The Proto-Germanic shift \( *\ddot{a} > *\ddot{o} \)
and early Germanic linguistic contacts

Post-PIE \( *\ddot{o} \) and \( *\ddot{a} \) from all possible PIE sources are both reflected in Germanic by a single sound which, because of the sounds that continue it in the individual Germanic languages, is usually reconstructed as \( *\ddot{o} \) for the latest stage of Proto-Germanic.\(^1\) This merger is paralleled by the merger of the post-PIE short non-high back vowels \( *o \) and \( *a \) in PrGmc. \( *a \). The merger of non-high back vowels is – at least in descriptive terms – a northwestern IE areal feature,\(^2\) encompassing Germanic, Baltic, Slavic and Celtic, with differences in the details. In Baltic, only the short vowels merged, but the reflex of \( *\ddot{a} \) remained distinct from that of \( *\ddot{o} \); the opposite is the case in Celtic, where only the long vowels were affected by the merger, whereas short \( *o \) and \( *a \) remained distinct.

The resultant vowel system of Proto-Germanic is oddly imbalanced, with the short vowels lacking a rounded mid-high back vowel and the long vowels lacking a low back vowel. Therefore it has been suspected that the parallelism of developments within Germanic had indeed been perfect and that the erstwhile outcome of the merger had been not a trapezoid or triangular vowel system, but a quadrangular one in which the short and long back vowels correlated with each other in quality. These vowels could be written phonemically \( *a \) and \( *\ddot{a} \), or, if greater allowance is made to phonetics, \( [\ddot{o}(:)] \) or rather rounded \( [\ddot{o}(:)] \), if not \( [\ddot{o}(:)] \). For the sake of clarity and in contrast to the later vowel system, here the symbols \( *\ddot{a} \) and \( *\ddot{a} \) will be used with reference to the low back vowels before the emergence of the classical reconstructable Proto-Germanic stage.

---

\(^\dagger\) My thanks go to Robert Nedoma and Stefan Schumacher for many valuable and important suggestions to this article. Part of this paper was written within the FWF-funded project P20755-G03 ‘Die altkeltischen Sprachreste in Österreich’ (The Old-Celtic Language Remains of Austria; http://www.univie.ac.at/austria-celtica/).

\(^1\) The hypothesis of Schrijver 2003 that \( *\ddot{a} \) and \( *\ddot{o} \) remained distinct in Germanic in final syllables and before tautosyllabic \( *n \) in initial and final syllables, is of no consequence for the lexical items discussed here and will not be examined further.

\(^2\) It may be noted here that also Proto-Finno-Ugric as well as Proto-Finno-Lappic possessed a quadrangular long vowel system consisting of \( *i\-\epsilon\-\ddot{o}\-\ddot{u} \) (see Sinor 1988: 268, 297, 523).
The Proto-Germanic shift *ã > *õ and early Germanic linguistic contacts 269

Given the ultimate divergence in quality between the short and the long vowel, it seems rational to surmise that despite their phonemic correlation there must have existed slight allophonic differences in their phonetic realizations, with the long vowel *ã tending stronger towards roundness. This is inferable from the very fact that it ultimately resulted in *õ some time in the Proto-Germanic period (thus basically Hollifield 1984: 65, but the scenario sketched by him is rather vague). Why then the phonological correlation between the two sounds was ultimately broken, can only be conjectured.3 Perhaps the long vowel came under pressure from the incipient shift *ã > *â > *ã, at least in the western and northern variants of Germanic. Furthermore, *ã may have been introduced as a marginal phoneme by the Proto-Germanic loss of *j between identical vowels, i.e. *aja > *ã (Þórhallssdóttir 1993: 35–36, citing Cowgill 1973: 296). On the other hand, the monophthongization of *a and a tautosyllabic nasal before a velar fricative did not help to fill the gap in the long-vowel system, because it resulted in a nasalized vowel *ã (i.e. *anţ > *ãţ), not in an oral long vowel *ã. Thus around the beginning of the historical period, Germanic was on the verge of acquiring a new *ã. In words that were borrowed into Germanic or its dialects from Latin in the imperial period, Lat. ã is not reflected by *õ (<*ã), but by the new *ã by default (Kluge 1913: 23–24, 128), e.g. OHG phãl ‘stake’ ← pâlus, OHG strâţza ‘street’ ← strâta, OHG kãsi ‘cheese’ ← cãseus, the OHG agentive suffix -ãri ← -ãrius. Cases where Lat. ã seems to be reflected by Gmc. *ã are actually borrowings from Vulgar Latin with pretonic shortening, e.g. OHG raith, reith ‘radish’ ← VLat. rãdîc- ← Lat. rãdix ‘root’. Two conclusions can be drawn: first, early Proto-Germanic *ã had been moved up the phonetic triangle towards *õ by the time of those loans, so that to the speakers of Germanic it was not a phonetic or phonological equivalent to Lat. ã. Secondly, loans from Latin helped establish *ã as a more or less marginal or even erstwhile loan phoneme in Germanic.

Nevertheless, a handful of words (partly transmitted in secondary sources, partly foreign loans into Germanic) have been cited as evidence for a relatively late date for the conjectured shift *ã > *õ during the Proto-Germanic period. In particular, it has been claimed that some of the evidence proves that the shift must have taken place after the first contacts of Germanic-speaking peoples with Rome, that is, in the 1st century B.C. or even as late as the 1st century A.D (see, for example, Ringe 2006: 145–146). In this article, this evidence will be reviewed

3 See also, for example, Tops 1973, Van Coetsem (1994: 76–81).
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and it will be argued that its chronological value is not as unambiguous as has been assumed hitherto.

1. The Gothic placename Ruma* (dat. sg. Rumai, Gal exp A) ‘Rome’ and the accompanying i-stem ethnonym Rumonelis* (dat. pl. Rumenim, Rom exp; 2 Tim 1, 17) ‘Romans’, together with Old High German Rūma ‘Rome’, rēmisk ‘Roman’, etc. (beside innovated Rōma, rōmisk, etc.), Old Norse Rūm, Rūmaborg ‘Rome’, etc. (beside innovated Rōm, Rōmaborg, etc.), and once Old English Rūmvalas* ‘the Romans’ (beside ordinary Rōm), allow us to set up a Proto-Germanic pair of toponym plus ethnonym *Rūmō ‘Rome’, *Rūmōnaz ‘Roman’ (the shift in stem-class of the ethnonym to the i-inflection in the plural is a specifically Gothic development, see Lühr 1985: 142–143, 147). The two names obviously go back to Latin Rōma, Rōmanus in some way. However, in them Lat. ō is represented by Gmc. *ū,# and Lat. ā by Gmc. *ō, very much unlike the regular substitute *ā mentioned above. This has been used as the prime piece of evidence for an early loan from Latin when the shift in Germanic had not yet taken place. It has been suggested that the names were borrowed at a time when *ā was still a closed, rounded sound in Germanic (perhaps approximately [vː]), but nevertheless suitable to represent Lat. ā, whereas the best approximation for Latin closed ō was to substitute it with Gmc. *ū. Thus *Rūmō would allow a rare glimpse at phonetic developments within the reconstructed Proto-Germanic period. This is the line of argument, for example, of Noreen (1894: 11–12), Streitberg (1896: 48–49), Jellinek (1926: 182–185), Schwarz (1951: 21–22), Corazza (1969: 39–40), Hollifield (1984: 65), Ringe (2006: 146).

This explanation is quite plausible and cannot be disproved on purely linguistic grounds. But there exists a less straightforward alternative to explain Gmc. *Rūmō ‘Rome’ and *Rūmōnaz, an alternative which nevertheless accounts better for the historical and political environment in which the borrowing took place in Iron-Age Central Europe. Gmc. *Rūmō, *Rūmōnaz could be loans from a Central-European Celtic language like Gaulish (Gaulish will be used here as a shorthand term for any Central-European Celtic language; such a source of *Rūmō was already suspected by Luft and Schwarz, according to Corazza 1969: 40;

# Lat. ō is regularly substituted by Gmc. *ū, e.g. OHG mūberi ‘mulberry’ ← Lat. mōras, OHG lūra ‘pomace’ ← lūrea, Middle Riparian ūr ‘hour’ ← hōra, and perhaps, with shortening, OHG wīnzuril ‘winemaker’ ← Lat. ūnitōr (Streitberg 1896: 48–49, Kluge 1913: 25).
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cf. also Öhmann 1919). The Gaulish exonyms for the city of Rome and for its citizens are not directly attested, but that such words must have existed is beyond doubt, and it is not unlikely that they were *Rūmā and *Rūmānos, themselves loans from the Latin words with adaptation to the Old-Celtic phonological system by substituting rounded high *ū for Latin closed ō. In Proto-Celtic, the pentadic long-vowel system *ī-ē-ā-ō-ū, inherited from post-PIE, had been first reduced to a triangular long-vowel system *ī-ā-ū (the question of possible remains of *ē are passed over here), a stage that still obtained in early Gaulish. The gap left by *ō had not yet been filled again at the time when Gauls and speakers of other Central-European Celtic languages were confronted with the rising Roman power in the second half of the 1st millennium B.C. The process of introducing a new ō into the system by the monophthongization of Proto-Celtic *ou < Pre-Celtic *eu, *ou and partly *uy happened only as late as the historical stages of the Celtic languages and is observable in the preserved linguistic material. A rare further instance of the Gaulish substitution of ō <ou> for Lat. ō is the feminine name Κούκαδροουνά (G-106) ← Roman gentilic Quadrónia (Stüber 2007: 6).

Alternatively, it is conceivable that there was an intermediary between Latin and Gaulish, for instance Etruscan *Ruma (cp. Etr. rumōx (Vc 7.33) ‘Roman, from Rome’, and the Etruscan gentilic names rumāte (Co 1.32), rumlnas (Vc 1.99), etc. < *rumeļe-na ← *rōmelo, Steinbauer 1999: 461), or Venetic *Ruma (cp. Ven. rumā.n.na (Es 49) and ruman (Es 50), which are perhaps to be derived from the etymon Rōma, see Pellegrini & Prodocimi 1967: 162–163; sceptical Untermann 1961: 164).

In any case, the names of the city of Rome and of its citizens in Gaulish, probably *Rūmā and *Rūmānos, are likely to have belonged to the earliest stratum of Latin loans into Gaulish. While there is no direct inscriptive evidence for them, the words may be indirectly reflected in names. A Roman-age titulus from St. Andrā im Lavanttal (near ancient Virunum, province of Noricum) contains the genitive Rumonis (CIL 3, 4966 = Ubi erat Lupa 1999),5 which may belong here. And the stem rum- recurs in the names of matronae in Germania Inferior: Matron(is)

---

5 The name of the contractor of the inscription is traditionally read as Auaro Rumonis (filius), but Weber (1973: 74; see also Diether Schirr in Ubi erat Lupa 1999) suggests that a letter may be missing at the beginning. It would then be possible to read it as the well-known Celtic name Cavauro = *kavaru. It is noteworthy that this same name is attested as kavaron.s. in the Venetic inscription Gt 4 from the Gurina in southern Carinthia, while the name *rūmā, which possibly underlies the spelling Rumonis, may be a loan from Venetic into Celtic (Pellegrini & Prodocimi 1967: 163).
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in the semantic fields of social institutions and organisation attest to the
close interrelationship between the two linguistic groups. At the same
time, borrowings occurring before the operation of Grimm’s Law like
Gmc. *ríkija ‘realm’ ← Celt. *rigijon virtually guarantee the early date
of Celtic-Germanic contacts, and borrowings unaffected by Grimm’s
Law like Gmc. *ambaxtaz ‘servant’ ← Celt. *ambœxtos attest to the
long persistance of the contacts.

In such a socio-political environment it would not be surprising to find
that the name of the Roman capital city had entered the Proto-Germanic
language via the transmission of speakers of Celtic, in a phonological
shape that can be postulated for an Old-Celtic language. The ordinary
traffic and exchange of people and information between the cultural
groups would have allowed the intrusion of the name into Germanic at
almost any time while the channels of communication were open. It is
most unlikely that the name of Rome had not been passed on to
Germanic by the time when the Cimbric-Teutonic expedition was
underway, an enterprise which had a notable Celtic component. In con-
sequence, Goth. *Rumoneis and the related words in younger Germanic
languages cannot be adduced as evidence for a relatively late shift of *ā
> *ō within the Common Germanic period, because this particular word
could have been borrowed from Celtic, not directly from Latin, very
early in history.

2. Goth. *siponeis ‘disciple’ (for Greek μαθητής) and the OHG hapax
seffu gl. satelles (AhdGl. II 444, 50; 11th century) have been suspected
to be loans from a Gaulish *sepänjos ‘follower’ (from the PIE root
šek ‘to follow’; e.g. Wissmann 1961, Delamarre 2003: 271; for a
survey of the research up to his time see Birkhan 1976 who himself
proposes a non-Celtic explanation). The relationship between these
words would exhibit the same correspondence between Gaul. *ā and
Gmc. *ō as the one postulated above for the word ‘Rome’. However, a
Celtic etymology faces the severe morphological obstacle that a suffix
*-āno- or *-ān(i)jo- is foreign to Celtic languages as we know them
(*-āno- in presumed *Rūmānos is of course a loan suffix). It is in
principle thinkable that there was an agent noun Gaul. *sepū, gen.
*seponos ‘follower’ < amphikinetik Pre-Celtic *sēkō(n) that could
underlie OHG seffu (for the inflectional type R(é)-ō(n), cp. the Gaul.
ethnonyms Rēdones < *rejō(n) ‘rider’, or Lingones < Pre-Celtic
arrive at a basis from which Goth. siponeis could be borrowed, a
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considerably larger amount of unprecedented morphological restructuring would be required. Without a certain etymology (see Lehmann 1986: 305–306 for alternative suggestions), this word does not qualify as an item relevant to the discussion about the chronology of the shift *ā > *ō in Germanic.

3. Another item that has been cited for an absolute dating of the inner-Germanic phonetic development is Bäcenis silua (presumably meaning ‘beech wood’), the name of a forest in Germania, reported by Julius Caesar in the Commentarii de Bello Gallico 6, 10, 5. This is an adjective *bōkeniz ‘beechen’ derived from an n-stem-derivative of the Gmc. root noun *bōk- ‘beech’ < PIE *bʰeh₂g- (see Neumann 1973: 572 and Griepentrog 1995: 60–77, esp. 70–71; sceptical, but non-committal Rübekeil 2002: 175–180). But this example is not probative either for the hypothesis that the shift from earlier *ā to directly reconstructable *ō had not yet taken place by the middle of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C., when the Romans encountered Germanic peoples habitating the Bäcenis silua. Again it is more likely from the entire political and historical environment in the first half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} c. B.C. that the name reached the Romans via Gaulish transmission (thus already Hirt 1898, see Neumann 1973: 572), i.e. in a Gaulicized phonetic guise with substitution of Gaul. *ā for Gmc. *ō. Again, the Gaulicization could have occurred much earlier than the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C. If at the time of the substitution the donor language Germanic had already arrived at its final reconstructable phonological system *f-ē-ō-ū, it is important to note that a different kind of substitution from the one in Lat. Rōma → Gaul. *Rūmā above has to be invoked here. Whereas for Latin closed [o:] Gaul. *ū seemed most appropriate as a substitute, for open Germanic [o:] Gaul. *ā offered the better phonetic approximation, even more so as in all likelihood it too was phonetically rounded, to judge from the further fate of Proto-Celtic *ā in the Insular-Celtic languages.

4. Possibly the same situation obtains in the next example, but the direction of borrowing is disputed. OE pl. brēc (sg. brōc), OHG proh, bruohe, ON brók, pl. brækrr, etc. (see Griepentrog 1995: 81–83) continue the Proto-Germanic feminine root noun *brōk-, pl. *brōkiz ‘breeches, short trousers’. Latin and Greek authors make reference to a similar word in Gaulish. Although the word is not attested in native Gaulish sources, it has been borrowed – with the object – into Latin as pl. brācae, beside rare brācēs ‘trousers’, repudiated by the grammarians.
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Bræcae is first attested between 116 and 110 B.C. in the works of the satirist C. Lucilius (ca. 180–103 B.C.), and frequently afterwards (see Kramer 1996: 119–120 for the attestations). Diódorus 5, 30, 1 (first half of 1st century B.C.), most likely drawing on Posidonius (beginning of 1st century B.C.), speaks of Gaulish βράκας (Greek acc. pl.); Hesychius (5th or 6th century A.D., but using older material) mentions Celtic βράκες · ἀναξιρίδες. The word also occurs as an ã-stem βράκαι6 and Greek papyri from Egypt attest to a derivative βρακίον7 (see Kramer 1996: 119–124 for references) that is continued as βρακί in the modern language. The Posidonian-Diodorian testimony βράκας is perhaps direct evidence for the word in Gaulish; as is well known, Posidonius spent some time in the Narbonensis. The form is ambiguous as to the word’s original stem class in Gaulish: Gaul. *βράκας could be the acc. pl. both of an ã-stem (< Pre-Celt. *-âns) and of a consonant stem (< Pre-Celt. *-qâ). In the latter case, the word would be a root noun in Gaulish. The Latin evidence points in the same direction. The rare pl. brâcês could continue a Gaulish consonant stem inflection, and bræcae could be due to ‘feminine thematization’, the starting point for which would be precisely the Gaul. acc. pl. This double treatment finds a parallel in the Gaul. compound root noun *druid- ‘druid’, which appears in Latin on the one hand as a consonant stem pl. druidës, druidum, and on the other hand as druidæ, druidârum, having undergone ‘feminine thematization’ on the basis of the Gaul. acc. pl. *druidâs. Still, on the basis of the evidence in classical literature two different stem classes cannot be excluded for Gaulish, even though the root noun is more likely.

Since an ‘Urverwandtschaft’ of Gmc. *brâk- and Gaul. *brâk- is excluded, the question arises which of the languages borrowed from the other (the third logical alternative that both languages borrowed from a third, unknown party is not pursued here). No consensus has been reached as to the diachronic analysis of the word. While some scholars favour a Germanic origin, others speak out in favour of Celtic/Gaulish. Since the matter is not essential to the main argument of this article, I

6 The gloss βράκαι · α’γγαι διφθέραι παρά Κελτοξ, frequently ascribed to Hesychius in the scholarship, must be a phantom.

7 Kramer (1996: 123–124) mentions also a by-form βρακίον, first attested between 317 and 324 A.D., the e of which he ascribes to the effects of Germanic i-umlaut. Such an early date, however, would be quite remarkable for Germanic i-umlaut. Krahe & Meid (1969: 59) speak of a date several centuries later for the first occurrences of its effects. In Old High German, *a before weakly stressed *i starts to be written <e>, <e>, <e> around 800; for Old English and Old Norse, a date one or two centuries earlier is usually assumed.
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just want to sketch the main points in the discussion and refer to Griepentrog (1995: 79–90, esp. 85–89) for the details: 1. Gmc. *brôk-, which beside ‘short trousers’ has also the meaning ‘tail-bone’, has been compared with Lat. suffrãgô8 ‘hinder part of four-footed animals’, and both words have been referred to the PIE root ʰbʰregʰ ‘to break (intr.)’ (LIV 91). However, the relationship of the two words to the root is not particularly striking on the semantic side, and the long vowels of the nominal forms have been said to be morphologically obscure (but see fn. 9 below). 2. It is undecided whether ‘tail-bone’ is the primary meaning of Gmc. *brôk-, or whether it has been secondarily transferred from ‘trousers’. 3. Not even a distantly acceptable Celtic etymology has been proposed for Gaul. *brâk- thus far. Szemerényi’s (1989: 117–118, 122) attempt to etymologize the word within Gaulish from *brâgikâ (in its turn related to Lat. suffrãgô) via syncope of the middle vowel is ad hoc and without parallel. 4. Outside Gaulish the word lacks continuants elsewhere in Celtic. Related words in Insular-Celtic are late loans from Latin or medieval Germanic languages.

Because of the objections raised under nrs. 1. and 2., Griepentrog (1995: 85–89) emphatically rejects a Germanic etymology for *brôk- and dismisses possible connections with suffrãgô by arbitrarily redefining the meaning of the PIE root ʰbʰregʰ as ‘to bow’. He apodically assigns the breech-word to Gaulish, but does not offer even the slightest clue to an etymology and does not comment on the conspicuous absence of the word elsewhere in Celtic. All of this does not help to instil confidence in Griepentrog’s position, rendering it rather unconvincing and inconclusive. Although it must be conceded that the connections of *brôk- to suffrãgô and its further root etymologies are far from certain, I still consider a weak Germanic etymology better than an isolated one in Gaulish. But I explicitly state that this is a provisional opinion in a matter which has not yet been finally decided.9

8 The relationship of suffrãgô to Lat. suffrãgium ‘vote, voting’ is an additional problem. Since I do not assume that the two words necessarily be related I do not enter into the discussion (differently Vaaltera 1993).

9 I want to sketch three conceivable explanations of the words:

1. Derivation from ʰbʰregʰ ‘to break (intr.)’: In view of Ofr. braïgid ‘to fart’, which is cautiously referred to this root in LIV 91 (but see below), it could be postulated that in Germanic, too, the root possessed the meaning ‘to fart’ in addition to its primary semantics. In that case, an agentive root noun *bʳôg٪s > Gmc. *brôk ‘farter’ could be postulated. For the long vowel of this formation, cp. other agentive root nouns like Gr. κλωύ ‘thief’, Lat. fār ‘far’, uōx ‘voice’, etc. In a further semantic step, the word ‘farter’ must then have been transferred to the ‘buttocks’ and finally to the ‘tail-bone’.
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In any case, no matter whether Germanic or Gaulish is the place of the word’s origin, what *brôkiz and *brâkes demonstrate is that there exists among them the same equivalence between Gmc. *ō and Gaul. *ā as in the examples discussed before.

5. In the certain examples discussed so far possibly three or more linguistic links are involved in complex chains of transmission: 1. *Rūmò: Latin (→ Etruscan/Venetic) → Gaulish → Germanic; 3. Bâcenis: Germanic → Gaulish → Latin; 4. brâcæ: Germanic → Gaulish → Latin (?). The next example is limited to only two. The name of the river Danube was *Dânuojos in Gaulish (the basis of the following are Schmid 1986 and Schumacher 2007: 181–182). Apart from the name of the river Donwy in North Wales, identical in formation to *Dânuojos, the name of the river is tangible for us only through Latin transmission, i.e. Dânuuius and Dânubius, and through Greek Δανούιος and Δανούιος, which itself is a loan from Latin. The b of the Latin spelling Dânubius is most probably simply orthographic for [β], [v] or [w], i.e. for the Latin sound that substituted Gaul. *y. Whether *Dânuojos is an original formation in Celtic or continues something earlier, for example an Old-European rivename *Dâneyjos or an Iranian *dânu-, is irrelevant here. From Gaulish, Gmc. *Dônawjaz must have been borrowed. Gaul. *d is represented by Gmc. *d, which

From there, it would have been carried over metonymically to the piece of clothing that covered that body-part. This, in its turn, was subsequently borrowed into Celtic. Apart from the chain of semantic shifts, which notwithstanding its many stages involves no controversial steps as such, the main problem with this explanation is that the meaning ‘to fart’ is not attested for vb’reHg/g in Germanic.

2. Derivation from vb’reHg’g ‘to smell (intr.)’: It is better to refer Ofr. braigid ‘to fart’ to a root vb’reHg/g ‘to smell (intr.)’ (not recorded in LIV; cp. Schrijver 1995: 170–171, Stüber 1998: 62, Schumacher 2004: 232–233). From this could then be derived Gmc. *brôk ‘tail-bone’ < root noun *b’reHg/gs or *b’rōHg/gs, and Lat. suﬀrahô ‘hinder part of four-footed animals’ < *b’rHg/gen-, unless an agentic root noun *br’EHg/gs ‘tail-bone < *farter’ existed already in the proto-language. The further development of *brôk within Germanic and the loan into Celtic would be parallel to that outlined in the preceding section.

3. Derivation from vb्राइ(क) ‘to lock in, constrict’: Finally, just for the fun of it, Celt. *brāk- could be explained as a root noun with lengthened grade generalized from the Pre-Celt. nominative *brāık/s, derived from the root vbraik ‘to lock in, constrict’ (not recorded in LIV) that appears also as vb’rank with ‘prenasalization’ in Gmc. *prangao ‘narrowing, tightness’ and in Lith. brai(kt)as ‘part of harness for a horse’, Latv. brankti ‘adjacent’ (EIW 103, Lehmann 1986: 32). ‘Prenasalization’ is one of the features that have been claimed for a particular stratum of loanwords from an unknown source in northwestern IE languages (see Kuiper 1995: 68–69). Pre-Celtic *brāık/s would thus be the ‘tights’. In this case, Celtic would be the donor, Germanic the borrower. But this is strict speculation.
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demonstrates that the loan took place after the operation of Grimm’s Law. In the vowels we find the expected phoneme correspondences Gaul. *ā → Gmc. *ō, and *o → *a. For Gothic, the Germanic form is attested as Δούναβι (acc.) in a Greek text of the 6th century A.D. (Pseudo-Caesarius of Nazianzus 1, 68; 3, 144), a spelling that presumably reflects a very closed, high articulation of *ō that was substituted by Gr. ă, or (Ostro-)Gothic raising of *ō > ă. In Old High German, the name surfaces as fem. Tuonouwa. The suffix has been remodelled after Germanic *awjō ‘island, river meadow’, so that no strict substitution rules can be set up between the rear portions of the two words.

A three-link chain of loans (Gaulish → ↑Latin → Germanic), i.e. via intermediary Latin Dānbīus, is excluded by the first syllable of Tuonouwa. Whereas the rest of the sound correspondences would be essentially unproblematic (but in view of the folk etymology that operated on the suffix an exact phonological equivalence must not be expected in the first place), loans from Latin into Germanic never substitute *ō (< *ā) for Lat. ā (Kluge 1913: 128; the apparent case of *Rūmō for Lat. Rōmā has been disposed of above). For all that is known, when Germanic people started to encounter Romans at the Danube on a regular basis, approximately in the Augustan period, Germanic or its dialects represented Lat. ā by the new marginal phoneme ă. Unlike with Gaulish, with Latin there existed no established pattern of substituting Gmc. *ō for ā. Furthermore, the name of the Danube is likely to have entered Germanic much earlier than the Augustan period. Those peoples and tribes that made incursions into the south in the 2nd century B.C. naturally had to cross the river. For the first half of the 1st century B.C., in the archaeological phase Latène D2a (85–45 B.C.), archaeology has unearthed Germanic settlements in the foothills of the Alps in southeastern Bavaria (Rieckhoff 1993; 2007: esp. 418–420, 423–427), that is seven decades before a Roman military presence was established in the region. And apparently by the middle of the 1st century B.C. at the latest, Germanic (Marcomannic?) and Celtic (Boian) elements started to blend in the area immediately to the north of the Danube in modern Austria, as displayed by Germanic names (Aínorix, Biatec[, Fariarix) in an otherwise Celtic environment on 1st century B.C. coins of the Boii (Birkhan 1971 and Birkhan in Göbl 1994: 69–71, 73–74). In any case, as

10 This early presence of Germanic people along the Danube, north of the Alps is of great relevance for the question of the origins of the Runic script. The chronological and spatial gap between the Germanic peoples and the various North Italic alphabets that
with *Rūmō above, it is most economic to assume that Germanic peoples first learned the name of the river Danube from their immediate Celtic neighbours, not from more distant parties.

In conclusion it can be said that none of the pieces of loanword evidence assembled above suffices to prove a particularly late date (say, for instance, 1st century A.D.) for the inner-Germanic shift from early Proto-Germanic *ā > *ō. What is more, for none of the words that were borrowed into Germanic can it be shown that they must have entered Germanic through direct contacts with Romans. Instead, all of the relevant examples (i.e. *Rūmō, *Rūmōnaz, *Dōnawjaz) most probably were transmitted by speakers of Gaulish or a related Central-European Celtic language. Likewise, all those words that were ultimately exported from Germanic into Latin (i.e. Bācenis silua, perhaps brācēs, -ae) are likely to have been transmitted by Celts. Therefore the primary pertinent question is the one regarding the relationship between Gaulish and Germanic, a relationship that has all appearances of having been extremely close and intertwined across the Celtic-Germanic contact zone in western Central Europe during the greater part of the 1st millenium B.C. What there may have existed across this contact zone is a state of bilingualism with an intuitive linguistic awareness of the properties of the other group’s phonological system. As long as this particular historical situation persisted there may have operated a rule of automatic phoneme substitution between Gaul. *ā and Gmc. *ō (or *ā, for that matter) when one lexical item was transferred from one language to the other. In more abstract terms it can be stated that there existed a bidirectional equivalence between Gaul. *ā and Gmc. *ō (represented by the symbol ↔ below), as against unidirectional equivalences like postulated early Gaul. *ū ↔ Lat. ō (against, presumably, Gaul. *ū → Lat. ē). If that was the case, the basis for establishing a chronology of loanwords containing those respective sounds becomes very thin. Only if it could be shown that there were Gaulish loanwords in Germanic that represented Gaul. *ā by the new Gmc. *ā, or Germanic loanwords in Gaulish with new Gaul. *ō for Gmc. *ō it could be said with certainty that the bidirectional equivalence had ended. If pressed hard, with Germ. *ō and Gaul. *ā being the only non-high back long vowels available, the previously discussed material does not even yield evidence that

may be regarded as the models for the Runic script is constantly shrinking (see, for example, the new identifications of specimens of Venetic and – perhaps – Raetic script in the south of Austria edited in Stifter 2010).
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there ever was a shift of *ā > *ō in Proto-Germanic. Evidence for an original stage *ā in early Proto-Germanic must be sought elsewhere.

The foregoing discussion now permits to set up the following provisional chronology of loans and substitution rules:
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