not normally considered part of the “Continental” or “South Germanic” runic corpus. Conversely, some items included in other corpora of Continental material (compare An; AZ; KJ; L; O) are omitted, in most cases on the grounds of intelligibility. A particular inscription is included in the corpus if it meets all of the following criteria:

1.2.1 Geographical and chronological context

The study incorporates material from a geographical area with no fixed western or southern boundaries. I have set as the northern limit of the area the line of the Danevirke. Although this fortification postdates the “runic” period (the earliest phase of construction is dated dendrochronologically to c.737 (Wilson 1978:3–7)), its placement exploits existing natural boundaries (Andersen et al. 1976; Andersen 1998; Wilson 1978). Klein (2001:579) identifies the Eider as the boundary between NGmc and WGmc dialect areas.

The eastern boundary of the study area is the Oder, corresponding to the boundary between archaeologically distinct Germanic groups conventionally identified as *Elb-Germanen* (or *Herminones*, after Tacitus) and *Oder-Weichsel-Germanen* or *Ost-Germanen* (Robinson 1992:17; Waterman 1966:43). Whether this river necessarily marks a boundary between WGmc and EGmc dialect areas is open to question.

All runic inscriptions found within the study area are included in the corpus, unless it can reliably be shown that they are written in non-WGmc dialects (e.g., if they attest the PNorse retention of IPGmc inflectional */-z/). Items conventionally identified as linguistically PNorse or EGmc are included if a WGmc interpretation of the inscription cannot be ruled out. For example, although the word *alu* is well-attested as part of the Scandinavian tradition, it is at least conceivable that a WGmc cognate (loanword?) is contained (or at least understood) in the Continental examples.

Conversely, finds from outside the area will be included in the corpus if there are reasonable grounds for believing that an “inland” WGmc dialect may be represented. Where this is unclear, the item is included and discussed in the appropriate parts of the text.

Several finds from the Low Countries and England have been included, even though they may belong to the “coastal” rather than to the “inland” group of WGmc dialects. Finds from this area are excluded only if they fall outside the time period of the study, or if they contain additional runes which would identify them as Frisian or English (§ 1.2.2).

An item is included if it is datable within the period c.400-c.700 A.D. This period covers all of the material conventionally classed as “Continental” or “South Germanic” (see § 1.1.2).

1.2.2 Content and graphology

An inscription is included only if it can reliably be identified as runic (objects with isolated rune-like carvings are excluded), and if it contains what might conceivably be an intelligible text (even if no interpretations are available). Uninterpretable inscriptions are excluded, as are the fupark inscriptions from Breza (AZ 8; KJ 5; L VII.10; O 8) and Trossingen (Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma 2006).

The corpus contains only inscriptions written using the 24-letter Older Fupark. Those using the innovative English and Frisian runes are excluded, as the addition of these runes reflects sound changes peculiar to the “coastal” dialects (Parsons 1996; Stiles 1995).

I have excluded one item from the corpus on the grounds of interpretability: the Bergakker scabbard mount (L IX.7) has been the subject of lengthy debate (see especially Bammesberger and Waxenberger 1999); however, its transliteration and linguistic interpretation remain so controversial that it cannot readily be evaluated for the purposes of this project. This is, admittedly, an *ad hoc* exception to the criteria stated above, but the inclusion of this item would necessitate lengthy discussion yielding very little of value to the aims of the project.

1.2.3 Authenticity

Several runic inscriptions have at one time or another fallen under the suspicion of being modern forgeries, and some of these are almost entirely ignored in the runological literature. I feel it appropriate to include in the corpus those items which are suspect but which have not been rigorously shown to be fakes: for example, the serpentine object from Trier (almost universally dismissed, though on unclear grounds) is included, while the Maria Saaler Berg bone inscription (exposed by the admission of the forger and by subsequent chemical analysis) is not (Düwel 1994c:104–105; Nedoma 2004a:389).

The items whose authenticity is in doubt are marked in the text with a superscript dagger [†]. I have chosen to include them for the sake of completeness, bearing in mind that attempts have been made in recent years to rehabilitate some of them. By including these items I do not mean to endorse them, but merely to allow that they may be worthy of discussion. They must be treated with caution, and it would be imprudent to allow any arguments about the language of the inscriptions to rely heavily on these witnesses. The arguments for and against authenticity are discussed briefly in Appendix 2.

2. Phonology and runic orthography

2.1 Introduction

The main part of the study takes as its point of departure the vocalic system of IPGmc, as far as it can be reconstructed. In the present chapter, this system will be outlined (§ 2.2), as will the developments which produced the vocalic systems of OHG and OS (§ 2.3). The subsequent chapters will then examine the runic data in detail to search for and evaluate the evidence for these sound changes.

2.2 The vocalic system of IPGmc

As noted above (§ 1.1.3), there is no complete consensus on the proper reconstruction and representation of the PGmc vocalics. In this section I shall outline the phonological system from which the later analyses will proceed.

2.2.1 Short vowels

$*/i/$ $*/u/ = *[u \sim o]$
 $*/e/$
 $*/a/$

The phonemic status of $*/i/$ and $*/e/$ has been disputed (e.g., by Moulton 1961:6–12); Lehmann (2005–2007 § 2.7.1) argues that they are distinct phonemes because, although their distribution is to a large extent complementary, we have near-minimal pairs such as PGmc **etanan* “eat” vs. **witanan* “know”; and both of them can occur before $*/a/$ and $*/u/$ in following syllables ($*/i/$ and $*/e/$ are not simply umlaut variants). The 4-member system of short vowels is also accepted by Antonsen (1972:132–133), van Coetsem (1994:46), and Ringe (2006:214, 220–225).

For the purposes of this study, I assume that $*/i/$ and $*/e/$ are separate phonemes, while recognising that they may not always be distinguishable. When

citing proto-forms, I follow Orel's (2003) reconstructions, unless stated otherwise. Orel acknowledges the difficulties in distinguishing between the two phonemes, and admits that some of his own reconstructions are "close to arbitrary" (2003:xii).

Within PGmc, underlying */e/ is raised to */i/ in unstressed positions (except before */r/). This applies only to those cases where a particular syllable may be either stressed or unstressed following the Gmc accent shift, such as the pronouns: PGmc *'ek ~ *ik > ON *ek*, OE *ic*, OHG *ih*; PGmc *'mek ~ *mik > ON *mik*, OE *mec*, OHG *mih* (Ringe 2006:220). OHG seems to generalise the */i/-forms (*ih*, *mih*, *dih*), while OS shows some variation, possibly as a consequence of competing orthographic influences (*ic* ~ *ec*, *mî* ~ *me* ~ *mik*, *thic*). On the general development of these phonemes in OHG and OS, see §§ 2.3.3.1–2.3.3.2.

ePGmc stressed */e/ is also raised to lPGmc *[i] before a syllable-final nasal; and before a syllable containing a high front vocalic (van Coetsem 1994:88–93; Ringe 2006:220, 224). Since this is a purely allophonic process, I have retained the representation **e* when citing proto-forms from Orel (2003), e.g., **weniz* "friend", **fenþanan* "find" (compare Ringe's (2006) **winiz*, **finþanq*).

PGmc */u/ has allophones conditioned by the vowel of the following syllable: */u/ = *[u] before a high vowel, *[o] before a non-high vowel (unless a nasal consonant intervenes).

I have characterised PGmc */a/ as low and central.¹ It is not my intention to endorse any particular theory about the PGmc value of this vowel; we could define it negatively as that vowel which belongs to the short/lax subsystem of the PGmc vowel system and which is distinguishable from the back/round vowel */u/ (→ *[u o]) and the front/spread vowel(s) */i e/ (or */i/ → *[i e]). Antonsen (1972:110; 1975:122–123) posits three umlaut allophones for */a/: *[æ] in a high-front environment; *[ɑ] in a high-back environment; and *[ə] in a combined high-front and high-back environment.

1 According to van Coetsem (1994:82–83), lPGmc */a/ represents a centralised or neutralised reflex of ePGmc */a/. Since the reconstruction of PGmc is not our object here, I do not intend to discuss this proposal further.

2.2.2 Long vowels

$*/\bar{i}/$	$*/\bar{u}/$
$*/\bar{e}_2/$	$*/\bar{o}/$
$*/\bar{e}_1/$	
$*/\bar{a}/$ (< $*/anx/$)	

The evidence of Latin loanwords on the one hand, and of the umlaut effects triggered by non-root vowels on the other, indicates that the PGmc reflexes of PIE $*/\bar{e} \bar{o}/$ were relatively low; consequently, Antonsen represents them as $*/\bar{æ}/$ and $*/\bar{ɔ}/$ (1972) or $*/\bar{ɔ}/$ (2002), respectively. In my own text, I use the more traditional notation $*/\bar{e}_1 \bar{o}/$ (compare Lehmann 2005–2007 § 2.2, § 2.7.3; Orel 2003:xii; Ringe 2006:214).

$*/\bar{e}_1/$ (< PIE $*/\bar{e}/$) is to be distinguished (at least in terms of its history) from another long/tense mid front vowel conventionally notated $*/\bar{e}_2/$. The origin of $*/\bar{e}_2/$ and its place in the history of PGmc is a subject of debate which need not concern us in this study (see Antonsen 1972:131; van Coetsem 1994:98–113, 114–118; Connolly 1979; Vennemann 1994b:208–212).

A process of nasal assimilation with compensatory lengthening affects PGmc $*/i a u/$ before $*/nx/$ in the later stages of the proto-language (Antonsen 2002:28; Ringe 2006:149–150, 215–216; see also § 2.4): $*/inx/ > */\bar{i}x/$; $*/unx/ > */\bar{u}x/$; $*/anx/ > */\bar{a}x/$. The last change produces a long low vowel $*/\bar{a}/$, which is not normally treated as part of the phoneme inventory of PGmc as it is a late development (though one which can plausibly be ascribed to IPGmc as it appears in all the dialects, e.g., PGmc $*xanxanan > \text{Go } hāhan$, OE $hōn$, OFris $huā$, OS OHG $hāhan$ “hang”) and occurs only in this restricted context.²

2.2.3 Diphthongs

Conventionally, the IPGmc vowel system contains 3 diphthongs which concern us:

$*/eu/$	$*/ai/$	$*/au/$
---------	---------	---------

2 Ringe (2006:214, 258) identifies another $*/\bar{a}/$ as an alternant with $*/ai/$ in the pres-stem-formant of class III weak verbs. Since no verbs of this class are attested in the inscriptions, I shall not comment further on this point.

A fourth diphthong */ei/ can be reconstructed for earlier stages of PGmc, though since this merges with */ī/ in lPGmc, it is not relevant to the present project (van Coetsem 1994:94–95; Lehmann 2005–2007 § 2.7.4).

Lehmann (2005–2007 § 2.2, § 2.7.3) and Ringe (2006:214) reconstruct a phoneme */eu/ with an umlaut allophone *[iu], while Antonsen (1972) and Moulton (1961) treat them as distinct phonemes, */eu iu/. Antonsen justifies his reconstruction by reference to Scandinavian runic data: Darum V bracteate (An 56; IK 43; KJ 104) **niujil** vs. Opedal (An 21; KJ 76) **leubu** (1972:129–130). Aside from the reading of Opedal **eu** vs. **iu**,³ these forms are not in contrastive distribution, and can perfectly well represent allophones of a single diphthong selected by the frontness or backness of the following vowel.⁴

2.2.4 On the distinction “front” vs. “back”

In §§ 4–6 I group the non-diphthongal vocalics (i.e., the monophthongs and the semivowels) into 3 sets which I label “back” (*u ū ō w/), “front” (*i ē ī ē₁ ē₂ j/) and “low” (*a ā/). In referring to a distinction between “front” and “back”, I am employing the terms of traditional philology. Antonsen (1972:132–133) argues that the contrasts of PGmc */i e/ vs. */u/ and */ī ē₁ ē₂/ vs. */ū ō/ are properly characterised by the opposition “spread” vs. “rounded”. The basis of his argument is that all of these phonemes have umlaut allophones which differ from the underlying form in terms of frontness/backness, but which preserve the contrastive feature of roundedness: thus, for example, *[y] appears as a front allophone of */u/; although it is front, it retains the contrastive feature of rounding, and so speakers perceive it as underlying */u/, not */i/. The vowel which I have characterised as “low” (i.e., */a/) is in this view neither spread nor rounded, though it has both rounded and unrounded allophones *[ɒ æ].

For the purposes of the current project, the point is moot, since we are concerned only with the practical contrasts between members of the system, whereas Antonsen is approaching the question with the aim of specifying features within a generative phonology framework. My groupings “back”,

3 Antonsen’s reading here diverges from the more widely-accepted **liubu** (compare, e.g., Krause 1966:175–176; Nielsen 2000:105).

4 A particular author’s decision to reconstruct one diphthong */eu/ or two */iu eu/ is not directly related to that author’s reconstruction of one or two short front monophthongs, */i/ or */i e/ (§ 2.2.1).

“front” and “low” correspond to the sets of phonemes which, if we were to use Antonsen’s features, would be specified as [-spread +rounded], [+spread -rounded], and [-spread -rounded].

2.3 The vocalic systems of OHG and OS

This section outlines the developments of the IPGmc vocalics in the later Continental dialects. The vocalic system is here subdivided on the basis of the contrasts diphthong/back/front/low, the same set of categories used in the core chapters (§§ 3–6). I have avoided subdivision into long vs. short subsystems at this point because we are turning our attention from phonological properties to rune-orthographic evidence, and there is no graphemic distinction between long and short vowels. Furthermore, the sound changes described in this section involve changes in vowel height, but the distinction back/front/low in the non-diphthongal vocalics seems to be relatively stable.

2.3.1 Diphthongs

2.3.1.1 PGmc */eu/

PGmc */eu/ undergoes a number of allophonic (and ultimately phonemic) splits, which are not always clearly distinguished from one another in the literature. They can be outlined as follows:

1. Umlaut variations (subject to restrictions outlined in 2.):

- a. Development of an allophone *[iu] before a syllable containing a high front vocalic (*i ī j/), as part of the general raising of PGmc */e/ in this context (§ 2.3.3.2) (Ringe 2006:221).
- b. Development of *[iu] before a syllable containing a high back vowel (*u ū; consonantal */w/ does not trigger this change). It is not clear whether this process is directly connected with the preceding one, or is an independent development. It is certainly attested in OHG and OS, and possibly also in early PNorse,⁵ which suggests that it may be common NWGmc (Klein 2001:583; Krause 1971:74–76; Nielsen 2000:105, 229).
- c. Development of an allophone *[eo] before /a/, and (at least in OHG and OS) before /e/ and /o/ (BR § 47; Klein 2001:583; Krause 1971:74–76; Nielsen 2000:229). Within PGmc, the allophone *[eo] is parallel to the open allophone of PGmc simplex */u/ → *[o] (§ 2.3.2.1).

⁵ The sole witness to this is Opedal **liubu**, the reading of which is disputed (§ 2.2.3).

Van Coetsem (1994:47, 94–98) has a different take on the chronology of these variations: in his reconstruction, lPGmc **/eu/* first develops the *a*-umlaut allophone **/eo/*; the remaining **/eu/* is then generalised to **/iu/*, with **/eu/* preserved before a high back vocalic.

If **/eo/* is the product of *a*-umlaut, then it must become phonemic after the loss of the conditioning environment (i.e., deletion of unstressed **/a/* in final position or before final **/z/*, common to the background of all the WGmc dialects).⁶

2. Consonant-conditioned variations in OHG:

- a. In UG, the variant **/eo/* appears only where the following consonant is a dental/alveolar, or */h/* < PGmc **/x/*. Before labial or velar consonants (including */h/* < PGmc **/k/* via Second Consonant Shift; see § 2.3.1.3.1), the surface form is always */iu/*.
- b. In Frk (and in OS), the umlaut-derived variations described above apply regardless of the consonantal environment.

Braune and Reiffenstein follow Vennemann's explanation (1972:879) that because the dental consonants and */h/* involve a relatively low position of the back of the tongue, they are more amenable to lowering of the back off-glide. Whether or not we accept this, the consonants before which */eo/* appears in UG are the same ones which condition the monophthongisation of PGmc **/au/* in OHG (including Frk) (§ 2.3.1.4.1). The consonant-conditioned alternation is conventionally characterised as blocking of the regular *a*-umlaut (**/eu/* > **/eo/*) by the labial and velar consonants (Armitage 1911:121 § 275; Braune 1877:557; BR § 47). We could alternatively explain it as a secondary raising of inherited **/eo/* triggered by the labials and velars. This appears to be the model which Penzl (1971:139–140) and Wright (1906 § 56) have in mind.

Whatever the theoretical underpinning of the UG consonant-conditioned variation may be, it produces the following surface patterns:

6 I leave aside the theoretical question of the motivation for phonologisation. For discussion and criticism of the dominant model, in which allophones become phonemes as a consequence of the loss of the conditioning environment, see Liberman (1991). That variants must be phonemic subsequent to the loss of the conditioning factors is not disputed; the argument is therefore not of direct relevance to our present object, namely the reconstruction of a phonemic system at a stage postdating this loss.

- * /eu/ + (labial or velar) + (non-high vowel): Frk *riochan*; *fliogan*; *klioban*;
liob; *thiob*.
 UG *riuhhan*; *fliugan*;
chliuban; *liup*; *diup*.
- * /eu/ + (dental or /h/) + (non-high vowel): Frk *biotan*; *siodan*; *niozan*;
kiosan; *lioht*.
 UG *biotan*; *siodan*; *niozan*;
kiosan; *lioht*.
- * /eu/ + (labial or velar) + (high vowel): Frk *liubī*.
 UG *liupī*.
- * /eu/ + (dental or /h/) + (high vowel): Frk 1.sg. *kiusu*.
 UG 1.sg. *chiusu*.

Where the surface form has no following vowel, the presence of /eo/ in Frk is conditioned by underlying inflectional */a/ (*liob*, *thiob*, *lioht* < PGmc **leubaz*, **þeubaz*, **leuxtān*). In the adjectives, the disappearance of the nom.sg.fem. suffix (/ -u/ < PGmc */-ō/; see § 2.3.2.3; § 4.4) results in an analogical form based on the masc. form, rather than a preserved /-iu-/ form (i.e., PGmc **leubō* > pre-Frk **liubu* → Frk *liob-Ø*).

The spelling <eu> does appear alongside <iu> in early (8th c.) OHG mss., and Frk pers.ns. in 6th–7th c. Lat mss. show free variation between <eu> and <eo> (BR § 47 Anm. 1). Occasionally, Frk mss. have forms like *liub* alongside regular *liob*, *liab*. Because they only appear sporadically, these are probably variants influenced by UG orthography, rather than evidence for the spread of UG dialectal forms (BR § 47 Anm. 4).

Both variants undergo further developments during the OHG period: early OHG /eo/ > /io/ > /ie/ = [iə] (BR § 48; Penzl 1971:137–138), merging with the diphthongal reflex of PGmc */ē₂/ (§ 2.3.3.5). /iu/ is monophthongised > /y/ (BR § 49). Since the first of these changes is conventionally dated to the 9th century and the second not until the 10th, they are unlikely to be relevant to this study, though they should not be ruled out absolutely. We have, for example, occasional <u> spellings in early sources which may indicate monophthongal reflexes of /iu/, e.g., *zūhit* 3.sg.pres. to *ziohan* “to draw, pull” (St. Gallen *Abrogans*, late 8th c. (Gibbs and Johnson 2000:27)).

The system in OS is essentially the same as that in Frk (Gallée 1910 §§ 102–108; Holthausen 1921 §§ 101–105). Inherited /eu/ is normally preserved word-finally, or before /w/ followed by a non-high vowel (e.g., *treuwa* “faith”); and the OS sources show some (analogical?) variation in the distribution of variants. Holthausen cites occasional forms with <iu> where we

would expect <eo> ~ <io> (e.g., *sniumo* ~ *sliumo* “quickly” from either the adj. **sliunig* or the verb **sniumjan* (: Go *sniumjan* “hurry”; OHG *sniumen* “to expedite”, < PGmc **sneumjanan*)); and (more commonly) the converse (e.g., *liohtean* “to shine”, by analogy with *lioht* “light”). As in OHG, the form of nominal and adjectival stems is usually generalised from the nom.sg.(masc.) (e.g., *liof* “dear”, dat.pl. *liobun*; *thiod* “people”, dat.sg. *thiodu*) (Holthausen 1921 § 103 Anm. 2–3).

2.3.1.2 The NWGmc monophthongisation of unstressed */ai/ and */au/

In OHG and OS, as in all of the NGmc and WGmc dialects, the reflexes of PGmc */ai/ and */au/ are monophthongal in unstressed position (e.g., OS *dag-e*, OHG *tag-e* “day” (dat.sg.) < PGmc **dag-ai*). This monophthongisation may belong to the common NWGmc stage: IPGmc */-ai/ > */-æ/ > NWGmc */-ē/; IPGmc */-au/ > */-ō/ > NWGmc */-ō/ (Antonsen 1970:315–316; Syrett 1994:271–276). The problem, as regards the Scandinavian Older Futhork material, is that for reflexes of unstressed */ai/, we have variation between digraphic **-ai** and monographic **-e**. The only witness to a reflex of unstressed */au/ is on the Vetteland stone (KJ 60) **magoz** → *magōz* “kinsman” (gen.sg.) (< PGmc **magauz*). Both Antonsen and Syrett take the view that monophthongisation has taken place in the period of the earliest inscriptions, and that the (relatively few) digraphic spellings are archaisms.

Although the immediate output of the NWGmc monophthongisation is a long vowel, the quantity of the reflexes in OHG is not entirely clear. Braune indicates that inherited long vowels remain long in unstressed final position in OHG at least into the 9th century (BR §§ 56–58). The cognates in OS are short (Gallée 1910 § 112, § 114; Holthausen 1921 § 150, § 152).

The shortening of unstressed vowels is a tendency attested throughout Gmc, and believed to result from the Gmc accent shift (Birkmann 1995:167; Prokosch 1939:133–140); as to the chronology, Prokosch states that “during the first two or three centuries A.D., ... final syllables lost one mora. About five hundred years later a second mora was lost” (1939:133).⁷ Since our runic inscriptions were produced in the 5th–7th centuries – that is, in the period during which (according to Prokosch) a general process of mora reduction was underway – the quantity of the monophthongal reflexes of unstressed */ai/

⁷ The validity of the hypothesis that PIE had trimoric vowels is disputed, and I do not intend to discuss it here: see Antonsen (2002:254–256); Lane (1963); Prokosch (1939:132–133). That PGmc */-ai/ in unstressed final position regularly produces a short monophthong in the later dialects is not controversial.

cannot be evaluated *a priori*. Given that the runic writing system does not have any means of marking vowel-quantity (except perhaps with a digraph, and there is little, if any, evidence that carvers ever employed such a device), it is unlikely that the inscriptions will shed any light on this problem.

2.3.1.3 PGmc */ai/ in OHG and OS

A further monophthongisation process affects stressed */ai/ in both OHG and OS. The resultant monophthong is conventionally represented \bar{e} or \bar{e} in the handbooks.

The “coastal” WGmc dialects also show monophthongisation of */ai/: in OE, /ai/ > /ā/ unconditionally (Campbell 1959 §§ 132, 134). OFris monophthongisation is also unconditioned, but the reflexes show an alternation /ā/ ~ /ē/, which has not been adequately explained (Heuser 1903 § 19; Stiles 1995:200–201).

PGmc */au/ in stressed position is also subject to monophthongisation in OHG and OS (§ 2.3.1.4). The developments of the two *a*-diphthongs are widely regarded as parallel, although any unified theoretical account of these processes must overcome considerable difficulties (§ 2.3.1.4.1).

2.3.1.3.1 Conditions for monophthongisation

Monophthongisation is not phonologically conditioned in OS, though diphthongs (or digraphic spellings, at any rate: <ai, æi, ei>) are retained before /j/ and in a few specific words (including many pers.ns., e.g., *Atalheid*) (Gallée 1910 §§ 89–94; Holthausen 1921 §§ 97–98).

In OHG the monophthongisation is much more restricted, although it is difficult to identify the phonetic motivation for the conditioning (see Durrell 1977; Harbert 1997; Penzl 1971:124–131; Rauch 1999; Schweikle 1964; Vennemann 1972). Since our concern at present is to outline the surface facts in OHG, rather than to evaluate theoretical explanations of the process, I simply follow Braune (BR § 43) and state the conditions for the monophthongisation atomistically:

1. Monophthongisation occurs regularly before /r w h/. Inherited /h/ (< PGmc */x/) triggers monophthongisation, but the consonant-shifted reflex of */k/ does not (§ 2.5.1.2.1): compare, e.g., $\bar{e}ht$ “property” (< PGmc **aixtiz*), *eih* “oak” (< PGmc **aikz*). This implies that the two are phonetically distinct. On the possible velar/uvular character of /r/ in this context, see § 2.5.2.1.1.

2. Certain interjections with proto-forms in */-ai/ have a monophthong in OHG (*sē*, *sē-nu* “behold!” < PGmc **sai*; *wē* “woe, alas!” < **wai*). This is not a general rule in final position (compare *zwei* “two” (neut.); *screi* 1.sg.pret. to *scrīan* “cry, moan”; *ei* “egg”);⁸
3. A number of anomalous forms appear in other environments, e.g., *wēnag* “miserable, poor, low” (< PGmc **wainagaz*/**wainaxaz*). The motivation for monophthongisation in these cases is not clear, but it is evidently not phonological (since formally similar words retain a diphthong, e.g., *weinōn* “to cry, wail”).

2.3.1.3.2 Chronology

Braune dates the OHG monophthongisation of */ai/ to the 7th century (BR § 43). He suggests that the process begins in Frk and is part of a more general shift in the north (reflected in the OS data, albeit at a later date). The earliest (8th c.) OHG sources show some instances of preserved /ai/ before /r/ (e.g., pers.ns. *Gairelaigo*, *Gairoaldo*), but otherwise monophthongs predominate throughout the OHG period.

Schneider (1980:196) cites a 7th-century Merovingian coin from Gondorf as the earliest witness to the change (it bears a Frk MN *Geroaldo* < **Gaira* < PGmc **gaizaz* “spear”; see Felder 1978:42), while Beck (2001:313–314) claims even earlier evidence in the Malberg glosses, citing forms like *fecho* (< PGmc **faixōn* > Go *bi-faih(o)* “exaction”, *gafaihōn* “to take advantage of, defraud” (Lehmann 1986)); *chreo* (< PGmc **xraiwa-* > Go *hraiwa-dubo* “turtledove”; OIc *hræ*, OE *hrāw* ~ *hræw* “corpse”; OFris *hrē-raf* “corpse-robbery”; OHG *rēo* “death, grave”) (see van Helten 1900:243–244). However, Beck’s claim that these examples “belong to those redactions of the Pactus Legis Salicae which represent the Old Frankish linguistic situation of the 6th century”⁹

8 Some commentators (Durrell 1977:52; Penzl 1971:125) count open juncture among the conditioning environments for monophthongisation, and Durrell proposes a feature specification for juncture in his attempt to provide a general account of the triggering conditions. I am not convinced that this account matches the data: most instances of word-final PGmc */-ai/ appear in unstressed syllables and so are subject to the NWGmc monophthongisation (§ 2.3.1.2), while (according to Braune) only some of the relatively uncommon monosyllables with final (stressed) */-ai/ undergo monophthongisation. Penzl (1971:127) ascribes the diphthong of, e.g., *ei* to derivation from a geminate (PGmc **ajjaz*); but this is not the case in *zuuei* < **twai*, or *screi* < **skrai* (Ringe 2006:265–268, 286).

9 “... gehören ... denjenigen Redaktionen des Pactus Legis Salicae an, die altfränkischen Sprachstand des 6. Jahrhunderts repräsentieren”

(2001:314) is misleading: the mss. to which he refers date from the mid-late 8th or early 9th century (Drew 1991:52–53; van Helten 1900:237; Hessels 1880 [2004]:xiv), and there seems no justification for dating the language of the glosses as far back as the 6th (Nedoma 2004a:295; Schmidt-Wiegand 2001:185).

Neither Gallée (1910) nor Holthausen (1921) discusses the chronology of the monophthongisation in OS; since there are only a few traces of the inherited diphthongs, it is probably safe to assume that the process is already advanced in the earliest (9th c.) OS sources.

2.3.1.3.3 Phonetic development

In early OHG sources, the reflex of **/ai/* in monophthongisation-triggering environments is frequently written <ae> ~ <ê>. From the 9th century, the usual spelling is <e, (ee, ê)>. From a phonetic point of view, the process occurs in two stages (according to Durrell 1977:59–63): first, the off-glide is lowered to produce a “pre-monophthongal” variant [æ]. The first element is subsequently raised, [æ] > /ē/ (= [ē]?) as part of a general process affecting the first elements of complex vowel-segments in the late 8th or early 9th century (see also van Coetsem 1975:11–17).

Penzl (1947:178–179; 1971:127–128) argues that the <ae> spelling is simply an orthographic device for distinguishing the relatively open product of monophthongisation (/ē/ < **/ai/*) from the more close /ē/ < PGmc **/ē₂/* (which by the 9th century undergoes diphthongisation > /ia/; see § 2.3.3.5). In Penzl’s account, the monophthongisation process is a matter of increasing palatalisation of the first element, [a] > [æ] > [ɛ], while the second is (concurrently?) lowered to [e], which assimilates to the preceding (and more strongly accented) element, [ɛe] > [ē]. Sonderegger (1961:271) cautiously favours the interpretation of <ae> in the 8th-century St. Gallen witnesses as an intermediate diphthong [aɐ].

The later developments of /ē/ < **/ai/* and /ē/ < **/ē₂/* show that they are distinct phonemes in OHG; in OS, however, it is generally assumed that the two have merged (Gallée 1910 § 84; Holthausen 1921 § 92; Penzl 1971:128). In the following text, I notate the product of the OHG conditioned monophthongisation as /ē/ and that of the unconditioned change in OS /ē/. For the products of the NWGmc monophthongisation of the unstressed diphthong, the notation used is NWGmc **/ē/* > OHG OS /e/. We cannot be certain of the actual quality of this vowel, but I am not aware of any evidence for distinct open and close mid front phonemes in the unstressed vowel systems of OHG or OS.

It is at least theoretically possible that an allophone with a lowered off-glide *[æ] was already present in IPGmc; this allophone would be a product of *a*-umlaut and/or consonant-conditioned lowering of */i/ before */x/ and */r/ (but not */w/) (van Coetsem 1994:48–49, 118–119).

2.3.1.4 PGmc */au/ in OHG and OS

Like */ai/, the reflexes of PGmc */au/ undergo monophthongisation in OHG and OS, producing a vowel conventionally represented as *ō* in the handbooks.

2.3.1.4.1 Conditions for monophthongisation

In OS, */au/ is monophthongised in all contexts except before /w/; here, as in the case of */ai/, the diphthong is preserved only where supported by a semi-vowel homorganic with the off-glide.

The OHG monophthongisation is conditioned by following consonants, but the conditions differ from those for the monophthongisation of */ai/. Monophthongisation occurs before /h/ < PGmc */x/ (§ 2.3.1.3.1), and before all dental/alveolar consonants. Attempts to unify the two monophthongisations in a single theoretical account have run into difficulties, not least in attempting to explain why the dentals affect only */au/. It may well be that we are dealing with two entirely distinct processes. For a detailed treatment of the problem, see Durrell (1977).

The similarity of the conditioning environments for the monophthongisation of */au/ and the UG distribution of reflexes of */eu/ (§ 2.3.1.1) seems to have attracted no attention in the literature (see § 8.1.3.1).

2.3.1.4.2 Chronology

According to Braune (BR § 45 Anm. 1), the monophthongisation of */au/ in OHG begins in the 8th century (i.e., somewhat later than the monophthongisation of */ai/). However, since it appears here and there in the earliest OHG sources, we should consider (and empirically evaluate) the possibility that it may appear in the runic inscriptions.

It is possible that the monophthongisations of */ai/ and */au/ are the first stage of a push chain (the “OHG vowel shift”), triggering the diphthongisations of */ō/ and */ē₂/ (§ 2.3.2.3; § 2.3.3.5). This hypothesis has the process

beginning in the north (i.e., in LG territory) and spreading southwards with diminishing effects (Szulc 1987:80–81).

2.3.1.4.3 Phonetic development

As with the monophthongisation of */ai/, there is some evidence for an intermediate stage with lowering of the off-glide, i.e., */au/ > [ao] > [ɔ̃]. The spelling <ao> is widespread in Bav. texts of the 8th and early 9th centuries, but is not found in Frk or Alam. (BR § 45 Anm. 2). Penzl (1971:127–128) interprets the <ao> digraph as an orthographic device for representing the relatively open monophthong [ɔ̃] (in parallel with his treatment of <ae>; see § 2.3.1.3.3).

In contexts where monophthongisation does not occur, the spelling <au> remains the norm until the 9th century, when it gives way to <ou>.

In OS, the reflexes of */au/ are spelled <ô, ao, oa, oo, â> (Gallée 1910 §§ 95–101; Holthausen 1921 §§ 99–100). It is possible – though the evidence is not clear – that the digraphs represent intermediate stages in the process.

2.3.2 Back vocalics

2.3.2.1 PGmc */u/

The PGmc umlaut allophones *[u o] (§ 2.2.1) are phonologised to /u o/ in all of the attested Gmc dialects (BR § 32).

In OHG, the inherited allophonic distribution produces contrasts such as *got* “god” vs. *gutin* “goddess”; *gibotan* “offered” (past part.) vs. *butun* (pl.pret.). Many such contrasts are levelled out by analogy, however (e.g., *gold*, inst.sg. *goldu* ≠ **guldu*; compare MFrk *guld*). Consistent exceptions to the normal pattern also appear (reflecting the status of /u/ and /o/ as full phonemes), e.g. *sumar* “summer” (< PGmc **sumeraz*); and we find alternation in forms of the same word, e.g., *ubar* ~ *obar* “over, above” (BR § 32).

The inherited distribution of /u/ and /o/ is preserved to a large extent in OS (Gallée 1910 §§ 69–78; Holthausen 1921 §§ 86–88). Here too the pattern is disturbed by analogical levelling (e.g., *goldu* inst.sg., following nom.sg. *gold*; *drohtin* ~ *druhtin* “lord”). OS /o/ is occasionally represented as <uo> (e.g., *Thuomas*) or <a> (e.g., *uuariehtio* ~ *uurhteo* “worker”). The latter reflects a more open articulation [ɔ̃] (particularly preceding /rC/, but also before other consonants) in western dialects (Gallée 1910 § 71). In the context /_rC/, the reflex of PGmc */u/ can also appear as <e>, producing doublets like *hress/*

hers ~ *hross/hors* ~ *hars* “horse” (Gallée is noncommittal on the directionality of the relationships between these variants, but it is clear that they are all ultimately reflexes of */u/ in PGmc **xrussan* (Orel 2003)).

In unstressed syllables, OHG shows considerable spelling variation, which reflects the levelling of the unstressed vowels > [ə]. Braune posits a three-member system /i a u/, in which [e o] are allophones of /a/, but also of the high vowels (BR § 62). Penzl, on the other hand, assumes that early OHG had the full set of vowel phonemes in unstressed syllables (i.e., that there is no distinction to be drawn between stressed and unstressed subsystems in respect of the inherited monophthongs) (Penzl 1971:141).

OS normally preserves the spellings of /u/ and /o/ as <u> and <o> in unstressed syllables, with some variations: inherited /o/ sometimes appears as <a> or <u> (Gallée 1910 § 114; Holthausen 1921 § 152). Gallée describes this as a dialectal feature without going into further detail, though it may simply reflect a levelling of the unstressed vowels. Similarly, we sometimes encounter <o> where we would regularly expect <u>.

In both languages, final /-u/ (whether derived from inherited */u/, */ō/, or */w/) is usually deleted after a long syllable (e.g., OS *hand-Ø*, OHG *hant-Ø* nom.sg. < pre-OS pre-OHG **hand-u* < PGmc **xanduz*), though in some instances it is “restored” analogically (e.g., *uuordu* inst.sg.) (Gallée 1910 § 115; Holthausen 1921 § 153). Short unstressed medial vowels (of all qualities, not only /u o/) are often syncopated after a long stem, e.g., OS *hēlgoda* (< *hēlagoda* “blessed, sanctified”) (Gallée 1910 § 138; Holthausen 1921 §§ 137–140). On syncope in the WGmc dialects in general, see also Birkmann (1995:172–175).

2.3.2.2 PGmc */ū/

This vowel does not undergo any change in stressed syllables, although Notker (late 10th/early 11th c.) often writes <uo> before <h, ch>. This spelling also appears occasionally elsewhere (BR § 41). Braune regards it as an orthographic variant with no phonological significance. Penzl (1971:93–95) mentions this variation, but does not comment on it. Variant spellings in OS (also believed to be purely orthographic, as these spellings are neither frequent nor consistent) are <ô, uo, ui>.

In unstressed medial position, the reflexes of */ū/ may be shortened, though the evidence is unclear (see comments in § 2.3.1.2).

2.3.2.3 PGmc */ō/

In “standard” OHG,¹⁰ inherited /ō/ is diphthongised to /uo/ in stressed syllables. This change begins in Alam. in the mid-late 8th century and is complete (with a consistent spelling <uo>) in all the OHG dialects by c.900 AD, whereas earlier texts show variation between <o, ua, uo, oa> (BR §§ 38–39; Szulc 1987:80).

The OS reflex of stressed */ō/ is usually written <ô>, with variants including <oo, uo, ô, û, u, ua, ou> (Gallée 1910 § 86; Holthausen 1921 § 94). Widespread variation between <ô> and <uo>, even within the same ms., suggests that a diphthongisation parallel to that in OHG might be underway, at least in some dialects; it could, alternatively, be an artefact of orthographic practices taken from OHG sources.

According to Moulton (1961:19–20), the diphthongisation of /ō/ is part of a push chain in the OHG phonological system, the “push” coming in this case from the monophthongal reflex of PGmc */au/ = /ǫ/ (§ 2.3.1.4.2; see also van Coetsem 1975:4, 31;¹¹ Szulc 1987:81–82). The phonetic similarity between the two prompts the diphthongisation of /ō/ and the subsequent raising of /ǫ/ to occupy the “vacant” position. Moulton proposes a development of [o:] > [oɔ] > [oɑ] > [uo] (1961:20). In effect, the diphthongisation consists of two processes: (i) the development of the second mora into a lowered off-glide ([ɔ] > [ɑ]); (ii) the raising of the entire diphthong, possibly as part of the general raising of the diphthongs in OHG (/ai/ > /ei/; /au/ > /ou/; /eo/ > /io/; /eu/ > /iu/) (Moulton 1961:20).

In medial syllables not bearing primary stress, inherited */ō/ is normally shortened to /o/ in both OHG and OS. Word-finally, PGmc */-ō/ > NWGmc */-ū/ > OHG OS /-u/ (Antonsen 1972:139; Ringe 2006:221).

10 Braune’s description of OHG uses the EFrk dialect of Tatian (9th c.) as an unmarked *Normalalthochdeutsch* variety for reference purposes, while making it clear that no genuine “standard” form of OHG existed (BR § 4).

11 Note that van Coetsem is concerned with the monophthongisation as a development from LPGmc umlaut allophones of the *a*-diphthongs (*[ae ao]); he does not comment on the consonant-conditioned monophthongisations which I have discussed in §§ 2.3.1.3–2.3.1.4.

2.3.2.4 PGmc */w/

OHG mss. normally use digraphs <uu, uv, vu, vv> to represent consonantal /w/, with the letter <w> appearing towards the end of the OHG period. Where /w/ is adjacent to /u/ or is geminated, the orthography varies between <uuu>, <uu> and <u>. OS also tends to use digraphic <uu>, with a single <u> common after a consonant or before /u/ (e.g., *tuelifo* “twelve”; *uundrode* “wondered”).

Phonologically, PGmc */w/ develops in a number of ways, depending on its position (BR §§ 106–114):

- Initial /w-/ is generally unchanged. In the clusters /wr- wl-/ it is preserved in OS, but in OHG it is deleted at a stage predating the earliest ms. sources (e.g., PGmc **wrītan* > OS *wrītan*, OHG *rīzan* “to carve, write”).¹² In the context /C_u-/, /w/ is sometimes elided (at least orthographically) in OHG (e.g., *huosto* “cough” < **hwuosto* < **hwōsto* < PGmc **xwōstōn*. Braune gives several more examples, in each of which the /-u-/ is a product of the diphthongisation of */ō/ (§ 2.3.2.3). Where a stem with initial /w-/ forms the second element of a compound (especially a pers.n.) it is often elided in OHG: e.g., *-old*, *-olf* (< *-wald*, *wolf*).
- Syllable-final or word-final /w/ following a vowel normally becomes syllabic /o/ (or occasionally /u/), e.g., OHG *kneo*, OS *knio* nom.sg. “knee” (< PGmc **knewan*); OHG *farota* pret. to *far(a)wen* “to dye, colour”.
- In certain words, medial /w/ following an open syllable is syllabicated to form a diphthong (e.g., OHG *sēula*, OS *seola* ~ *siola* “soul” < PGmc **saiwalō*).
- Following a long vowel and preceding another vowel, /w/ is often (though not invariably) preserved in OHG (*grāwēr* “grey” (nsm.), *ēwa* “law”,¹³ *spīwan* “to spit, spew” vs. *grāēr*, *ēa*, *spīan*). Where it follows a long vowel and precedes a consonant, it is deleted in OHG (e.g., early OHG *sēula* ~ *sēla*; *lāta*, 1.sg.pret. to *lāwen* “to betray” (< PGmc **lēwjanan*)).

12 Initial /w-/ in these clusters is preserved in MFrk, with occasional appearances in other dialects, in early mss. (e.g., Alam. *uuerecho* “avenger”). Most of the examples cited by Braune have an anaptyctic vowel.

13 Note that the OS cognate *ēo* does not qualify as a parallel for or counter-example to this phenomenon, as it is a masc. (pre-OS **aiw-Ø* < PGmc **aiwaz*), whereas OHG *ēwa* is a fem. form. The OS reflex of */w/ becomes word-final following the loss of thematic */-a/, and is therefore syllabicated.

2.3.3 Front vocalics

2.3.3.1 PGmc */i/

In OS, this phoneme is subject to lowering conditioned by the vowel of the following syllable: */i/ > /i/ before a high vowel or semivowel, /e/ before a mid or low vowel (Gallée 1910 § 56; Holthausen 1921 §§ 84–85). There is, nevertheless, a considerable amount of variation, and we find alternants like *lebđin* vs. regular *libđin* 3.pl.pret. “lived” (< PGmc **libēđun*).

The pattern in OHG is less consistent. Under most conditions, reflexes of */i/ appear as <i> (occasionally <ie>), even before a following mid or low vowel (BR § 31). <e> (presumably → /e/) appears before a non-high vowel in the following:

1. some adjectives, e.g., OHG *quec* “alive” (compare the related verb *quicken*);
2. weak verbs of classes 2 and 3, e.g., *klebēn* “to stick”;
3. some nouns, e.g., *steg* “footbridge” (< PGmc **stigan*); *lebara* “liver” (< **lib(a)rō*).

Some authors have attributed this lowering of */i/ to *a*-umlaut (e.g., Antonsen 1964:181–184; van Coetsem 1994:88). However, as Connolly (1977:174–176) objects, lowering is the exception rather than the rule in OHG, where it is more frequent than in most of the other Gmc dialects. Proponents of the *a*-umlaut hypothesis are forced to assume a great deal of analogical restoration of */i/. Connolly argues instead that the lowering may be explained by the presence of a PIE laryngeal. For the purposes of this project, there is no need to debate this point.

More lexical items develop /e/ < /i/ during the OHG period (e.g., *lirnēn* ~ *lernēn* “to learn”; *skif* ~ *skef* “ship”). Lowering occasionally occurs before /h/ or /r/ (e.g., *widarbirgi* ~ *widarbergi* “steep, arduous”).

In final unstressed position, /-i/ tends to be lowered to /-e/ in both OHG and OS. This process is identifiable in 9th-century sources (BR § 58 Anm. 2; Gallée 1910 § 113; Holthausen 1921 § 184), although in the earlier OHG material and many of the OS sources the contrast of /-i/ and /-e/ appears to be preserved. This lowering may be part of the general levelling of the unstressed vowels (BR §§ 59–60).

After a long or disyllabic stem, final /-i/ is normally deleted (e.g., OHG OS *gast* “guest” < **gasti* < PGmc **gastiz*, vs. short-stem *wini* “friend” < **weniz*).

2.3.3.2 PGmc */e/

According to Braune (BR § 28 Anm. 1–2), inherited /e/ is realised as [ɛ] in OHG, with a distinct *i*-umlaut allophone [e] which merges with the *i*-umlaut allophone of /a/ = [e] (§ 2.3.4.2). This variation results in a phonemic split (/e/ = [ɛ ~ e] > /ɛ, e/) from the 9th century.

In the primary sources, both variants are commonly written <e>, though in some mss. the open allophone appears as <ê> or <ae>. Braune marks the open variant as *ë*, the close one as *e* (e.g., *ërda* “earth” vs. *fëlis* “rock”, *herti* “hard” (< *hart*)).

In both OHG and OS, we find evidence of the raising of PGmc */e/ > *[i] (→ <i>) before a syllable containing a high front vocalic, and before a tauto-syllabic nasal (§ 2.2.1; §BR 30; Gallée 1910 §§ 56–63; Holthausen 1921 § 84). Note that the handbooks on the daughter languages state the conditioning factor for this raising as a cluster N+C, rather than as a nasal at the syllable coda.

Additionally, reflexes of PGmc */e/ are raised before a syllable containing /u/ or (usually) before /ww/ (e.g., OHG *miluh*, OS *miluk* “milk” < PGmc **melukz*; OS OHG *triuua* “loyalty, troth” < PGmc **trewwō*). Braune (*loc.cit.*) implies that this change belongs to the early stages of OHG, noting instances of preserved [ɛ] → <e> in the earliest sources, especially before simple /w/ (e.g., pret.part. *gisëwan* “seen” ≠ **gisiwan*). Raising before a high back vocalic is not consistent; and even before a high front vocalic we commonly find cases where [ɛ] is preserved(?) or (more probably) restored by analogy (e.g., OHG *hërza* “heart” has gen./dat.sg. *hërzin*, not the expected **hirzin*). Conversely, analogical <i> (→ [i]) sometimes appears in place of regular <e> (e.g., *bëta* “request” ~ *bita* < PGmc **bedō*).

Occasionally in OS, <o> appears where we would expect <e>, e.g., *worold* for *werold* “world” (< PGmc **wira-aldiz*). Before /r/, inherited /e/ is often lowered to /a/ (e.g., *farahe* dat.sg. to (regular) *fer(a)h* “life” (< PGmc **ferxwan*)) (Gallée 1910 § 57).

OS /e/ often becomes /a/ (or a vowel represented <a>) before /r/: e.g., *farahtlīco* vs. regular *ferahtliko* “wisely” (< PGmc **ferxwt-* (Köbler 2000)).

2.3.3.3 PGmc */ī/

PGmc stressed */ī/ remains unchanged in OHG and OS (and is normally spelled <i> or <î>), although in Notker it is diphthongised to /ie/ before /h/ (e.g., *liehte* vs. the more common *līht* “easy”). <ie>-spellings also occur sporadically in other contexts (BR § 37).

*/ī/ is also preserved in unstressed syllables in OHG (to some extent, at least, and more commonly in UG than in Frk) prior to the levelling of unstressed vowels in later OHG (BR § 57 Anm. 1). In OS, unstressed */ī/ is normally shortened to /i/ and frequently lowered to /e/ (Gallée 1910 § 113; Holthausen 1921 § 133). On the general shortening of unstressed long vowels, see § 2.3.1.2.

2.3.3.4 PGmc */ē₁/

PGmc */ē₁/ unconditionally develops into /ā/ in all the WGmc dialects, as well as in PNorse and ON. Braune does not assign the change to a common NWGmc stage, however. In Frk (as represented in Latin records of pers.ns.), /ā/-variants do not start to appear before the 6th century, and do not become the norm until the 7th, with /ē/ still appearing in the 8th (e.g., *Theu-domērus*, *Dagorēdus*) (BR § 34; Bremer 1886:17–29). Occasional /ē/-forms also appear in OS, e.g., *uuēpan-berand* ~ *uuâpan-berand* “weapon-bearer” (PGmc **wēpnan*) (Gallée 1910 §§ 81–83; Holthausen 1921 §§ 90–91). Felder (1978:26) attributes <E> and <I> spellings on coins to Burgundian or Gothic influence.

2.3.3.5 PGmc */ē₂/

In early OHG sources, the reflex of */ē₂/ is /ē/ (written <e> or <ee>), which later undergoes diphthongisation > /ea, ia/ (9th c.) > /ie/ (10th c.) in stressed syllables (BR § 35, § 53). This diphthongisation is believed to be part of the “OHG vowel shift” (§ 2.3.1.4.2; § 2.3.2.3). The chronology of forms suggests that the diphthongisation can be subdivided into (i) lowering of the second mora, followed by (ii) raising of the first mora and/or of the whole diphthong (Moulton 1961:20). Note that this subdivision parallels that of the monophthongisations of */ai/ and */au/ (§§ 2.3.1.3–2.3.1.4).

Braune also notes some spelling variations, including occasional <ei>, <eia> for /ē/ and /ea/. In the later sources where <ie> is normal, a variant <i> occasionally appears.

The OS reflex of */ē₂/ appears as <ê ie>, with a particular ms. favouring one form or the other (Gallée 1910 § 84; Holthausen 1921 § 92). <ia> and <ie> are also attested. Gallée does not discuss chronology; it may be that this phoneme undergoes diphthongisation in some OS dialects, as in OHG; or the variation might result from the influence of OHG scribal practices. Holthausen ascribes the digraphic spellings to Frankish influence.

2.3.3.6 PGmc */j/

According to Braune (BR §§ 115–119), /j/ is always written <i> in OHG mss.; <j> is not used at all. In Notker, consonantal /j/ is indicated by an accent on the following vowel (e.g., *iâr, iúng*, vs. syllabic /i/ in *îo, bîeten, iuuër*). Before a following /i/ or /e/ it is often written <g>, possibly realised as a fricative [j]. A similar situation exists in OS: /j/ is normally written <i>, with <g> appearing before a front vowel (Gallée 1910 § 158; Holthausen 1921 § 170).

Frequently (though by no means always), reflexes of PGmc */ij/ or */jj/ appear in OHG as <ii> or <iei>, e.g., *fiiant* “enemy” vs. *fiant* (< PGmc *fijēndz).

Medial /j/ after a consonant (except /r/) starts to disappear in early OHG, and in 9th-century sources is regularly deleted. Where it does appear, it is usually written <i> before <e u>, <e> before <a o>. <e> here probably represents a lowered [j], resulting from assimilation to the following vowel (see BR § 118). This deletion does not normally occur in OS: e.g., PGmc *sebjō > OS *sibbia*, OHG *sibba* “kinship”; PGmc *skapjanan > OS *skeppian*, OHG *skepfen* “to shape, form, create”.

/j/ is preserved in OHG after /r/ (which is not affected by the WGmc consonant gemination), e.g., *nerian* ~ *nerien* “to nourish, feed, save, redeem, heal” (in sources where postconsonantal /j/ is otherwise absent). In Alam. and Frk dialects, where /r/ undergoes a secondary gemination (unconnected to the WGmc gemination), /j/ is deleted (> *nerren*). Braune argues (BR § 118 Anm. 3) that where this /j/ is preserved it is strengthened to [j], often written <g> (like /j/ before a front vowel – see above).

In final syllables, /-ja/ > /-e/ even in the earliest OHG sources: e.g., PGmc *sundjō > pre-OHG *sundja > OHG nom./acc.sg., nom./acc.pl. *sunte*, dat.sg. *suntiu*.

Where /j/ becomes word-final by deletion of following material, it becomes syllabic /i/, even where /j/ is otherwise deleted: e.g., OHG OS *kunni* “kin, tribe, people” (< PGmc *kunjan) vs. gen.sg. OHG *kunnes* (with /j/-deletion), OS *kunnies* (without).

2.3.4 Low vowels

2.3.4.1 PGmc */a/

OHG shows some variation between <a> and <o> for reflexes of */a/. Braune classifies these /o/-variants into 4 types (BR § 25):

- a. Pairs like *halōn* ~ *holōn* “to fetch, call, take”; *mahta* ~ (Frk) *mohta* “power, might”; *rask* ~ *rosk* “quick”. Some of these cases can be attributed to older ablaut; others to assimilation; Braune mentions labialisation (in *mohta*?), but does not elaborate.
- b. Occasionally <o> appears before nasals and /l/: e.g., *wamba* ~ *womba* “body”; *weralt* ~ *werold* “world” (< PGmc *wira-aldiz). These <o>-variants probably reflect assimilation to the following consonants.
- c. <o> for inherited /a/ is common in weakly stressed function-words, e.g. *joh* “and”; *oh* “but”; *fan(a)* ~ *fona* “from”.
- d. Deuterothemes in pers.ns. often contain <o> for inherited /a/, e.g., *-bald* ~ *-bold*; *-walt* ~ *-(w)olt*; *-bato* ~ *-boto*. For this group, as for group c, weak stress appears to be the motivator (although I note that many of the examples cited by Braune have a following /l/, and so may be connected with group b).

OHG medial /a/ is susceptible to assimilation by the vowels of neighbouring syllables (BR §§ 67–68). The conditioning vowel is usually that of the final syllable (e.g., *heidinisc* “heathen” (adj.) vs. *heidan* “heathen” (subst.); *keiseres* gen.sg. to *keisar* “emperor”), less frequently the preceding stem-vowel (e.g., *hōhona* ~ *hōhana* “from above”; *gicorone* ~ *gicorane* pret.part. “chosen”). Where medial /a/ is affected by *i*-umlaut (§ 2.3.4.2), the product is usually /i/, not /e/.¹⁴ This /i/ may in turn trigger umlaut in the preceding syllable.

In OS, several other changes to /a/ are observable besides *i*-umlaut (Gallée 1910 §§ 50–55; Holthausen 1921 §§ 76–81):

1. Occasionally, /a/ > /e/ before /rC/ (in spite of the tendency of this environment to block *i*-umlaut), e.g., *forthuuerd* “forward” ~ regular *forðuuardas*. In some sources, /a/ is also raised and fronted before /g k/ and sporadically in other contexts, e.g., in pers.ns. *Gérdeg*, *Hillidæg* (< -dag).
2. /aha/ > /ā/ (→ <â> ~ <aa>): e.g., *gimâlða* < *gimahalda* (pret. to *gimahlian* “to speak”) (see § 2.5.1.4.2).

¹⁴ On Braune’s proposed three-member system of unstressed vowels, see § 2.3.2.1.

3. /a/ assimilates a following nasal before /θ f s h/, producing a lengthened vowel represented <â> or <ô>: e.g., *ôðar* nom.sg., *âthres* gen.sg. “other” (< PGmc **andraz*) (§ 2.5.2.2).
4. /a/ > /o/ in certain consonantal environments (compare group b of the OHG /o/-variants above):
 - a. before /nC/ (e.g., *hondscôhe* “gloves”).
 - b. before /l/+dental (e.g., *hagastoldos* pl. “servants” ~ -*stald*-; pers.ns. *Grimbold*, *Athalold* (< -*bald*, -*wald*)).
 - c. between /w/ and /r/ (e.g. *andsuôr* “answer” < PGmc **and-swaran*).

2.3.4.2 “Primary” i-umlaut

The other major phenomenon affecting /a/ in OHG and OS is “primary” i-umlaut before a syllable containing /i ī j/, e.g., *heri* “army” (< **xariz*/**xar-jaz*) (BR §§ 26–27, § 51; Gallée 1910 §§ 46–49; Holthausen 1921 § 115; Schweikle 1964). Enclitic personal pronouns may trigger umlaut of /a/ in the preceding word, e.g., *drenk ih* “I drank”.

An inherited /i ī j/ in a third syllable can trigger assimilation of an unstressed vowel in the second and consequent umlaut of the stressed vowel in the first: e.g. *apful* “apple” → nom./acc.pl. *epfili*. This is not consistent – e.g., *zahar* “tear” invariably has pl. forms *zahari*, *zahiri*, without umlaut.

Unmutated forms are found in the earliest OHG glosses, although umlaut is frequent even here (BR § 27; Szulc 1987:84). Before /ht hs/ and /Cw/, umlaut is not evident until the 12th century (e.g., OHG nom.pl. *mahti* (> MHG *mähte*) to *maht* “power, might”; *nahti* gen./dat.sg. (> MHG *nähte*) to *naht* “night”). In UG dialects, /lC/, /rC/, /x/ (< PGmc */k/) and /h/ (< PGmc */x/) also block umlaut (BR § 27; Paul et al. 2007 §§L16, L30).

We often see unmutated forms in deadjectival abstract nouns (e.g. *starchī* ~ *sterchī* “strength” < *stark* “strong”), nouns in -*ida* (e.g., *bigangida* ~ *bigen-gida* “care”), and adjectives in -*īn* (e.g. *tannīn* ~ *tennīn* “made of pine”). The gen. and dat.sg. of masc. *n*-stem nouns are often unmutated (e.g., *hanin* alongside regular *henin*, to *hano* “cock”), by analogy with the other case-forms; and certain derivational suffixes with /i ī/ appear not to trigger umlaut: -*nissi*, -*nissa*, -*lih* (e.g., *irstantnissi* “resurrection”; *langlih* “long”).

The mutated vowel is normally written <e> in OHG and OS mss., with variants <ae ei> also attested. This vowel is conventionally regarded as being phonologically distinct from /ɛ/ < PGmc */e/ prior to the loss of the conditioning environment (9th c.?), but its actual development and phonetic real-