



**LACUS
FORUM
XXX**

*Language, Thought
and Reality*



University
of Victoria

YOUR RIGHTS

This electronic copy is provided free of charge with no implied warranty. It is made available to you under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial license version 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>)

Under this license you are free:

- **to Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **to Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- **Noncommercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

With the understanding that:

- **Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.
- **Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:
 - Your fair dealing or fair use rights;
 - The author's moral rights;
 - Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as publicity or privacy rights.

Notice: For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to the web page cited above.

For inquiries concerning commercial use of this work, please visit
<http://www.lacus.org/volumes/republication>

Cover: The front cover of this document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>) and may not be altered in any fashion. The LACUS “lakes” logo and University of Victoria logo on the cover are trademarks of LACUS and the University of Victoria respectively. The University of Victoria logo is used here with permission from the trademark holder. No license for use of these trademarks outside of redistribution of this exact file is granted. These trademarks may not be included in any adaptation of this work.



PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS



ON GOTHIC GAHLAIBA AND LATIN COMPANION:
AN EXCURSUS IN HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS METHODOLOGY

Angela Della Volpe
California State University, Fullerton

The following was conceived in appreciation and homage to my friends and colleagues at LACUS who warmly befriended me, sixteen years ago, when I first joined the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States. Through the years, I have benefited in large measure from their intellectual companionship and support. I, therefore, found it apt as an historical linguist to re-examine the etymology of the Late Latin term *companion*.

THIS PAPER REPRESENTS AN EXCURSUS in Comparative Historical Linguistics methodology. It endeavors to explore what we do, when we try to ascertain the most probable etymology of a word; how we do it; and what, if anything, do we get out of it. Accordingly, while not intending to introduce a new and definite solution to an etymological problem—though in the end the data may point towards some resolution—this essay, by the use of a case study, will strive to illustrate the formalization process that has ensued from advances made in the area of borrowing by the Historical and Comparative method, during the twentieth century.

To introduce the problem, classic scholarship provides a rather unsolvable puzzle when it comes to the etymological analysis of the word *companion*. Among scholars, half assume that the Latin term is actually a semantic loan derived from Goth. *gahlaiba* while the other half assume the reverse, suggesting that the direction of the *calque* is, in fact, from Vulgar Latin into Gothic. Linguistically, both *companion* and *gahlaiba* could fit the definition of loan translation. And in fact, the historical situation in Western Europe during the earliest centuries of the first millennium AD (Heather 1969) was conducive to large numbers of loans or borrowings¹ both from Germanic into Late Latin and from Late Latin into Germanic. In such cases, the Comparative Historical method, whose preliminary aim is to ferret out loanwords from legitimate cognates, offers some guidance.

In general, it is possible to get an idea of the direction of a borrowing by determining whether the phonological patterns of the presupposed borrowing language have been violated—a word like *Mbakara*² for instance, violates English phonotactic constraints and is accordingly marked as a loanword in English. Hence, the analysis of phonological constraints, concurrently with the investigation of the historical phonology of both the donor and the recipient languages, affords an extremely valuable tool in discovering the direction of a borrowing. A second criterion used in this area

relies on the determination of the morphological complexity of the word under investigation. The language which shows a more complex morphology is usually marked as the source of the borrowing. A commonly cited example is the English word *vinegar* which was borrowed from French *vinaigre*, compound of *vin* 'wine' + *aigre* 'sour'. Lastly, the donor language is assumed to be the one with the most cognates (L. Campbell 1999:64–69). Along with such investigative linguistic devices, scholars avail themselves of additional evidence such as those preserved in the historical and cultural records.

Thus, taking into account the above listed criteria for its theoretical framework while also considering the historical and cultural contexts, this essay will investigate the etymology of the term *companion*. This exploration will be divided into three parts. The first part will survey the origin of the Gothic term *gahlaiba* whereas the second will look at the origin of VL **companion*. The third and final part will offer some suggestions in light of the historical-cultural context and historical linguistic methodology.

1. THE SCHOLARSHIP OF GOTHIC GAHLAIBA. The sole evidence presented by those scholars who maintain the view of an original Gothic coining borrowed into Latin is that the first attestation of the Gothic compound *gahlaiba*, literally 'co-breader', comes from the Gothic Bible which is ascribed to Wulfila or Ulphilas (b. 311 d. 380 or 381)³ and dates from the 4th century AD. Feist (1939:183) states that *gahlaiba* derives from an unattested **gahlaifs*, and gives its meaning as '*der das Brot mit jemandem gemainsam hat*', in other words, 'he who has bread in common with someone'. Feist then adds that this is a loanword from VL **cumpanio* from Lat. *pānis* 'bread', OF. *compain*, Fr. *compagnon* but that it is possible that the Latin term is a calque fashioned after the Germanic compound and cites Meyer-Lübke (1935:2093) in support.

Lehmann (1986:139) reports that while Velten (1930:345) also regards Goth. *gahlaiba*, OHG *ga-leipo*, as a calque from the Vulgar Latin military term **companion*, on the other hand, Meillet (1966:266–78), Scardigli (1964:188–89, 283–84), and Meyer-Lübke (1935:2093) among others, prefer to assume that the Vulgar Latin term was based on Goth. *gahlaiba*. Indeed, Meillet (1966:277–78) states that 'la formation de *companion* calque celle de got. *gahaiba* "qui partage le pain avec": il y a là un terme militaire, venant de pratiques militaires.' He also points out that 'la notion de *companion* se retrouve dans le nom arménien *ənker* "compagnon", littéralement "qui mange avec."

Scardigli (1964:188–220) concedes that there are many calques from Greek and Latin into Gothic and reasons that many of the semantic translations created by Wulfila suggest both bilingualism and biculturalism among the Goths. Were it otherwise, the referents of those calques would not have been readily understood by his intended audience. Scardigli further notes that, among the attestations of *gahlaiba*, there are some inconsistencies. For instance, in the Naples document, we find both *gahlaibim*, which is a theme in *-i-*, and *gahlaibaim*, which suggests a strong adjective with a theme in *-a-*. Both of these terms, however, should belong to the declension

in *-n-* as compounds with *ga-* generally do. Scardigli believes that Wulfila probably created the term, and that the Goths took it with them into Italy (Scardigli 1964:220).

Meyer-Lübke (1935:2093) flatly affirms, under a reconstructed **companion -ōne* ‘Genosse’, that the Latin term is a formation patterned after Germanic *gahlaiba* and gives its cognates in Romance languages; thus Italian *compagno*, Old French *compain*, *compagnon*, Provençal *companh*, *companhó*, Catalan *company*, *companyó*, Spanish *compañero*. Meyer-Lübke lists as derivatives It. *compagnia*, Fr. *compagnie*, Prov. *companhia*, Sp. *compañía*, Port. *companhia* ‘Gesellschaft’. Moreover, in the entry preceding that of *companion*, 2092a, he provides another postulated form: **companicum* ‘Naturalverpflegung’ (provisions) which supposedly gives Salamanca *compango*. In fact, the term *compango* in Asturian refers to a meat dish accompanied by beans and not by bread (Ferreiro, Manzano, Rodríguez 1995: 130).

Lastly, in a two-part study on Gothic borrowings, Velten (1930:335) finds that there are about 400 calques or loan translations⁴, in Gothic, modeled after Greek and Latin compounds compared to a mere 116 loanwords from these two languages (Velten 1930:332). Among these semantic loans, Velten lists the term *gahlaiba* which calques Gr. *σοστρατιώτης* and Lat. *commilito*: ‘*gahlaiba* = Vulgar Latin **cumpanio*, French *compagnon* “one who eats from the same loaf” from *panis*’ (Velten 1930:35). Velten then suggests that *gahlaiba* renders a military term that belonged to the colloquial speech of the Roman legions with which the Goths were well acquainted in Wulfila’s time (Velten 1930:36).

In summary, a more in depth review of the scholarship still leaves us at an impasse in so far as either term could be a calque of the other and no evidence has been adduced to resolve the issue.

2. GOTHIC ATTESTATION OF THE TERM *GAHLAIBA*. As loan translations and semantic loans are notoriously difficult to recognize as such, and because the available scholarship has thus far not been very revealing of the origins of the aforementioned terms, following the investigative process of historical linguistics methodology, we will begin anew by analyzing the earliest attestations of the Gothic term. Perhaps this approach will help us solve the conundrum before us. The Gothic attestations of the term *gahlaiba* are as follows:

- (1) John 11:16:
 Goth. þanuh qaþ þomas saei haitada Didimus þaim *gahlaibam* seinaim:
 gaggam jah weis, ei gaswiltaima miþ imma⁵. [CA]⁶
 Eng. Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, to his **companions** (disciples), “Let us go and die with him.”
 Lat. dixit ergo Thomas qui dicitur Didymus ad **condiscipulos** eamus et nos ut moriamur cum eo⁷.
 Greek εἶπεν οὖν Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος τοῖς **συνμαθηταῖς**, Ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ⁸.

(2) Philippians 2:25

Goth. aþþan þarb munda, Aipafraudeitu broþar jah gawaurstwan jah **gahlaiban** meinana, iþ izw<ar>ana apaustulu jah andbaht þaurftais meinaizos sandjan du izwis; [B]

Eng. But I think it necessary to send Epaphroditus, my brother and co-worker and **companion** (fellow soldier), but your apostle and minister to my need, to you.

Lat. necessarium autem existimavi Epafroditum fratrem et cooperatorem et **commilitonem** meum vestrum autem apostolum et ministrum necessitatis meae mittere ad vos.

Greek Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμην Ἐπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ **συστρατιώτην** μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς

Our investigation reveals that *gahlaiba* appears as a substantivized adjectival form both in *John* 11:16, where we have the dat. pl. m. form *gahlaibam*, and in *Philippians* 2:25 where we have the acc. sing. m. form *gahlaiban*. In the Naples Deed, a document so called because housed at the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples, this contract, written on papyrus circa 551 AD during the Ostrogothic Empire, and originated by the clerics of the Gothic Arian church of Santa Anastasia in Ravenna, shows four signatures affixed at the bottom of the document. These signatures are meant to attest to a transaction between the church and a certain Peter Defensor. Within the signatures, there are four forms of Goth. *gahlaiba* in the dat. pl. m.; three written *gahlaibaim* and one written *gahlaibim*. The latter could be a scribal error rather than a theme in *-i-* (Scardigli 1964:187). Worthy of note is that the Clerics of Santa Anastasia in Ravenna are the ones who produced the Codex Argenteus (Heather 1996: 315). Thus:

- (3) Ik Ufitahari papa ufm<el>ida handau meinai jah andnenum skilliggans ·j· jah faurþis þairh kawtsjon miþ diakuna Alamoda unsaramma jah miþ **gahlaibaim** unsaraim andnenum skilliggans ·rk· wairþ þize saiwe.
- (4) Ik Sunjaifriþas diakon handau meinai ufmelida jah andnenum skilliggans ·j· jah faurþis þairh kawtsjon jah miþ diakona Alamoda unsaramma jah miþ **gahlaibaim** unsaraim andnenum skilliggans ·rk· wairþ þize saiwe.
- (5) Ik Merila bokareis handau meinai ufmelida jah andnenum skilliggans ·j· jah faurþis þairh kawtsjon jah miþ diakuna Alamoda unsaramma jah miþ **gahlaibim** unsaraim andnenum skilliggans ·r·k· wairþ þize saiwe.
- (6) Ik Wiljariþ bokareis handau meinai ufmelida jah andnenum skilliggans ·j· jah faurþis þairh kawtsjon jah miþ diakona Alamoda unsaramma jah miþ **gahlaibaim** unsaraim andnenum skilig<g>ans ·r·k· wairþ <þ>ize saiwe.

3. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF *GA-HLAIBA*. According to the available data, then, there seems to be one form with weak endings, as evidenced by the dat. pl. m. *gahlaibam*, which suggests the reconstruction of a nominative **gahlaiba*, and another

form with strong endings evidenced by *gahlaibaim* and which suggests the reconstruction of a nominative **gahlaifs*. The latter, however, does not conform to the *-n*-stem declension as expected in compounds with *ga-*. Finally, there is also a theme in *-i-* (Scardigli 1964:188). Though we are left to wonder about these alternations, both between themes and between weak and strong endings, from a word formation viewpoint, we can still identify *gahlaiba* as a bahuvrīhi compound composed of a prefix *ga-* and possibly belonging to a declension in *-an* (Von Grienberger 1900:84). The prefix *ga-* was rather productive in this function and a number of such compounds exist in Gothic. Originally a preposition which had the meaning of ‘together’, ‘with’, already in primitive Germanic, it was no longer used as an independent preposition but as a prefix for coining collective nouns, or more often, as an intensive, for example, in *ga-baurþs*, ‘birth’, *ga-bruka* ‘fragment’, *ga-juk*, ‘a pair’ *ga-man* ‘fellow man’, *ga-waurstwa* ‘fellow worker’ (Wright 1968:172–73; Braune 1920:110–111). In compounds, this verbal and/or nominal prefix was characterized by a weak accent and exhibited not only the meaning of ‘with’ but also of ‘together with’ as in OE *ge-*, *gi-*, OFris *ge-*, *ie-*, *e-*, *i-*, OHG *ga-*, *gi-*⁹. Thus, a word like *ga-hlaiba* would have the meaning of ‘he who has bread with (others?)’. Gothic shows an abundance of bahuvrīhi compounds. This type of word formation may exhibit, as the first member of its compound, either a noun, *aihva-tundi* ‘having horse-like teeth’; an adjective, *alja-kuns* ‘having other kin, stranger’; an adverb, *swa-leiks* ‘having such appearance’; a pronoun, *hvi-leiks* ‘having appearance like’; or as in our case, a prefix such as *ga-* ‘having X with’ or ‘having X in common’ (Dolcetti Corazza 1997).

Among the Gothic bahuvrīhi compounds formed with the *ga-* prefix are the following: *ga-juka* < *juk* ‘yoke’, ‘having a yoke in common, mate’, found only in the accusative plural *ga-jukans* (2 Corinthians 6:14)—*ga-juko*, f. ‘Genossin’ (Philippians 4:3)—assumed to be a calque from Gr. Παραβολή (Velten 1930:339); *ga-sinþa* ‘having travel in common, companion’, dative plural *gasinþam* (2 Corinthians 8:19); *ga-sinþja* ‘traveling company’ most probably in the sense of roaming expedition; *ga-waurstwa* ‘having work in common, fellow worker’ (2 Corinthians 8:23)¹⁰; *ga-daila* < *dails*, ‘part’, ‘having a part in common, partner’; *ga-dauka*, < **dauks* ‘house’, ‘having a house in common, house mate’, *ga-leika* < *leik*, ‘form, body’, ‘having a form (countenance) in common’. These compounds seem to use the verb ‘to have’ as their verbal predicate and to be characterized by a nasal suffix in *-an*. Moreover, in these bahuvrīhi compounds, the prefix *ga-* seems to denote parity in the possession of the quality or objects described (Ramat 1976:65–76).

4. THE SEMANTICS OF *GAHLAIBA*. Analyzing the semantics of *gahlaiba* reveals two problems. The first relates to the meaning of the prefix. The semantic rendition of *ga-* as ‘common’ and thus of translating *gahlaiba* as ‘having common bread’ has occupied several scholars. Among them is Giacalone Ramat (1976:65–76) who has analyzed the meaning of *ga-* in this particular compound and has concluded that therein, the prefix *ga-* retains the nuance *not* of ‘with’ or ‘together’, but of ‘common’. Yet, the interpretation of *gahlaiba* as ‘having common bread’ or even as ‘having bread in common’

raises the question of how. One can have a ‘common yoke,’ one can have a ‘common way,’ one can even have a ‘common form (countenance),’ but how does one have ‘common bread?’ Bread is consumed; it is not held or had in common. In which case, we must infer that, in this particular case, the prefix *ga-* may just have the meaning of ‘together or together with’ rather than denoting the meaning of ‘common.’ Unfortunately, there is little contextual evidence upon which to base the choice of one meaning over the other.

The second semantic problem arises with the notion of military obligation. Meillet, Velten and others (see above) assume that the meaning of companionship and of sharing bread in Goth. *gahlaiþa* entails a military nuance. The evidence, however contradicts this inference. There were other terms in Gothic which Wulfila could have used to render the notion of brothers-in-arms. Two of them come readily to mind: *ga-drauhts* (Matthew 8:9; John 19:2; Luke 7:8; 2 Timothy 2:3) and *ga-sinþa* (2 Corinthians 8:19)¹¹, both of which occur elsewhere in the Gothic Bible:

- (7) 2 Timothy 2:3 [B] - *gadrauhts* ‘soldier’:
Goth. þu nu arbaidei swe gods *gadrauhts* Xristaus Iesus.
Eng. endure, therefore, hardship like a good *soldier* of Christ Jesus.
Lat. labora sicut bonus *miles* Christi Iesu.
Greek συγκακοπάθησον ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
- (8) 2 Corinthians 8:19 [B] – *gasinþa* ‘travelling companion’:
Goth. aþþan ni þat~ain, ak jah gatewiþs fram aikklesjom miþ *gasinþam*¹²
 uns miþ anstai þizai andbahtidon fram uns du frauþins wulþau jah
 gairnein unsarai.
Eng. and not only, but he was chosen by the churches to travel with us
 with this grace which is administered by us to the glory of the Lord
 himself and to show our eagerness to help.
Lat. non solum autem sed et ordinatus ab ecclesiis comes *peregrinationis*
 nostrae in hac gratia quae ministratur a nobis ad Domini gloriam et
 destinatum voluntatem nostrum.
Greek οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν
συνέκδημος ἡμῶν σὺν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονουμένη ὑφ’ ἡμῶν
 πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου δόξαν καὶ προθυμίαν ἡμῶν

5. DIGEST. Thus far, the only factor supporting the theory that *ga-hlaiba* was a semantic borrowing is the undisputed evidence that Wulfila was clearly fluent in both Greek and in Latin and that given the morphology of OF. *complain*, (Prov. *comparing*) there may have been a Latin form *cum-panio* of which there is no attested evidence. Unquestionably, the Gothic translation of the New Testament shows many Grecisms in both morphology and syntax (Bennett 1980:127), although Latinisms are also evident, particularly with regards to the creation of bahuvrīhi compounds. Some such examples are: Goth. *hardu-hairts*, which appears to be a calque from Gr. *σκληροκαρδία*; Goth. *arma-hairts*, which is clearly a calque of Lat. *miseri-cors*; Goth. *ga-daila*,

obviously from Lat. *con-particeps*; and according to Velten, Goth. *ga-hlaiba* from Lat. *com-pan-io*. (Velten 1930:339–45).

Once again, our excursus informs us that the scholarship has been unable to determine whether or not the term *gahlaiba* was an original Gothic coining. Analyzing the attestations of the term, both in the Bible and in the Naples Deed, does not shed any further light on the matter. Certainly, the quest for violations of phonotactic constraints or morphological complexity remains open notwithstanding the peculiarities of the Gothic compound, both on the morphological and semantic level. Consequently, availing ourselves of the last device mentioned in the introduction of this paper, in order to ascertain the direction of borrowing, we now look for cognates in related Germanic languages. The following terms can be found: OE *gædeling* (-as) m., ‘companion, comes’; *gefara* (-n) m., ‘companion, associate, *socius*, *contubernālis*, comes, *condiscipulos*’; OHG *giferto*, *gefarto*, from *fart* ‘journey’; *gehlaeða* (-n) m., ‘companion, comrade, *socius*’; *gemæcca* (-n) m., ‘companion, consort’; OHG *gimahho*, from *gimah* ‘fit, match’; *gesið* m., ‘companion, follower of chief or king, *socius*, comes’; OHG *gasint*, *gisindo*; ON *sinni* ‘fellowship’ (Buck 1949:1346–47). The only direct cognate with Gothic *gahlaiba* seems to be OHG *ga-leipo* (Lehmann 1986:139). Historical records, however, inform us that the OHG territory was invaded by the Visigoths during the 4th century AD (Heather 1996: 250–58) and they undoubtedly brought the word with them. This information casts doubt on the validity of OHG *ga-leipo* as a cognate. On the other hand, there are several forms with the *ga-* prefix as well as many cognatic forms for the word *hleib-*, OE *hlāf*, ‘leavened bread made with wheat flour’ but we shall return to this point below.

In search of evidence for the relevant linguistic contact between Gothic and Late Latin speakers, and thus for a context for the borrowing from Latin, we now turn to historical information as it relates to Gothic history and texts.

6. HISTORICAL EVIDENCE: THE GOTHs. Germanic soldiers had infiltrated the Roman army since the first century AD. During the 3rd century, many Germanic tribes were invited to settle on vacant lands of the empire. By the 4th century, in the west, the bulk of the Roman army and its generals were Germanic (B. Campbell 1999:218). In the east, the Visigoths obtained permission to settle as allies inside the Roman Empire and in 376 AD settled in the area west of the Danube (Modern Bulgaria). After Theodosius I had died, the Visigoths, under the leadership of Alaric, invaded Italy and sacked Rome in 410 AD. Then, two years later, in 412 AD, guided by Athaulf, they crossed the Italian Alps, entered Southern Gaul, where they joined a confederacy of Burgundians and Alans, and established the kingdom of Toulouse in 418 AD¹³. In turn, the Ostrogoths, under the command of Theodoric, entered Italy in 493 AD, seized Ravenna, made it their capital, and founded the great Ostrogothic Empire which lasted till 554 AD (Heather: 1996:216–58)¹⁴.

Our knowledge of Gothic, the earliest attested Germanic language, is derived primarily from the surviving manuscripts of a Bible translation made in the 4th century by the Visigothic bishop Wulfila¹⁵. The surviving manuscripts, however, are not

originals but much later copies believed to have been transcribed in northern Italy during the period of Ostrogothic rule, around the first half of the 6th century AD (Bennett 1980:226–27)¹⁶. As a consequence of constant raids and of the establishment of the Ostrogothic Empire, plenty of linguistic and cultural contact existed between the two groups. At this point, it is entirely possible that the Gothic term formed the basis for the Latin word ‘companion,’ except for the fact that Goths followed the Arian Creed while the Italians followed Papal Rome. There was enmity between the two people making the situation not conducive to borrowing a word which indicates social and/or religious kinship. To the Italians of the time, the Goths represented an alien culture and religion. Relevant, at this point, though, is a characteristic of Germanic social structure.

7. THE GERMAN *COMITATUS*. The Germanic tribes, nomadic by nature, had developed the practice of *comitatus*. According to Tacitus (*Germania* 13–14) young men attached themselves to a chief and became his associates and followers. Tacitus calls this type of follower a *comes* (*com* + *eo*) ‘companion,’ literally, ‘one who goes with another.’ Reportedly, a *comes* was an ornament for the leader in time of peace and a means of defense in times of war. In fact, chiefs achieved prominence based on the number of followers that they could gather around themselves. In return, these chiefs provided their followers with shares of booty, feasts, and entertainment aplenty. This state of affairs is celebrated in the Germanic literature from *Beowulf*, to the *Nibelungenlied*, to the Icelandic Sagas (Lindow 1976). This *comitatus*, a ‘company, escort, retinue,’ as Tacitus refers to the troop of faithful armed followers, as a rule, ate and drank and even slept together in the great hall. The practice of surrounding oneself with a *comitatus* was retained by the Germanic tribes even when Romanized, for, in the late Roman Empire, they encountered the same practice¹⁷. Indeed, not only did the emperor have his own praetorian guard (B. Campbell 1999:219), but in addition, there was scarcely a member of the Roman aristocracy who was without his own private body guards (Bloch 1961:155).¹⁸

8. SUMMARY. To conclude the first part of our inquiry, the weight of the cultural evidence seems to point to the notion of a ‘companion-at-arms’ as being an intrinsic part of Germanic society and thus, terms for it must have existed as well. In that case then, one wonders why Wulfila would have coined a new word for his Bible translation. The data, in point of fact, shows that Wulfila had at his disposal at least two other words denoting this type of companionship; namely, the word *gasiŋpa* ‘traveling companion,’ which could perhaps better be rendered as ‘companion of expedition’ for their movements were more akin to expeditions than to peaceful traveling; and the word *gadrauh̄ts* ‘soldier.’ It is possible that Wulfila’s coining of a new word had a very specific purpose; that of highlighting the sharing of the sacramental bread. In that case, the notion of ‘common’ assigned to the prefix *ga-* by some scholars (see sections 4 and 5) could refer to the sacramental experience. Actually, according to the Christian Creed, the bread is the body of Christ and Christians share it, all in common¹⁹. Wulfila, who was a very careful translator, may thus have coined this specific word to

render the notion of companionship devoid of a military nuance. And indeed, looking at the two attestations in Gothic, we find that in John 11:16 neither the Latin term *condiscipulos* nor the Gr. *συνμαθητής* held the notion of companionship at-arms. It is only in Philippians 2:25 that the Gothic term *gahlaiba* translates Latin *commilito* and Greek *συστρατιώτης*, each of which does contain a semantic component with a trace of military nuance. First, one must remember, however, that this notion can only be inferred in the sources for the Gothic translation and is not found in the Gothic term itself. Second, even in Late Latin *commilito* had acquired the meaning of ‘comrade’ while still retaining its original meaning of ‘fellow soldier’ (Lewis & Short 1993:378), and the same can be said for the Greek term. It is therefore entirely possible that Wulfila did not want to use *gasiŋpa* nor *gadrauhts* because he was refraining from making any reference to a military semantic component profiled in his sources. If this is true, then the term *gahlaiba* would simply have the connotation of a ‘one who has bread with (others)’; that is, an ‘associate’ in a religious sense. Support for this assumption can be found in the texts themselves. As a case in point, in 2 Philippians, the Apostle Paul writes to his congregation to inform them that instead of himself, they will meet with his envoy. A previously ill missionary, Epaphroditus is introduced as Paul’s brother, coworker and ‘fellow soldier’, that is, an ‘associate, companion’. Thus, the literary context itself makes an overt reference to a ‘bond’ between Paul and Epaphroditus rather than to military nuance or context. In addition, in the Naples Deed, the authors of the signatures on the document who identify themselves as ‘companions’, are an Arian priest, a deacon, and two amanuenses, a scribe and a cleric (Scardigli 1964:189). In other words, these four are men of the cloth, ‘brethren’, if you will. Again, there is no direct reference to a military connotation other than, perhaps, to a male association. Two further historical pieces of information can be cited in support of the above proposal. The first is that while Wulfila, and his followers, had incurred persecution for having rejected the Nicean Creed, there is no evidence of these Goths fighting back. The second is a statement made by Wulfila’s biographer who informs us that the only religious book not translated by Wulfila was the Book of Kings. The reason given for this lack was Wulfila’s specific wish to eliminate any reference to war when addressing his constituency (Walford 1855, *Philostorgius* 11.5). It is possible then, that Wulfila coined a word which his new believers plainly understood within the religious context and whose connotational meaning did not entail the implication of military nuances. If available, the word *companion*, allegedly meaning *cum-panis*, could have supplied Wulfila with the necessary paradigm. This brings us to the second part of our analysis and the exploration of the etymology of Lat. *companion*.

9. THE SCHOLARSHIP OF LATIN *COMPANIO*. According to the scholarship, the Latin term ‘companion’ is derived from an unattested **cum-pānio-ōnis* from *cum* and *panis*. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1906–1912:2004) states its meaning as ‘*membrum, socius*’ and gives as its first occurrence the Lex Salica. The following entry, which is also relevant to our investigation, lists LL **cum-pān-i-um, -i*, as a neuter form with the meaning of ‘*contubernium, societas*’. Herein again, the Lex Salica is cited as pro-

viding the first occurrence. Indeed, Du Gange in his *Glossarium*, under the heading of *compagus*, lists *compagnons* as being earlier *compains*. Then, following the term *companium*, which he glosses as ‘*contubernium, societas, Compagnie*’, he adds: ‘*Pactus Legis Salicae tit. 66. §2: Si quis hominem ingeneuum, qui Lege Salica vivit, in hoste in Companio de Companiei suorum occiderit, in triplo componat... Galli dicerent, “En la compagnie de ses compagnons”*’ (Du Gange 1954:461). Du Gange goes on to suggest that the lexeme *companio* may have arisen from the practice of sharing bread among military people and thus *companium* may stand for *campanium* but gives no reason or data for the assumption (Du Gange 1954:ibid). The proposition may have arisen from the fact that this particular segment of the Salic text refers to a law articulating the penalty to be imposed on a free man, if the latter, in the ‘company’ of his ‘companions’, (gang members?) killed another free man who was serving in the army. Of note is that, though not a military nuance, this usage of ‘companion’ and of ‘company’ definitely holds a militant nuance.

Diez (1969:106) under the heading of It. *compagno* gives Sp. *compañio*, Prov., OF. *compaing* ‘gefärtle’, from which *compagnia* and the verb (*ac*)*compagnare* from MLat. *companium* ‘company’ all from *cum* + *panis*. He states that the etyma were fashioned after the pattern of OHG *gi-mazo* or *gi-leip* ‘brotgenosse’. Diez further suggests that *compagnon* could have been derived from *compāgānus* but only if the accent had shifted to the root which he doubts, of course, due to the nature of the long vowel (ā) in the suffix²⁰. Diez also lists other possible sources for the two etyma such as Latin *compaginare* as well as Provençal, Catalan *companatge*, but makes no further comment.

Meyer-Lübke (1935:2093) in his *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* gives *companion*, *-one* as an unattested form with the meaning of ‘Genosse’ formed after the Germanic form *ga-hlaiba* and cites Diez in support. But, in a discussion of the suffix *-ia*, and on its archaism, Meyer-Lübke (1974:496–97) remarks that even in Latin the *-ia* suffix created collectives. Among a number of such formations he lists *compania*, It. *compagnia*, OFr. *compagne*, Sp. *compañia*. He then goes on to state that the term *compania* must be a formation after a Germanic *gahlaibi* in the same way as the term *companion* is formed on the model of *gahlaiba*. We shall return to this point below.

In other words, while in Gothic we have at least six separate attestations: two in the Bible passages and four in the signatures of the Naples Deed, no attestations are available, either in Latin or in Vulgar Latin, for the terms *companio* and *companium*. All references cite unattested forms. This prompts us to seek evidence in Old French.

10. RISE OF THE FRANKS: FROM GALLO-ROMAN TO OLD FRENCH. The Romanization of Gaul began in 56 BC with Caesar’s conquest. Soon after, the Gallo-Romans began to use Latin, albeit the military vernacular brought by the legions and not Classical Latin²¹. Between the 3rd and 4th centuries, Germanic invasions and Christian missionaries further promoted the adoption of Latin, though by this time, the local idiom showed Gaulish influence both on the phonological and lexical levels. Not much later, the Franks, who had earlier settled in Gaul as Roman allies, engulfed the Visigothic Kingdom of Toulouse and, during the latter part of the 5th century, gradually over-

took the government of Northern Gaul under the leadership of the Merovingians²². As these Germanic tribes coalesced with the Gallo-Roman population, they relinquished their language in favour of Latin. At the beginning of the 6th century, under King Clovis, they established the Frankish Kingdom. Indeed, the Franks, who had repelled Aryanism with the Goths, along with king Clovis accepted Christianity on Christmas 496 AD. (Rickard 1974:8–35). It was around that time that the first version of the *Pactus Legis Salicae* was most certainly written down²³ bearing the first attestations of both the term *compagnon* and the term *compagnie*. The variety of different versions of the text have presented endless challenges to editors. The law version referred to in this paper is a translation based on the late 8th century text, the oldest available text, amended with the later capitularies as well as the so-called Malberg glosses (germanic glosses) that appear in some manuscripts (Drew 1991).

11. ATTESTATIONS OF *COMPANION*. In addition to the evidence in the *Pactus Legis Salicae*²⁴, a second set of attestations of both terms can be found in the *Chanson de Roland* (Berkeley Digital Library 1995), a poem which dates toward the end of the 11th century (Duggan 1969; Rickard 1974). These texts, however, are not the oldest specimens of Old French²⁵. Actually, the first complete text in the new language, the *Serments de Strasbourg*²⁶, is from 842. It is the record of an oath sworn by two of the three grandsons of Charlemagne against their older brother. From the *Serments*, it is evident that, by this time, a large segment of the population must have spoken the vernacular while the elite and the learned, especially within the church, continued to speak Latin. We know, in actual fact, that by 813 Latin had become completely incomprehensible to the common people, and it must have been so for several hundred years before that date, because in that year, the *Council of Tours* granted permission to the clergy to preach in the vernacular as the people could no longer understand Latin (Rickard 1974:35).

An interesting pattern in the usage of the term ‘companion’ is evident in Joseph J. Duggan’s *A Concordance of the Chanson de Roland* (1969)²⁷. The vocative/nominative form, *cumpainz* appears 24 times. Only once it is written as *cumpain* (verse 2000 ‘*Sir cumpain, faites le vos de gred?*’)²⁸. The remaining 23 occurrences, which are written *cumpainz*, can be subdivided into two categories: First, the term is used by the narrator to indicate a member of the pair composed of Roland and Oliver; Second, the term is used by the members of the pair to address one another²⁹. In only three instances does the word *cumpainz* refer to someone other than Roland or Oliver. As a case in point, in verses 1269, 1380 and 2404, *cumpainz* refers to either Gerier or Gerin, friends who also are perceived as a pair³⁰.

The word *cumpagnun* occurs 17 times, 10 times in the singular and 7 times in the plural. In the plural, the term most often designates the 12 peers that made the inner-armed troop, at other times it refers to the soldiers at large. The word *compagnon* occurs but once while *compagnie/cumpaignie* occurs several times, both with the abstract meaning of ‘togetherness’, that is, referring to the relationship that bound the

compagnons as in verse 1735; and with the concrete meaning of ‘military troop’, as in verses 587, 912, 1087, 1471 and so on (Duggan 1969:67–68).

Though an in depth study on the usage of *cumpain* vs. *cumpagnun* is beyond the scope of this paper, one must reckon with the great deal of variation between spellings. These discrepancies, of course, may be simply the result of regional differences, for without a doubt there were many dialects spoken at the time (Rickard 1974:46–51) and the *Chanson* must have been performed in what the people of the period referred to as the local ‘romanz’ or ‘*lingua romana rustica*’. Thus, as an oral performance by poets and troubadours, undoubtedly, the *Chanson* did reflect many of those dialectal differences. In addition, Old French, at this time, was still viewed as an oral medium of expression, and consequently, not worthy of being written down (Beaulieux 1967:13). Not surprisingly, the spelling, which also at this time had not yet been codified, added to the variety of spellings. Last and most important, however, is the fact that when it was finally written down, the way in which the words were represented in writing often depended on the scribe. Those clerics who were aware of, or even just inferred, Latin origins may have tried deliberately to show the relationship orthographically (Beaulieux 1967:x). In any case, the few surviving documents from this period still provide considerable insight. Of all the alternations, what catches the eye is the consistent fluctuation between *compain* and *compaing*. We will address this point below.

12. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS. Without a doubt, the earliest attestation of the French term *compagnon*, *compaing*, *compainz* and so on, ‘companion’ are, at the very least, more than four centuries later than those of Goth. *gahlaiba*, i.e., the *Lex Salica* (c. 800), or roughly between 500–700 years later. i.e., the *Chanson de Roland* (c. 1080). The widespread agreement on the meaning of the term in Old French contrasts sharply with the many alternative spellings which are also evident in later Medieval French literature. For instance, the *Dictionnaire de l’Ancienne Française* (9–15 century) reports *compan*, *compens*, *compainz*, *cumpainz*, *compeinz*, *compoinz*, *compoins*, *compaings*, *compaing*, *compoing*, all subject cases of OF. *compaignon* (Godefroy 1982:202)³¹.

In his *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828), Noah Webster presents a very interesting suggestion. Under the entry *company*, he states: ‘...not from *cum* and *panis*... but from *cum* and *pannus*... What decides this question is the Spanish mode of writing the word with a tilde... *pañõ*, “cloth” whereas *panis* “bread” is *pan*’. Webster goes on to define the meaning of ‘company’ as ‘a band or number of men under one flag or standard’. Though Webster may not be an authority on Romance philology nor, for that matter, on Old French phonology, he does proffer an alternative aimed at reconciling the military nuance exhibited by both the terms for *companion* and *company*, and their postulated morphology and in so doing, indicates interesting investigative venues which we will explore below.

There is more than one phonological change in Vulgar Latin, and in Old French itself, that could have produced the palatalized nasal in the word *compaing/compain*. First, the palatalized nasal in French, in many cases, originated from the *n* + front vowel so that Lat. *vinea* became Fr. *viña*. Second, the voiced velar, which had indeed

already become very unstable since Classical Latin times, underwent a process of palatalization in several environments. For instance, in initial position and followed by *-a-*, the velar palatalized and words like Lat. *gaudere* > OF. *jouir*. In medial position, when the *-g-* was followed by front vowels it disappeared altogether, thus from Lat. *regina* > OFr. *reïne*, Prov. *reina* (Bourciez 1930:162). This palatalization process occurred not only when the velar was followed by vowels but also, for instance, when the velar was in a consonant cluster with *-n-* as in *-gn-*. Lindsay (1894:292) states that, in Latin, even at the beginning of the 2nd century BC the consonant cluster *-gn-* had by then become *-n-*. In fact, in Romance languages Lat. *co-gnoscere*, has reflexes devoid of the velar; thus It. *conoscere*, Prov. *conoiser*, Fr. *connaître* < OF. *conoistre*, Cat. *coneixer*, Rum. *cunoaște*. Fouché (1961:605) explains it as a process of assimilation so that *-gn-* gives *-ñ/ñ-* which was written, at a much later time with the diagraph *-gn-*; thus Latin *dignus* became OF. *deññyer*. Such type of gemination, he suggests, lasted until the 11th century (Fouché 1961:809). In the following centuries, a large number of learned words were reintroduced into French from Latin and the new words took on the palatalized pronunciation as well³². In support of the notion that this sound change began at an early period in French, Fouché cites several examples: OF. *pre-nant* < *praegnante*, *dine* < *dignum*, *rene* < *regnum* (ibid 607).

In addition, the palatalized nasal of Old French could also originate from a consonantal group *-nc-* or *-ng-*. Mendeloff (1969:23), Fouché (1961:605), and others state that, with noted exceptions, the *-ng-* cluster simplified to *-n-* and was then subject to palatalization (Beaulieux 1967:75) i.e. *plangente* > *playnant* > *playnyant* > *plainnant*. If one takes this latter phonological change into consideration, based on the alternative spellings of *compaing*, *compain*, and *compaign*, besides deriving *companion* from an underlying form *cum-panis*, as some of the scholars would have it, the Old French word could also have derived from a Late Latin form *com-pāngo*.

The verb *pango* ‘to join, to unite several parts into a whole’ has an alternate form *pāgo* ‘to fix, covenant, stipulate, contract’ (Lewis & Short 1993:1297) and several compound forms³³ among which *com-pingo/com-pango*³⁴. It is possible that from *com-pingo/com-pango* ensued a nominalized form *com-pango* ‘the one who joins, unites, associates, socius’ and a secondary form to which the suffix *-ia* denoting ‘a conditions’, or more likely a ‘collective’, had been affixed to the root producing the term *com-pang-ia* with the meaning of ‘a union, association’. When these forms underwent the process of palatalization in Old French, probably first *compayngia* > *cumpaynyia* > *cumpañie*³⁵ and then by analogy *compango* > *cumpaynyio* > *cumpañoio*, the velar, at a first stage, became palatal as it partially assimilated to the preceding nasal so that the cluster *-ng-* became *-ndy-*. At a second stage, the *-dy-* of the *-ndy-* cluster completely assimilated to the preceding *-n-* which, because of the following front vowel, palatalized resulting in a cluster *-ñny-*. With the sound change of *ng* > *ñny*, later > *ñy*, two homophonic etyma would have resulted: the first *cum-pañyo* which had the meaning of ‘with bread’ and the second *cum-pañyo* which had the meaning of ‘socius’. Later, as the writing became canonized, these forms were written alternatively as *compaign*, *compain* or *compaing*, and so on. As a result, the meaning of this conflation of two

different terms would encompass not only the meaning of ‘the one with the bread’, or ‘he who is with bread’—which will be elucidated below—but also ‘he who joins, unites, *socius*’. This solution would account for the military nuance exhibited by the two compounds. Indeed to become a Roman *comes*, or even a member of the Germanic *comitatus*, an oath had to be sworn to sanction their association. Thus, as we shall see below, the semantic overlap could have been aided by the existence of the practice of *comitatus*, a practice familiar to the Franks, in which the *companions* of a leader were indeed fed by him but also bore arms for him. The proposed solution would also avoid a number of required semantic shifts which, would be necessary in order for the semantic sphere of the term to encompass the meaning of ‘union, association’ if, initially, the word simply meant *cum + panis*, ‘one who has bread with’³⁶.

The merge of two forms, because of their phonological similarity, is not an unknown phenomenon (Weinreich 1970:47–62). For instance, English *belfry* ‘bell tower’ derives from OF. *belfroi*, earlier *berfroi* from a Germanic compound of **berg* ‘high place’ and *frij-* ‘safety, peace’. In the Middle Ages, speakers reanalyzed the compound and began to identify the first syllable *bel-* with the free morpheme *bell*, so that the original meaning shifted to that of ‘bell tower’. A modern case is found in the word *hamburger* which most English speakers reanalyze as ‘*ham*’ plus the word ‘*burger*’ having no inkling of its etymological origin. In fact, native speakers of American English, in particular, are often puzzled by the absence of pork meat, that is, of ‘*ham*’ in their ‘*hamburger*’³⁷. This type of false analogy, also known as folk etymology—a process by which somewhat similar words are altered, either phonologically or in spelling, to conform even more closely to the pattern that draws them—plays an important part in language change, and more specifically, in the alteration of a word-form to fit a more acceptable pattern. Folk etymology is itself a kind of semantic assimilation. Further support, for the supposition stated above, can be found, as we have seen, in the historical context. In French Medieval times, a *companion* was often part of the household of his leader. To his leader he was bound through an oath of fidelity, and by his leader he was housed and given food and drink, and later even land. In exchange, he bore arms against the enemy. In other words, he was a warrior (Bloch 1961).

13. THE INDO-EUROPEAN WARRIORS. According to IE scholars, the notion of the warrior within IE languages is rooted in the war-band organization. A ‘young man’ was defined as an ‘(armed) youth’, PIE **h_ajuh_x-n_o-k_o-* ‘youth’ who took up arms as a member of a war-band PIE **korios* (McCone 1987:103). Reconstructed vocabulary hints at warrior clusters, for instance, PIE **korios* refers to an ‘army, war-band’ while **leh₂uos* and **teutéh_a* refer to the ‘people under arms’. Literary evidence suggests the existence of two kinds of bands: the one composed by young warriors in training and the established *Männnerbund* or *comitatus*. These war-bands were linked to a leader by personal ties as evidenced by the Ir. *fianna* ‘war and or hunting band’. Indeed, in the Irish *Tàin Bó Cúalgne* or *Cattle raid of Cooley*, the expression *in maccrad*, which is rendered as ‘the youths’, clearly refers to the young band of the king and is associated with *Cú Chulainn*, their leader. The same situation can be found in *Beowulf* (*Beowulf* 20–25)³⁸

and in the Anglo-Saxon poem *The Battle of Maldon*. The Gr. *ephēbeia* also trained to obtain full status as warriors (Mallory & Adams 1997:632). This type of war-band, joined to its leader by oaths and personal ties, is described by Tacitus who identifies it as the Germanic *comitatus*. Indeed, in Frankish Gaul, kinship ties and personal ties by oaths were equally binding and constituted one of the strongest social bonds (Bloch 1961). Noteworthy is that in the early Frankish kingdom there was not an army run by the state as it had been in Roman times, there were only ‘companions’ whom the king and chieftains attracted to themselves (Bloch 1961:153). The chiefs, especially the young chiefs, used to gather around themselves ‘companions’ or *gesind*, literally, ‘companion of expeditions’. Tacitus, thoughtfully equaled *gasind* to *comes*. These companions were led to battle or in raiding expeditions by their chief who, in between raids, offered them hospitality in their great halls and lavished them with immense amounts of food and drink. In exchange, the war-band supported its chief not only in wars but in vendettas as well (Bloch 1961:154). The Germanic *comitatus* described by Tacitus in the first century AD continued for several centuries, particularly in the Frankish kingdom, giving later rise to the feudal system.

14. THE ONOMASIOLOGY AND SEMASIOLOGY OF ‘COMPANION’ IN I-E. The notion of the type of companionship described above is a very old concept in Indo-European languages and is attested in most of the literary traditions of the descendant languages. Forms which have proliferated in the attested languages include derivatives of pronominal stems signifying ‘one’s own’; of verbs for ‘follow or attend’; and of compounds made with prefixes denoting the notion of ‘with’ (Buck 1949:1346). As a case in point, Lat. *sodālis* ‘companion’, OCS *svatŭ* ‘relative’ *svobodŭ* ‘free’, Skt. *svaka-* ‘relative’ are from the reflexive pronominal stem PIE **s(w)e-dh(o)-* < **s(w)e* while Skt. *sākhā-* and Av. *haxā-* ‘friend, companion’, Gr. *ἀσέεω* ‘help’ are from PIE **sekʷ-* ‘follow’ whose thematic form PIE **sókʷ-h₂-jós* ‘follower, companion’ gives Latin *socius* ‘partner, companion’ and Proto-Germanic **sagwja-* from whence OE *secg* / ON *seggr* ‘warrior, follower (of a leader in combat)’. Finally, Lat. *comes* which is a compound of *com-* ‘with’ and *i-t-* < *ire* ‘go’. (Pokorny 1959:896–97; Buck 1949:19.51, 19.53; Mallory & Adams 1997:115–16).

The meanings developed by the various terms appear to fall into three distinct categories, each denoting the notion of partnership in a specific environment. The first category relates to travel, i.e., OE *gefēra*, *foera*, ME *yfere*, ‘traveling companion’, from OE *faran* ‘go’, OHG *giferto*, *gafarto*, MHG *geverte*, from *ga* + OHG *fart*, OE *færd*, OS *farđ* ‘military expedition, army’; Goth. *gasinþa*, OE *gesinþ*, OHG *gasint*, ‘traveling companion’, from *ge* + *sinþ*, ‘way, journey’, *ga-sandjan* ‘accompany’, *gisindi* ‘retinue’ ON *sinni* ‘fellowship, company’ MW *hennydd* ‘companion’; *cydymaith*, a compound of *cyd-* ‘co-’ and *ymdeith* ‘travel’. Finally, Skt. *sahāya* from *saha* ‘together’ and *aya* ‘going’.

The second category in which the terms can be grouped refers to the sharing of lodging, i.e., Fr. *camarade* ‘chamber mate’ from *camara*, ‘chamber’, MHG *stalbruoder*, *stalbröder* ‘roommate’ from *stal* ‘place, stall’ and ‘brother’; OHG *gesello*, *gesellio*, MHG *geselle*, Dutch *gezel*, with reiteration *metgezel* ‘house mate’ from OHG *sal* ‘hall, building’.

Lastly, there are terms denoting a bond, a partnership in general such as Goth. *gadaila* from *ga* + *daila* ‘share’, NE *partner* from *part* ‘share’, OF. *parcener* from Lat. *partitionarius* < *pars*. Lith. *beñdras* ‘companion’, Gr. *πενθερός* ‘father-in-law’, Skt. *báandhuṣ-* ‘relative, kinship’ from PIE **bhendh* ‘bind’. The only two terms having to do with the sharing of food are Goth. *gahlaiba*, ‘sharing bread’, OHG *galeipo* and OHG *gimazo*. The first apparently originated as a religious term (see sec. 8) . The second, OHG *gimazo*, seems to have encompassed drinking as well as eating and feasting (Lehmann 1986:247).

15. CONCLUSION. What we do when we engage in the techniques of Historical Comparative Linguistics methodology is to analyze the data in relation to a theoretical framework. What we get out of such an undertaking is often more questions than answers. As a case in point, from our excursus, it is apparent that in spite of advances in the field, the theoretical assumptions related to identifying semantic loans have not yielded helpful results. That is, we have not been able, at least so far, to ascertain the direction of the semantic loan under investigation by examining deviation in phonotactics in both Gothic or Latin (Old French); nor have we been able to pinpoint morphological complexity in one of the languages as opposed to the other. Lastly, we have not been able to identify a group of cognates in either language. Thus, the question of whether or not Lat. **companiono* is a calque from Gothic *gahlaiba*, or vice versa cannot, as yet, be put to rest.

We can make, however, some deductions from the data we have gathered. From both the linguistic and the historical evidence, the Gothic term clearly appears to be a separate and distinct coining, unconnected to Lat. *companion*. Wulfila, who had at his disposal two other words with the meaning of ‘companion’, namely, *gadrauhts* and *gasinþa*, to render the equivalent terms of the Greek and Latin Bible, chose to coin a new word. His apparent motivation seems to have been the desire to supply his religious constituency with a word devoid of a military nuance. Worthy of note is that this coining dates back to the 4th century and that there is no attestation, at that time, of a Latin term which could have provided the basis for a semantic loan into Gothic.

The notion of bread is very important in the religious context but we know that, from a sociological perspective, the notion of bread was also very important in Germanic as the Old English titles, ‘Lord’ and ‘Lady’, *hlāfweard* and *hlāfdige* seem to indicate. It is just possible, therefore, that the *n*-stem Germ. **xlaiþan*⁻³⁹ ensued from the metonymic use of ‘loaf of bread’ for ‘one associated with the bread provided by his lord’, in other words, a ‘client, recruit’. In that case the *ga-* prefix would have the same collective meaning as the one found in OE *gebröder* and NHG *Gebirge* ‘mountain range’ making the attested term *gahlaiaban* ‘fellow loaf(men)⁴⁰.

As for the etymology of Old French *companion*, the earliest attestations go back to the 8th century and are thus rather late in comparisons to the Gothic attestations. What is more, the pragmatic contexts in which the word appears do not support the meaning of ‘he who has bread with’, deduced by some scholars from a putative morphology of *cum* + *panis*, but rather, that of ‘an associate, companion-at-arms’.

Scholars have attempted to reconcile the military semantic component of the word ‘companion’ with the morpho-phonological sequence *cum-panis* by suggesting that soldiers shared bread. Eating bread together was, in fact, a military practice (Meillet 1966:277). And indeed, the Roman military unit, the *contubernium*, composed of 8–10 men under the leadership of one commander, carried and made their own bread. Bread was so plentiful and came in so many varieties in Rome that Pliny the Elder could not name all the different types (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* Book XVIII, XXVII, 105). What is more, bread was such an essential staple in the Roman army diet that it had its very own name: *panis militaris*. This *panis militaris* came in two varieties, *panis castrensis* for when the troops were encamped and *panis mundus* for when they were on the march (Faas 2003:191). Unquestionably, the Romans believed that ‘bread was the only food fit for soldiers’ while any other type of food, including meat, was viewed by the military men themselves as being demeaning and unfit for a real Roman soldier (Dupont 1993:125).

Work in experimental archaeology supports literary reports that Roman soldiers, at the far reaches of the western empire, carried grain and made their own bread (Junkelmann’s 1997:11–13, 136). If we take both the cultural and historical contexts into consideration, it is entirely possible, then, that the Roman soldier may have been referred to as ‘the one with the bread’. This metonymic shift must have developed in Gallo-Roman times and would account for the term being attested so late. Of relevance here is, Procopius’ account of how the remnants of the Roman army in northern Gaul, which came to serve under Frankish kings, maintained and preserved many of their military traditions, including foot attire. Among the preserved traditions there may have been the making and carrying of bread. The Roman army in Gaul had, in effect, long been Germanized; conversely, the Frankish army had long been Romanized. Procopius’ story suggests some kind of fusion of the two military systems may have come about, presumably under the earliest successful Frankish kings, Childeric or Clovis, who date back to the 6th century AD (*Procopius Germania*, Wars V. xii. 13–19). It is thus possible that the creation of the term *cum-pan-io*, through the addition of an adjectival suffix denoting a characteristic or profession, became a metonym for a ‘soldier’ at this time⁴¹. Such notion, then, may have been adopted by the Anglo-Norman. In which case, OE *hlāfweard* could be explained as a military term⁴². A homological parallel involving a metonymic shift from ‘a grain staple’ to man is supplied by Pliny who states that gladiators were nicknamed ‘barley-men’ after their basic staple: ‘gladiatorum cognomine qui hordearii vocabantur’ (*Nat. Hist.* Book XVIII, XIV). One can easily suppose that the appellative *cumpan-io* was used in the same speech context as that of *hordeario* < *hordearius* when members of the two different fighting units had occasion to address each other, perhaps in non-complementary ways. If so, the two appellatives could easily have been subject of further analogy based on their immediate juxtaposition to one another.

To sum up, the data taken as a whole seem to suggest that, through a metonymic shift, a Gallo-Roman soldier was designated as a *com-pan-io*, that is, ‘the one with the bread’. Concurrently, phonological changes in Early French, caused the nominal-

ized form of the verb *com-pango* ‘he who joins, unites, *socius*’ designating a *comes* to be reanalyzed as *com-pan-io*. As a result of folk etymology, speakers merged the two different words both at the morpho-phonological and at the semantic level. This proposal, of course, is only tentative. To fully settle the question, further investigation is necessary in the area of borrowing, loanwords and semantic translation as well as in the area of Late Latin and French morpho-phonology. These preliminary results may not satisfy everyone, but present a great opportunity for those interested in the techniques employed by historical linguistics to observe the interplay between cultural history, regular sound change, and the individual history of each, and every word.

- ¹ Borrowings presuppose language contact situations and require speakers with some degree of bilingualism.
- ² *Mbakara* is a loan from Efik and means ‘white man’.
- ³ Wulfila was from Cappadocia, the largest province of Asia Minor located in what is today eastern Turkey. It was bordered in the north by Pontus, in the east by Syria and Armenia, in the south by Cilicia, and in the west by Lycaonia.
- ⁴ The term *loan translation* is itself a calque of modern German *Lehniübersetzung*.
- ⁵ <http://extranet.ufsia.ac.be/wulfila/Corpus/Corpus.html>.
- ⁶ Following the established convention, square brackets [] indicate deletions; angular brackets < > indicate additions; italic indicates that either the characters or the words cannot be identified within a certain degree of certainty. Abbreviations used are: [CA]=Codex Argenteus; [A], [B], [C]=Codex Ambrosianus A, B, C; [Naples]= Naples Deed.
- ⁷ This is the Latin Bible, or ‘Vulgate’. Translated from Hebrew and Aramaic by Jerome between 382 and 405 AD. This text became known as the ‘versio vulgata’, that is, ‘common translation’ (<http://www.biblegateway.com/cgi-bin/bible?language=latin>).
- ⁸ <http://www.greekbible.com/>.
- ⁹ Gaul. *co(m)-* Lat. *co(m)-*, Osc. *com/n-*, OIr. *co/um-*, *co/u-* all deriving from PIE **kom-*. Thus OIr. *com-arbe* ‘fellow-heir’ Goth. *ga-juka* ‘companion’ Lat. *con-jux* ‘spouse’ (Lehmann 1986:133). Some scholars consider Gmc. *ga-* < PIE **ǵʰo-*, a semantic equivalent of Italo-Celtic **kom-*.
- ¹⁰ Formed with a derivation in *-*ti* from the verb *driugan, drauhti-witōþ*.
- ¹¹ In Luke 2:44 the expression *in gasinþjiam*, a dative plural presupposes a variant *gasinþja*.
- ¹² Seebold considers *miþ gasinþam* a corruption of the text which should read *miþgasinþam* instead (1974:10).
- ¹³ The Franks successfully kept the Goths away from the greater part of Gaul.
- ¹⁴ The Ostrogothic Empire included Italy, Sicily, the areas of Dalmatia, Upper Rhaetia, and later on, Provence. There must have been a number of bilingual people.

- ¹⁵ Wulfila, also referred to as Ulfilas or Ulphilas, probably born in 311, was a descendant of Cappadocians captured by the Goths from the north of the Danube during their raids in Asia Minor. As a young man he was consecrated Bishop by the Bishop of Nicomedia, Eusebius. Shortly after his consecration he returned to Dacia and worked among his fellow-countrymen as a missionary. After a decade or so he was compelled, because of persecution, to seek refuge in Moesia with many of his Christian converts. It was at this time that he conceived the idea of translating the Bible into Gothic. Wulfila translated 'all the books of Scripture with the exception of the Books of Kings, which he omitted because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war' (Philostorgius, *Hist. eccl.* II, 5).
- ¹⁶ These texts include considerable portions of the New Testament, and minor parts of Nehemiah from the Old Testament. Other remnants include some fragments of a commentary on St. John's Gospel (*Skeireins*), a fragment of a calendar, two deeds containing some Gothic sentences, and a 10th-century Salzburg manuscript which gives the Gothic alphabet, a few Gothic words with Latin translation, and some phonetic annotations (Bennett 1980:26–27).
- ¹⁷ Constantine split the army into two. Some troops were stationed along the borders, others were part of his retinue or *comitatus* and were therefore called *comitatenses* (Codex Theodosianus 12,1,38 <http://www.gmu.edu/departments/fld/CLASSICS/theod12.html>). It is out of this practice that arose the '*comes rei militaris*', that is *companions of warfare*.
- ¹⁸ The so-called *buccellari* were hired soldiers very loyal to their masters.
- ¹⁹ The communion rite (Eucharist) goes back to the very beginning: Acts 3:46 ('Breaking bread in their homes' = the Eucharist); see also: 1 Corinthians 10:16–17 and 11:23–26. Thus the ritual was probably first celebrated right after Jesus' crucifixion and coincides with the beginning of belief in his resurrection. Though debated at the time of Wulfila, it did not become the creed of transubstantiation till the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.
- ²⁰ *Compagānus* and *pāgānus*, as nouns, designated a 'country inhabitant', that is, an inhabitant of a *pāgus*. *Pāgānus* was opposed to *urbanus* 'inhabitant of the city'. Within military jargon, however, *pāgānus* acquired the additional meaning of 'civilian' in opposition to *castrensis* 'soldier'. As Christianity spread to the urban centers, the word *pāgānus* came to mean 'non Christian' (Tagliavini 1964:174).
- ²¹ The Gaulish tongue was relegated more and more to the rural countryside and by the end of the 5th century, it had all but died out. (Rickard 1974:11–15).
- ²² The Franks were a multi-tribal coalition of 'free men', who after extensive looting and pillaging concluded a peace treaty with Rome around the year 286. Subsequent to the treaty, they began a period of military service in the imperial army. Many Franks served in the legions and small groups were settled on the Rhine frontier where they were assigned defensive duties during the 4th century. These heterogeneous settlements and groups of military character slowly coalesced into two main groups: the (western) Salian Franks and the (eastern) Riparian Franks.

- 23 This law code is generally considered the most Germanic of the 'barbarian' law-codes. The Lex Salica is quite clearly influenced by the Roman legislative tradition. Earlier versions credit four learned men who gave judgement according to ancient custom.
- 24 There were several law codes grouped under the title *leges barbarorum* and dating from the 5th to the 9th century: the Gothic (Visigothic, Burgundian, and Ostrogothic), the Frankish (Salic, Ripuarian, Chamavian, and Thuringian), the Saxon (Saxon, Anglo-Saxon, and Frisian), and the Bavarian (Alemannic and Bavarian). The earliest versions of the Salic code have neither pagan nor Christian elements.
- 25 The Reichenau Glosses, so called because they belonged to the abbey of Reichenau, on an island in Lake Constance, were probably compiled around the 8th century and are believed to be the earliest attestations. The glosses represent a list of approximately 200 words explaining certain words in the Vulgate Bible of Saint Jerome.
- 26 The oath cemented the alliance between Charles the Bald (Charles II of the Holy Roman Empire) and Louis the German against their brother Lothair I. Each brother made his oath in the language of the other's followers, so that the oath might be understood by all. The version used by Louis is thus considered the oldest known text of French (Rickard 1978:30).
- 27 The *Chanson*, was probably inspired by a true event. In 778, the rear guard of Charlemagne's army was attacked in the Pyrenees by an army of Basques. The earliest text of the *geste*, however, dates back to the latter part of the 11th century.
- 28 The basic case form, *cumpagnun/cumpagnon* which survived in the majority of instances was the accusative. The distinction between the nominative and the accusative case continued for a time, though in the *Chanson de Roland*, one may already observe the demise of the nominative flexional *-s*.
- 29 Ne Oliver, por co qu'il est si cumpainz; - 324; Mult par est proz Oliver, sis cumpainz; - 559; Estramariz I est, un soens cumpainz: - 941; Sire cumpainz, alum I referir!" - 1868; "Sire cumpainz, amis nel dire ja! - 1113; Dist Oliver: Sir cumpainz, ce crei, -1006; Co dist Rollant: Mis cumpainz est irez! - 1558; "Sire cumpainz, mar fut vostre barnage! -1983; "Sire cupmainz, multben le saviez -1146; "Bel sire, chers cumpainz pur Deu, que vos enhaitez? -1963; Co dist Rollant: Cumpainz, que faitesbos? -1360; E il respond:"Cumpainz, vos lefeistes -1723; Quant jël vos dis, cumpainz, vos ne deignastes - 1716; U est Gerins e sis cumpainz Gerers? - 2404; E sis cumpainz Gers en Passecerf; -1380; E sis cumpainz Gers fiert l'amurafle: -1269; Mult par est proz sis cumpainz Oliver; -546; Cuntre lui vient sis cumpainz Oliver; -793; Co dit Rollant : "Bels cumpainz Oliver, 2207; 'Cumpainz Rollant, l'olifan car sunez:1059; que ses cumpainz Rollant li ad tant domandee, -1368; "Cumpainz Rollant, sunez vostre olifan: -1070 (Duggan 1969:68).
- 30 The third pair is composed of *Ivon* and *Ivoire*.
- 31 The OED states that the vocative *compagn* in Romanic occurs in a gloss dated about 825 but gives no further information (http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/findword?query_type=word&queryword=companion).
- 32 Fouché (1961: 809) 'Cependant la grafie *gn* s'était conservée à côté de la graphie phonétique. Elle est même devenue de plus en plus fréquent à partir du XIV^e siècle avec les

progrès de la latinisation. C'est à cause d'elle et par analogie avec les mots de formation populaire dans lesquels *gn* (ou *ign*) représentait *n* mouillé, que le *gn* des formes savantes a commencé à se prononcer [*ñ*] dès le XVI^e siècle et peut-être même avant. Cette prononciation a été d'abord blâmée par les grammairiens en particulier par H. Estienne. Mais elle continué à faire des progrès. Encore au début de XVII^e siècle, le mots comme *bénigne*, *consigner*, *digne insigne*, *maligne*, *résigner signe* et leur dérivé pouvaient se prononcer avec [*n*] ou [*ñ*]. A la fin du XVIII^e, [*ñ*] était devenue général. Un mot a pourtant fait exception jusqu'à nous jours. C'est *signet* dérivé de *signe*.'

³³ Among them, *compāgus* -i, m. 'one belonging to the nearest village, a fellow member of a *pāgus*, a cult title Insc. Orell. 3793, *com-pāg-in-o*, 1st declension, active verb 'to join together', *compāgo-inis*, f. and *compāges* -is also f. 'a joint, structure', *compāg-us*, -i, m., 'one belonging to the same village' and *compāg-ānus* -i, m., 'an inhabitant of the same village'.

³⁴ The nasalized form, *com-pango* has an allomorphic variation, *com-pingo*. When the verb *pango* became the second member in a compound, in some cases, the short -ā- in the root became -i-, thus *pāg-o*, *pāng-o* *compang-o* but also *compingo*. The root vowel, however, remained unchanged in *de-pango* 'fix to the ground', in *re-pango* 'to set in, plant' and in *pro-pāgo* 'to set or fasten down' and its derivatives (Lewis & Short 1993:1467). Also *tāg-tāngo* gives *contingo* but *con-tāges*.

³⁵ When before *a, e, i*, the voiced velar first became *y* then assimilated either completely or partially to the neighboring vowels.

³⁶ The OED has the following meanings: 'associate, fellow, companion-in-arms, colleague, partner, journeyman, vade-mecum, appliance uniting several objects into one set'. The word *company* refers to 'a theatrical association, a firm, firefighter unit, army unit'.

³⁷ Furthermore because of this reanalysis the second member of the compound, the word 'burger' has acquired the meaning of 'sandwich', consisting of a bun and a beef patty or any other such concoction (*The American Heritage Dictionary*, 3rd edition, 1993:188) as for instance a cheeseburger, chicken burger, crab burger and so on.

³⁸ Swā sceal [geong g]uma gōde gewyrcean,
fromum feoh-giftum on fæder [bea]rme,
þæt hine on ylde eft gewunigen
wil-gesīþas, þonne wīg cume,
leode gelæsten; lōf-dædum sceal
in mægþa gehwære man geþeōn.
So ought a [young] man, in his father's
household,
treasure up the future, by his goods and
goodness,
by splendid bestowals, so that later in life,
his chosen men stand by him in turn,
his retainers serve him when war comes.
By such generosity any man prospers.
(*Beowulf* 1977:49)

³⁹ PG **xlaiβα-*, ON *hleifr* OE *hlāf*, O Fris. *hlēf*, OHG *hleib*, Goth. *hlaibs* is widespread in Germanic, and although the etymology is disputed, most scholars do agree that its meaning was that of 'bread'. In Old English, the term underwent semantic narrowing and denoted 'loaf'. The 'piece' of bread was designated by OE *brēad*, ON *brauð*, OFris. *brād* OS *brōd*, OHG *brōt*, CGoth. *broe[d]*, from PG **brauð-*. The Old English plural *brēadru* 'crumbs' and the terms for 'honeycomb' OE *beobrēad*, OS *bibrōd* and OHG *bibrōt* support the assumption that PG **brauð-* referred to pieces of bread and indirectly support the meaning of 'loaf of bread' for PG **xlaiβaz* (Huld, personal communication 29.July 2003).

- ⁴⁰ I am indebted to Martin Huld for this suggestion; Karlene Jones-Bley and Huda Ghattas for editorial remarks; and Ruth Augustine and Giovanna Rocca for assistance with research materials.
- ⁴¹ If we assume a form *com-pan-io*, 'the one with the bread' the term appears to be suffixed with *-io-* from a PIE **-yo-*, a suffix used to form verbal adjectives, especially gerundives. This suffix, in fact, is often used to create verbal nouns, though most often in the neuter and in the feminine. Thus PIE **sok^w-yo-s* 'follower, dependent', Lat. *socius* 'ally', PG *sagjaz* 'man, warrior', (ON *seggr*, OE *secg*, OS *seg*) OInd. *sāciya*—Gr. **όσοος* assured by *α-οση-τήρ* (Lindsay 1894:319). This suffix is also used in proper names i.e., Lat. *Lucius*, and patronymics, i.e., *Octavius*, patronymic of *Octavus*.
- ⁴² Still, the most semantic accessible etymology, could very well be from Lat. *compāgānus*, glossed as 'an inhabitant of the same village' by Lewis and Short (1879: 385 Inscriptioe Gruteri 209, 1). Indeed, both the Roman army and the Germanic *comitatus* grouped their members according to descent. This solution, however, would require that the word *compāgānus* undergo haplology and a shift in accent resulting in a postulated *compāg(ā)nus*.

REFERENCES

- BEAULIEUX, CHARLES. 1967. *Histoire de l'orthographe française*. Paris: Champion.
- BENNETT, WILLIAM H. 1980. *An introduction to the Gothic language*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Beowulf: A dual-language edition*. 1977. Translated with an introduction and commentary by Howell D. Chickering, Jr. Garden City NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- BLOCH, MARC LÉOPOLD BENJAMIN. 1961. *Feudal society*. Translated from the French by L. A. Manyon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2 vol.
- BOURCIEZ, ÉDOUARD. 1930. *Éléments de linguistique romane*. Paris: Klincksieck. [1956].
- BRAUNE, WILHELM. 1920. *Gotische Grammatik*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- BUCK, CARL DARLING. 1949. *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- CAMPBELL, LYLE. 1999. *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- CAMPBELL, BRIAN. 1999. The Roman Empire. In *War and society in the ancient medieval worlds*, ed. by Kurt Raaflaub & Nathan Rosenstein, 217–40. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- CODEx THEODOSIANUS. 12,1,38 <http://www.gmu.edu/departments/fld/CLASSICS/theod12.html> (Accessed 5.August 2003)
- DIEZ, FRIEDERICH. 1969. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*. New York. G. Olms Verlag. Reprint of the 1887 ed. published by A. Marcus, Bonn.
- DOLCETTI CORAZZA, VICTORIA. 1997. *La bibbia gotica e i bahuvrhi*. Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso.

- DUGGAN, JOSEPH J. 1969. *A concordance of the Chanson de Roland*. Columbus OH: Ohio State University Press.
- DU CANGE, CHARLES DU FRESNE. 1883–87. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, vol. 8. Reprinted in 1954. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt.
- DUPONT, FLORENCE. 1993. *Daily life in ancient Rome*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- DREW, KATHERINE FISCHER. 1991. *The laws of the Salian Franks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- FAAS, PATRICK. 2003. *Around the Roman table*. Translated from the Dutch by Shaun Whiteside. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- FEIST, SIGMUND. 1939. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- FERREIRO, FÉLIX, PABLO MANZANO & URBANO RODRÍGUEZ. 1995. *Diccionariu basicu de la llingua Asturiana*, 3rd ed. Xixón, Asturias: Trea.
- FOUCHÉ, PIERRE. 1961. *Phonétique historique du Française*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- GIACALONE RAMAT, ANNAMARIA. 1976. A proposito dei composti germanici con *ga-*. In *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-european linguistics: Offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, June 5, 1976*, ed. by Anna Morpurgo-Davies & Wolfgang Meid, 65–76. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- GODEFROY, FRÉDÉRIC. 1982. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française: et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle*. Genève-Paris: Slatkine.
- JUNKELMANN, MARCUS. 1997. *Panis militaris*. Mainz: Von Zabern.
- HEATHER, PETER. 1996. *The Goths*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P. 1986. *A Gothic etymological dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- LEWIS, CHARLTON T. & CHARLES SHORT. 1993. *A Latin dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- LINDOW, JOHN. 1976. *Comitatus, individual and honor: Studies in north Germanic institutional vocabulary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LINDSAY, W. M. 1894. *The Latin language*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- MALLORY, JAMES P. & ADAMS, DOUGLAS Q., eds. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- MEYER-LÜBKE, WILHELM. 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, von W. Meyer-Lübke. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- . 1974. *Grammaire des langues romanes*. Traduit par Auguste et Georges Doutrepoint. Vol. II. Morphologie. Genève: Slatkine Reprints of 1890–1906.
- MCCONE, KIM. 1987. Hund, Wolf un Krieger bei den Indogermanes. In *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*, ed. by W. Meid, 101–150. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- MEILLET, ANTOINE. 1966. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- MENDELOFF, HENRY. 1969. *A manual of comparative Romance linguistics*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

- PLINY THE ELDER. 1961. *Natural history, with an English translation by H. Rackham*, vol. 5. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- POKORNY, JULIUS. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- PROCOPIUS. 1953. *Procopius, with an English translation by H.B. Dewing*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- RICKARD, PETER. 1974. *A history of the French language*. London: Hutchinson.
- SCARDIGLI, PIERGIUSEPPE. 1964. *Lingua e storia dei goti*. Firenze: G.C. Sansoni.
- SEEBOLD, ELMAR. 1974. Gt. *gasiṃpa** 'Reisegefährte' und *gasiṃp** 'Reisegesellschaft'. In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, vol. 96:1–11, ed. by Helmut de Boor & Ingeborg Schröbler. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- TACITUS, CORNELIUS. 1963. *Dialogus, Agricola, Germania* (*Dialogus* translated by Sir William Peterson; *Agricola* and *Germania* translated by Maurice Hutton). Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- TAGLIAVINI, CARLO. 1964. *Le origini delle lingue neolatine*. Bologna: Casa Editrice Prof. Riccardo Pàtron.
- The American Heritage dictionary*, 3rd ed. 1993. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. 3, 1906–12. Lipsiae: in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri.
- VELTEN, HARRY. 1930. Studies in the Gothic vocabulary with special reference to Greek and Latin models and analogues. *The journal of English and German philology* 39:443–49.
- VON GRIENBERGER, THEODOR. 1900. *Untersuchungen zur gotischen Wortkunde*. Wien: Carl Gerolds Sohn.
- WALDORF, EDWARD. 1855. *Epitome of the ecclesiastical history of Philostorgius*, compiled by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople. London: Henry G. Bohn.
- WEBSTER, NOAH. 1970. *An American dictionary of the English language*. Johnson Reprint Corp. (1970 Reprint of Noah Webster's original 1828 edition.)
- WEINREICH, URIEL. 1970. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- WRIGHT, JOSEPH. 1910. *Grammar of the gothic language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
<http://extranet.ufsia.ac.be/wulfila/Corpus/Corpus.html> (Accessed on 5/22/03).
<http://www.biblegateway.com/cgi-bin/bible?language=latin> (Accessed on 5/22/03).
<http://www.greekbible.com/> (Accessed on 5/22/03).
<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/OMACL/Roland> (Accessed on 5/22/03).

