A Linguistic Analysis of the Codex Bononiensis*

Roland SCHUHMANN

Summary: In this paper, the recently discovered *Codex Bononiensis* is linguistically analysed. First, the scribal practice (abbreviations), some phonological features and the grammar in the fragment will be compared with what is found in standard Biblical Gothic. Second, the newly transmitted words (*agisleiks**, [1] *dagands**, *fairjan**, *jiuht[s]**, *skaps**, *liuþ** and *leiks*) will be dealt with etymologically.

1. Introduction

The find of the *Codex Bononiensis* and its publication by Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013) marks a true milestone in Gothic studies. It has been quite a long time since a major Gothic text was discovered. The *Codex Bononiensis* represents the first major discovery since the find of the *Codex Gissensis* in the year 1907.[2] I leave aside the *Fragmentum Spirense* (one leaf discovered in 1970 that belongs to the *Codex Argenteus*)[3] and the *Fragmenta Pannonica* which have apparently been lost since 1992. These were already discovered in the 1950s, but the Gothic character of the text only became evident much later, in the early 1980s.[4] In addition – and this seems quite important – the text of the *Codex Bononiensis* is very interesting, because, even though it does incorporate many biblical quotes, it stands outside the Wulfilanic corpus. This text is rather an original untranslated one. The date and place of the composition of the text are unknown. The manuscript itself is dated between 493 and 553, and was written in Ostrogothic Italy.

In the following, I will undertake a short linguistic analysis of this fragment in view of its utmost importance for Gothic studies. The basis for this analysis will not

---

[1] In the following * before a word means that it is reconstructed, * behind a word that this form is not attested in the text corpus and + before a word that it is an emended form.
[2] Glaue/Helm (1910).
[3] Haffner (1971).
[4] Ebbinghaus (1989).

be the edition given in Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013) but the improved edition in Falluomini (2014).[5]

2. Scribal features

On the pure graphic level there is not much that is worth mentioning:[6]

a. Abbreviations of the *nomina sacra* follow the normal pattern:

1. *guþ* 'god' is abbreviated as: *gþ* (12x), *gþa* (2x);

2. *frauja* 'lord' is spelled as: *fa* (11x), *fins* (1x), *fin* (1x), *fn* [the alternative *fan* is not chosen] (1x);

3. *Iesus* 'Jesus' is found as: *iu* (1x);

4. *Xristus* 'Christ' appears as: *xu* [the alternative *xau* is not chosen] (1x).

b. Other abbreviations:

1. The nasal *n* is abbreviated with a superscript line in the words *þan* (9x) and *þannu* (1x).

2. There is perhaps the abbreviation of *diabaulus/diabulus* as *dia* (1x).[7]

c. Scribal errors (as indicated in Falluomini (2014)):

1. *þair*: *þair<h>*;

2. *qa*: *qa<þ>*;

3. *hauhairtaim*: *hauh<h>airtaim*;

4. *hauhairteins*: *hauh<h>airteins*;

5. *hauhairtein*: *hauh<h>airtein*;

6. *frawaurjai*: *frawaur<k>jai*;

7. *haitan*: *haitan<d>*;

8. *snd*: *s<i>nd*;

---

[5] In the edition of Falluomini (2014) the identification of Ps. 11 (12):2 should be attributed to Sergio Neri (Jena).

[6] Cf. Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 139–140); Falluomini (2014: 284).

[7] The abbreviation *dia* is likely to be incorrect, if the rereading of the passage by Peter Alexander Kerkhof as *auzandil* is correct (also approved by Carla Falluomini). In the following, this word will not be dealt with.

9. *sagqids*: *sag<g>qids*;

10. *jh*: *j<a>h*.

    Whereas 2. *qa<þ>*, 6. *frawaur<k>jai*, 7. *haitan<d>*, 8. *s<i>nd* and 10. *j<a>h* can be regarded as simple scribal errors,[8] the others require a bit more attention. Numbers 1., 3., 4., 5. all share a missing *h*. Of these cases 1. *þair* could point to an assimilation of *-rh* to *-r* as in *þairwakands* (Lk 6:12) versus *þairhwakandans* (Lk 2:8).[9] The forms 3., 4. and 5. with *hauhairt-* instead of *hauhhairt-*[10] also seem to point to a weaker pronunciation of *h* before a vowel (the same writing with a single *-h-* in this word is found in 2. Tim 3:2B).[11] As it should not be the object of an edition to transform this late text into a pseudo-Wulfilanian one, the loss of *-h*(-) should in my opinion be preserved in the text. The emendation in 9. of <sagqids> into *saggqids* is not necessary at all because before *q* the writing of the nasal as *g* is the rule, and its spelling as *gg* the exception (although the spelling *gg* before *q* occurs more often than before *g*).[12] That *sagqids* is indeed the correct form for this manuscript can easily be seen by the form *sagqanana*, which has (by mistake?) not been emended into *sag<g>qanana* by Falluomini[13] (it is further confirmed by the form <faurasuggwanin>). I guess that the motive for the emendation is to be found in the consistent use of <ggq> in Ambrosianus B that Falluomini regards to be close paleographically.[14]

    In conclusion, the emendations in 1., 3., 4., 5. and 9. are misleading, since the spellings in the *Codex Bononiensis* apparently reflect the language/writing of the author/writer.

d. Others[15]

1. In two cases the expected outcome of the *Auslautverhärtung* before *s* is not written: *mitads*, *ufsagqids* with *d* (against *unfroþs*, *inmaidiþs* with thorn). This

---

[8] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 284).

[9] Cf. Krause (1968: 133); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 84).

[10] Cf. Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 143–144).

[11] Cf. Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 69–70).

[12] Cf. Krause (1968: 69); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 72).

[13] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 301).

[14] Falluomini (2014: 284); cf. also Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 144).

[15] Cf. Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 144); Falluomini (2014: 284).

phenomenon is found quite often in the Gothic manuscripts, compare *ataugids* [1. Kor 15:5A, 1 Tit 3:16A] for *ataugiþs*; *gods* [Jh 10:11, Lk 6:35.43, 2Tit 2:3B] for *goþs*; *mitads* [Lk 6:38] for *mitaþs*; *gawasids* [Lk 16:19] for *gawasiþs*).[16] This could point to a neutralisation of *þ* and *đ* in this position (comparable phenomena in other languages could be adduced for that). However, I always wonder why the *d*-forms are not consistently emended in the editions.

3. Grammar

The grammar of the fragment largely follows that found in Wulfila's Bible translation.

a. Substantives

1. *a/ja/wa*-stems:

		masculine	neuter
sg.	nom.	*andbahts*	*witoþ* (2x), *g(u)þ* (10x)
	gen.	*[hi]minis*	
	dat.	*aiwa* (2x), *skapa* (2x), *himina* (3x), *jiuhta*?	*kunja, leika* (2x), *g(u)þa* (2x), *mela, liuþa, jiuhta*?
	acc.	*munþ, maurgin*	*kuni, þiuþ, g(u)þ, hiwi, hawi*
	voc.		*g(u)þ*
pl.	nom.	*þiudanos, wulfos*	
	gen.		*lambe*
	dat.	*wairam*	*tojam* (2x)
	acc.		*waurstwa*

The dat.sg. *aiwa* shows the regular ending. The noun *aiws** is a mixed *a/i*-stem (acc.sg. *aiw*, gen.sg. *aiwis*, dat.sg. *aiwa*, acc.pl. *aiwins*, gen.pl. *aiwe*, dat.pl. *aiwam*).[17] In the singular, the inflections of the *a*- and the *i*-stems are identical, so it cannot be determined from the pure form of *aiwa* whether we are dealing with the *a*- or the

---

[16] Cf. Krause (1968: 130–131); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 76–77).
[17] Cf. Krause (1968: 158); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 91).

i-stem; however, the word is listed under the *a*-stems because we are dealing with a secondarily thematised *u*-stem: *aiws** < *PGmc. **aiwa-* < **h₂ói̯-u-* + *-o-*.[18]

2. *ō/jō/wō*-stems:

		feminine
sg.	nom.	*marka*
	gen.	*Saudomos, fraistubnjos*
	dat.	
	acc.	*lauhmunja*
pl.	nom.	*stauos*
	gen.	
	dat.	*þiudom, wastjom*
	acc.	

Of these forms, only the genitive singular *Saudomos* is worth noting. The only other attestation of a genitive of the name *Saudauma* is *Saudaumje* (Mt 11:24), which is a plural. Fluctuation in loan names is quite frequent in Gothic.[19]

3. *i/ō*-stems:

		feminine
sg.	nom.	*naseins* (2x), *[þi]uþeins*
	gen.	*naseinais* (2x), *midjasweipainais*
	dat.	*gawargeinai*
	acc.	
pl.	nom.	
	gen.	
	dat.	
	acc.	

---

[18] Cf. Casaretto (2004: 200–201).
[19] Cf. Schulze (1966: 527–535); Lühr (1985).

There are no irregularities.

4. *i*-stems:

		masculine	feminine
sg.	nom.		*magaþs*
	gen.		
	dat.	*garda*	
	acc.		*anst, maht*
pl.	nom.		
	gen.	*apaustaule*	*wailadede, wiste*
	dat.		*frawaurhtim*
	acc.		

Of these forms, *apaustaule* shows the regular *i*-stem genitive plural ending (*apaustaulus* is a mixed *i/u*-stem: nom.sg. *-us*, acc.sg. *-u*, gen.sg. *-aus/-us*, nom.pl. *-eis*, acc.pl. *-uns*, gen.pl. *-e*, dat.pl. *-um*).[20]

5. *u*-stems:

		masculine	feminine
sg.	nom.	*praufetus* (3x), *airus, wulþus*	
	gen.	*da[u]þaus*	
	dat.	*praufetu, diabulau*	
	acc.	*diabaulu, sunu, iu, xu*	
pl.	nom.		
	gen.		
	dat.	*magum*	*handam*
	acc.	*magu[n]s*	

---

[20] Cf. Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 112).

In the singular, the *Codex Bononiensis* mostly displays the 'regular' endings (nom. *-us* [not *-aus*], gen. *-aus* [not *-us*], acc. *-u* [not *-au*]).[21] Only in the dative are both variants found, namely the normal ending in *-au* and the deviant ending in *-u*. This might indicate that both variants could be chosen at random in the language of the author (though I cannot completely rule out that *diabulau* could be a spelling error for *diabaulu*, because in the other form *-aul-* is written[22]). The form *handam* is irregular and has no justification.[23] Hence this form must be included into the list of '*a* for *u*', e.g. *gaunoþa* (2 Kor 7:7AB) for [+]*gaunoþu*; *ina* (Rm 10:14A) for *inu*; *afsnaiþ* (Lk 15:27) for [+]*ufsnaiþ*; *witad-u* (Jh 13:12) for [+]*witud-u*. If, as was suggested to me by Michiel de Vaan, *handam* belongs to the first member of a compound (the letters that follow are illegible), to be segmented as *handa-m…*, we could be dealing with a deviating later (perhaps East Gothic) compound vowel *-a-* instead of *-u-* (cf. e.g. *hardaba* [2 Kor 13:10A] for *harduba*).[24]

6. *n*-stems:

		masculine	neuter	feminine
sg.	nom.	*fa* (11x), *ahma*, *[a]uhsa*		
	gen.	*fins*		*hauhairteins*, *gagudeins*
	dat.	*fin*	*namin*, *watin*, *hairtin*,	*managein*, *marein*, *kilþein*
	acc.	*fan*	*namo* (2x)	*managein*, *hauhairtein*, *marein*
pl.	nom.			
	gen.		*hairtona*	
	dat.			
	acc.			

There are no irregularities.

---

[21] Cf. Krause (1968: 159–161); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 100–102); Neri (2003).

[22] For the vacillation between *diabaul-* and *diabul-*, cf. Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 35).

[23] According to Falluomini (personal communication), a reading *handum* is not possible.

[24] Cf. to *a* for *u* Marchand (1973: 50).

7. Other stems:

		masculine	feminine
sg.	nom.	*manna* (2x)	*mitads*
	gen.		
	dat.	*broþr*	
	acc.	*mannan*	
pl.	nom.	*reiks*	
	gen.	*manne* (2x)	
	dat.	*mannam*	
	acc.		

The Gothic paradigm of *manna* shows forms of the *n*-stems and of the consonant stems: sg. nom. *manna*, gen. *mans*, dat. *mann*, acc. *mannan*, pl. nom. *mans*, *mannans*, gen. *manne*, dat. *mannan*, acc. *mans*, *mannans*.[25] It is a pity that no crucial forms of *manna* are transmitted in the text: it would have been interesting to see if the consonantal forms were still present at that time.

8. Adjectives:

		masculine	neuter
sg.	nom.	*weihs, airkns, waihnahs, galeiks* (2x), *unfroþs, sama* (2x), *unsibjis* (2x), *leiks* (2x?), *afguda, unselja*	
	gen.		
	dat.	*agisleikamma, midjamma, swesamma*	
	acc.		
pl.	nom.	*uns[ibj]a[i, unb]r[ukj]ai*	*managa*
	gen.		
	dat.	*unsib[jaim, frawau]rhtaim, weihaim, hauhairtaim, haunidaim*	
	acc.		

---

[25] Cf. Krause (1968: 170); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 110); Casaretto (2004: 44–45).

The forms are without any irregularities. In addition, the syntactic use of the weak and strong forms is as would be expected. The only forms that gave me pause for thought were *weihs* and *airkns*, for which perhaps weak adjectival forms might be expected. The strong forms can, however, be explained by the close following of the Greek *Vorlage*.

9. Pronouns

There are no irregularities in the pronouns:[26] *ainƕarjammeh*, *ƕas* (3x), *ƕis* (2x), *ƕana* (3x), *ik* (2x), *mis*, *mik* (5x), *is* (2x), *imma* (2x), *ina*, *ize* (4x), *izos*, *im*, *jainaim*, *jainans*, *izwis*, *meins* (2x), *meina*, *meinamma* (2x), *meinaim*, *sa* (8x), *þis* (6x), *þamma* (6x), *þana* (2x), *þata*, *þize*, *þans*, *saei* (10x), *þizei*, *þammei* (2x), *þanei* (3x), *þatei*, *þaiei* (2x), *þaimei*, *seina*, *seinaizos*, *seinamma*, *seinaim*, *sis*, *sik*, *silba*, *silbin*, *sumai*, *þeina*, *þeinai*, *þeinamma*, *þeinaizos* (2x), *þu* (2x), *þus* (2x), *þuk* (3x), *þuei* (6x), *unsar*, *weis*, *unsis* (8x). In the dat./acc. of *weis* only the 'long' form *unsis* is attested.[27]

10. Numerals

The numerals – *anþar* (2x), *anþara*, *þrim*, *þrins* – are as to be expected.

11. Strong verbs

In the strong verbs, there are no deviations: *andstandiþ*, *atdraga*, *atgiban*, *bairgais*, *brinnandin*, *daig*, *driusandan*, *fairlag*, *faurasuggwanin*, *fratrudan*, *fraþjiþ*, *gabairiþ*, *gabauiþ*, *galis*, *ganimiþ*, *ganisan*, *gasaƕ*, *gataih*, gibiþ, *insakan*, *inwidandans*, *nemum*, *qam*, *qiþan*, *qiþiþ* (2x), *qaþ* (13x), *qiþanda* (3x), *qiþandin*, *qiþanin*, *sagqanana*, *ist* (17x), *sind*, *sijai*, *standandan*, *trudan*, *urrinnanda*, *usdraus*, *ushniwun*, *usqam*, *usquman*, *usþinsai*, *wairþa*, *warþ* (6x), *waurþun*, *wilwandans*, *was* (3x), *wesun*, *wisandam*.

It is a pity that of the verb *digan** only the preterite form *daig* is transmitted. Thus, also this new text cannot help us decide if the present of this verb is a

---

[26] In the following, the forms will only be listed because tables would be too complex and the information, therefore, too confusing.

[27] On the long and short forms in the acc. of *weis*, cf. Krause (1968: 192); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 132–133). For the functional distinction between *uns* and *unsis* cf. Snædal (2010).

deviating zero grade present *digan** or if the relevant form *digandin* shows a spelling error *i* for *ei*, so that the infinitive would be *deigan** (the only attestations are *þamma digandin* [Rm 9:20A], *gadigans* [1 Tim 2:13A], *gadigands* [1 Tim 2:13B], *digana* [2 Tim 2:20B]).[28]

There is one syntactic problem regarding *qiþanda* (in: *jah skapa [h]rọpeiþ qiþanda*; *qiþanda: in guþa naseins meina …*; *qiþanda: Nist auk þan …*). In all three cases, the weak form *qiþanda* is exceptional. In the light of the Gothic Bible, *qiþands* would be the expected form.[29] It should be noted that in the Gothic Bible the weak form *qiþanda* is not attested at all.

12. Weak verbs

The following weak verbs are attested: *afdomeiþ, ananamnida, awiliudo, bauam, bikausjands, fairjais, fijands* (2x)*, fraqistnam, frawardida, frawaurkjai, gabauiþ, gakannida, galaubjan, galaubjandane, gamaurgeiþ, gameliþ, gamelidin, ganasjiþ, ganasides* (5x)*, gaskeiriþ, gatawida* (2x)*, gawargeiþ, gawitais, habaidedun, hausideduþ, hropeiþ, inmaidiþs, inriurida, insandei, lauseiþ, matida, nasjan, nasjai, nasei* (7x)*, taujands, ufsagqids, usbugjondane, waurkjai, wenjandans*. They are unproblematic except for one form, namely *usbugjondane*. This is a genitive plural masculine or neuter of the present participle pointing to a weak verb of the second class, *usbugjon**. However, the other attestations of this verb (also without a prefix and with the prefix *fra-*) point to a weak verb of the first class (-)*bugjan*.[30] If such had been the case here too, we would expect a form [+]*usbugjandane*. So one might conclude that the spelling with *-o-* is a scribal error. And indeed, there is one instance of such an error in the Codex Argenteus, namely in *ainoho* (Lk 8:42) for [+]*ainaho*.[31] In *ainoho*, however, the *-o-* can either be explained from the analogical influence of *ainohun* or as an anticipatory error due to the following *o* of the ending. For *usbugjondane*, such an explanation is impossible. Therefore, if *usbugjondane* indeed stands for *usbugjandane, a simple scribal error must be

[28] Cf. Krause (1968: 230); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 150); *LIV* (140–141).
[29] On the coexistence of strong and weak forms in the participle present, cf. Krause (1968: 174).
[30] Cf. Snædal (2013: 85).
[31] Cf. Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 122).

assumed. That said, in some rare cases, a fluctuation between weak verbs of the first and second class is found. Besides *hausjan* 'to hear' we find also *hausjon* (Mk 4:33, Lk 5:15, Jh 6:60), *hausjondam* (2 Tim 2:14B); besides *gabeisteiþ* (1 Kor 5:6A) – so with an infinitive *ga-beistjan** 'to leaven' – there is also a present participle *unbeistjodai* (1 Kor 5:7A), indicating an infinitive *ga-beistjon**; also compare the variation between *suþjandans* (2 Tim 4:3A) and *suþjondans* (2 Tim 4:3B [the reading is not completely secured]), which could point to *suþjan** besides *suþjon** 'to tickle'.[32] Hence a side form *bugjon**, besides *bugjan**, is a reasonable possibility here.

4. Lexicon

The last part of this overview will be devoted to the lexicon. Mostly, of course, the lexicon coincides with the transmitted lexicon, consisting predominantly of words also used by Wulfila in his translation of the Bible.

However, some words are attested in the *Codex Bononiensis* for the first time in Gothic:

a. *agisleiks**: The edition of Falluomini (2014: 301) gives the following text:[33]

12   þuei jainans þrins magu[n]s ananeian aza
13   reian mesael us handam....u.a jah in agisa
14   leikamma auhna funins brinnandin gana
15   sides·

In this text version, *auhna funins brinnandin* would be an apposition to *in agisa leikamma*. When I first dealt with this text extensively, I thought that it would be more logical to edit it in the following way: *in agisaleikamma auhna funins brinnandin*, so that *funins brinnandin* would be an apposition to *in agisaleikamma auhna*. This solution was also proposed by Michiel de Vaan after reading the manuscript of my talk. However, I had discarded this possibility because I was not able to explain the -*a*-. During a chat with Carla Falluomini (06.07.2015), I asked her if the -*a*- really was existent. To my surprise, she answered that a reading *in*

---

[32] Cf. Krause (1968: 243); Braune/Heidermanns (2004: 161).

[33] The edition of Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 117) is in this case not enlightening.

agis is more likely than *in agisa* because what was hitherto read as *a* is more likely to be a stain.[34] This leads to an adjective *agisleiks**, which was previously unattested in Gothic. *Agisleiks** would continue PGmc. **agis-līka-* 'awful, terrible, horrible', which is also reflected in OHG *egislīh*, MHG *egeslich*, G (dialectal) *aischlich, eis(e)lig, aislik, eischlich*, OS *egislīh*, MLG *eyslīk*, ODu. *egislīk*, MDu. *eiselijc*, Du. *ijselijk*, OE *egeslīc*, ME *ei(e)slīch*.[35]

b. *dagands**:[36] The attested form *dagand* must be, syntactically speaking, a dative singular. As such, it can only belong to the group of the *nd*-substantives, a class that consists of substantivized present participles. Currently, the following are known in Gothic: *allwaldands, bisitands**, *daupjands, fi(j)ands, fraweitands, nasjands, frijonds, fraujinonds**, *gardawaldands, gibands, merjands, midumonds* and *talzjands**.[37] These nouns are derived from verbs, in this case from a verb *dagan of the third weak class, continuing PGmc. **đagai̯-/-i̯e/a-* 'to dawn'. This verb has parallels in OHG *tagēn*, MLG, MDu. *dagen*, OIcl., Icl., Far., Norw. *daga*, older Dan. *dage*, OSwed. *daghas*. This PGmc. derivation of the substantive PGmc. **đaga-* 'day' has a parallel in verbs like OHG *nahtēn* to *naht* 'night' and OHG *abandēn* to *aband* 'evening'. Besides this derivation, there is also a weak verb of the second class, PGmc. **đagōi̯e/a-*, which is continued in OE *dagian*, ME *dauen*.[38] However, the semantics remain somewhat unclear. The underlying meaning of the verb must have been 'to become day', which would mean that the participle meant 'becoming day'; a *nomen agentis* derived from this is difficult to imagine ('the day becomer'). In Old High German, the word could be used to translate, for example, Latin *illuminare*. If the same semantics, 'to light, to illuminate', also existed in Gothic, then the agent noun *dagands** could have matched the Latin word *illuminator*. This word is used in ecclesiastic Latin literature to indicate the Holy Spirit (in contrast

[34] She also remarked that *us* is a more probable reading than *in*; *us* is indeed the expected word in this context.
[35] Cf. *EWA* (2, 962).
[36] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 296).
[37] Cf. Krause (1968: 169); Braune/Ebbinghaus (2004: 107–108); Casaretto (2004: 437–444).
[38] Cf. Fick (1909: 199).

to God, who is the *auctor* and the Son, who is the *creator*). Therefore, in my opinion, *dagands** could be a loan translation for Latin *illuminator*.

This is interesting, in that it seems to show that – because *dagands** is apparently a newly-coined translation of Latin *illuminator* – the *nd*-stems were a productive stem class still in later Gothic times. Although this contradicts the general decline of the consonantal stems in the single Germanic languages,[39] it could have a parallel in Goth. *midumonds* 'mediator'. This word is likely to be a new formation translating Gr. *μεσίτης* 'mediator'.[40]

c. *fairjan*:[41] The attested form *fairjais* is a second singular optative active of an otherwise unattested verb *fairjan** 'to remove', belonging to the first weak class. It continues a PGmc. verb **fer̥i̯e/a-* that is also continued in OHG *firren*, MHG *virren*, OS *firrian*, ODu. *firron*, OE *firran*, OIcl. *firra*.[42] The verb is a derivation of the PGmc. adverb **fererō > *ferrō* 'far', continued in OHG *fer*, *ferro*, MHG *verr(e)*, OS *fer(re)*, MLG *vēr(e)*, ODu. *ferro*, MDu. *verre*, Du. *ver*, OFris. *fīr*, WFris. *fier*, OE *feor(r)*, ME *fer(re)*, E *far*, OIcl. *fjarri*, Norw. *fjeri*, older Dan. *fjaer*, Swed. *fjär*.[43] A different derivation is present in PGmc. **ferai̯-/-i̯e/a-*, which is continued in OHG *ferrēn*, MHG. *verren*, MLG *vēren*, *verren*, MDu. *verren*, OFris. *firia*, OE *feorrian*, ME *verren*.[44]

d. *jiuht(s)*:[45] The attested form *jiuhta* is a dative singular of either a masculine or a neuter *a*-stem, whence we may reconstruct a nominative *jiuhts** or *jiuht**. The meaning of the word in the context is doubtful; Falluomini (2014: 296) gives as a translation "'Joch'? 'Zugtier'?". Because the text continues that he ate hay like an ox, the latter translation seems more probable to me. Falluomini (2014: 296) refers to OE *geoht* 'yoke'. However, this word continues a zero grade form PGmc. **i̯uχta-* n.,

---

[39] However, it finds a parallel in the still productive Gothic *u*-stems, whereas the *u*-stems in the other Germanic languages are by and by given up.

[40] Cf. Casaretto 2004: 438, 443. This is not the place to discuss if there are possibly stylistic reasons behind the retention of this word formation pattern.

[41] Cf. Finazzi/Tornaghi (2013: 145–146); Falluomini (2014: 296).

[42] Cf. *EWA* (3, 306–307).

[43] Cf. *EWA* (3, 157–159).

[44] Cf. *EWA* (3, 172).

[45] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 296).

which is also continued in OHG *gi-joht*,[46] and is not an *e*-grade PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}e\underset{\sim}{u}\chi ta$-*, which the Gothic form presupposes. Now, theoretically PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}e\underset{\sim}{u}\chi ta$-* could be interpreted as a Vṛddhi-derivation of PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}u\chi ta$-* 'yoke', that is, meaning '[the animal] belonging to the yoke' = 'draught animal'. However, in view of the accepted Vṛddhi-formations in Germanic, this solution seems less likely on semantic grounds. Nevertheless, the form PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}u\chi ta$-* is helpful for the solution of the Gothic word (this follows the interpretation given by Sergio Neri). It continues PIE *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}ug$-tó-* (continued in Ved. *yuktá-*, YAv. *yuxta-*),[47] an original verbal adjective ('harnessed'), substantivized in PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}u\chi ta$-* n. 'the harnessed [that, which is harnessed]' = 'yoke'. In *NIL* (399), a PIE adjective, namely *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}e\underset{\sim}{u}g$-tó-* 'harnessed' (continued in Gr. ζευγτός, Lith. *jáugtas*), is listed. One could assume that this adjective was substantivized in PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}e\underset{\sim}{u}\chi ta$-* m. 'the harnessed [he, who is harnessed]' = 'draught animal'. However, this seems unlikely in view of the PIE morphology. First, Gr. ζευγτός is rather an inner-Greek neo-formation, analogically built upon the verb form with full grade. Secondly, Lith. *jáugtas* can continue an abstract formation PIE *$\ast i\acute{o}ug$-to-*. This leaves PGmc. *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}e\underset{\sim}{u}\chi ta$-* isolated. It is best explained by starting from the verbal adjective PIE *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}ug$-tó-*. This could be substantivized as an *e*-grade with accent retraction as PIE *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}\acute{e}\underset{\sim}{u}g$-to-* (cf. PIE *$\ast\hat{g}\underset{\circ}{n}h_1$-tó-* [> PGmc. *$\ast kun\eth a$-*]: *$\ast\hat{g}\acute{e}nh_1$-to-* [> PGmc. *$\ast ken\not{p}a$-*][48]), so PIE *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}ug$-tó-* 'harnessed' → PIE *$\ast\underset{\sim}{i}\acute{e}\underset{\sim}{u}g$-to-* 'the harnessed one'. As a consequence, *jiuhta* is best regarded as a dative singular of a masculine *a*-stem *jiuhts**.

e. *skaps**:[49] The attested form *skapa* is a dative singular of a masculine *a*-stem *skaps**. In the context (being a parallel to *dagand*), it is clear that it must have the meaning 'creator'. It can therefore be regarded as a derivation from the strong verb PGmc. *$\ast skap\underset{\sim}{i}e/a$-* 'to create', continued in Goth. *-skapjan*, OHG *skepfen*, MHG, G *schaffen*, OS *skeppian*, MLG *scheppen*, ODu. *skeppen*, MDu., Du. *scheppen*, OE *scieppan*, ME *shapen*, E *shape*, OFris. *skeppa*, WFris. *skeppe*, OIcl. *skepja*, ODan.

---

[46] Cf. *EWA* (4, 287).
[47] Cf. (399).
[48] Cf. *EWA* (5, 515–518)
[49] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 296).

skapæ, Dan. *skabe*, Norw. *skape*, OSwed., Swed. *skapa*.[50] Now, in the other Germanic languages a verbal noun PGmc. **skapa-* is also existent, continued in OHG *skaf*, OS *skap*, OE -*sceap*, OIcl. *skap*.[51] However, these words are neuter, all meaning 'that, what is created' = 'creation' (PGmc. **skapa-* n.). Therefore, they are not identical to this Gothic word, which is a *nomen agentis*. The Gothic word must continue PGmc. **skapa-* m. 'creator'. The same difference between EGmc. and NWGmc. languages is apparent in a derivation from the verb PGmc. **wreke/a-*, namely Goth. *wraks* 'persuer', cf. Casaretto (2004: 53): "< germ. **wrak-a-*, vgl. ae. *wræc* 'Exil', as. *wrak-sīđ* 'Weg in die Verbannung, Verfolgung'; deverbale Ableitung zu got. *wrikan* 'verfolgen' …, das nur im Got. als Nomen agentis belegt ist, sonst Abstraktum 'Verfolgung'; es liegen also unabhängige Bildungen vor". This picture does not even change if *wraks* is identified as an *i*-stem (though this is less likely, cf. Casaretto (2004: 53): "Aufgrund der Beleglage könnte das got. Wort formal auch auf einen *i*-St. **wrak-i-* zurückgehen; dort sind jedoch Personenbezeichnungen, die neben germ. Verben stehen, ebenfalls selten"), because also *skapa* could continue an *i*-stem and then be compared with the compound member OHG -*scaf*, E -*ship* with feminine gender.

f. *liuþ**:[52] The attested form *liuþa* is a dative singular of a neuter *a*-stem *liuþ** 'song'. The word is listed by Falluomini (2014: 296) under the section "Einige Wörter sind sonst nur mit anderen Präfixen oder in Komposita belegt". This is a bit misleading. The Gothic word *liuþ** derives from PGmc. **leu̯þa-*, continued in OHG *liod*, MHG *liet*, G *lied*, OS -*lioth*, MLG *lēt*, MDu. *liet*, Du. *lied*, WFris. *liet*, OE *lēođ*, ME *lēth*, *leoth*, *leod*, OIcl. *ljóð*, Icl. *ljóð*.[53] For Gothic, Falluomini (214: 296) refers to the noun *awi-liuþ* 'thanks'. However, in *awiliuþ* the *þ* is the result of Auslautverhärtung, as is shown by the case forms with -*d*- (which have also intruded into the nominative/accusative singular *awiliud*) and by the derivative verb *awiliudon* 'to thank' (weak verb class II). Therefore, this word continues a Verner variant PGmc.

---

[50] Cf. Kroonen (2013: 440).
[51] Cf. Orel (2003: 334).
[52] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 296).
[53] Cf. *EWA* (5, 1336–1338).

-leu̯đa-. The Grammatischer Wechsel is due to the different stress between the simplex and the compound form. It is, of course, clear that the form PGmc. *leu̯þa-* also existed in Gothic in view of the derivations *liuþon* (weak verb class II) 'to praise' and *liuþareis* (m. *ja*-stem) 'singer'.[54] Now the *Codex Bononiensis* provides us with the material proof for this form.

g. *leiks*:[55] This adjective is probably attested two times in the *Bononiensis*, namely as nom.sg.m. (strong) *leiks* (2x? [both in the combination *swa leiks*, so *swaleiks* could perhaps also be read]). If *leiks* is indeed a separate word, it would be the most intriguing word in the text from a linguistic point of view. Until now, PGmc. *-līka-* was only attested as the second member of compounds, mostly in PGmc. *ga-līka-*, continued in Goth. *galeiks*, OHG *gilīh*, MHG *g(e)līh*, G *gleich*, OS *gilīk*, MLG *g(e)līk*, ODu. *gelīk*, MDu. *gelijc*, Du. *gelijk*, OE *gelīc*, ME *līch*, *līk*, E *like*, OFris. *līk*, WFris. *gelyk*, OIcl. *líkr*, OSwed. *liker*.[56] Now it is clear that this second member *-līka-* belongs as an exocentric adjective (*ga-līka-* in the sense of 'having the same shape') to the substantive PGmc. *līka-* 'body', continued in Goth. *leik*, OHG *līh*, MHG. *līch*, G *Leiche*, OS *līk*, MLG *līk*, *like*, MDu. *lijc*, *like*, Du. *lijk*, OE *līc*, ME *līch*, *liche*, *like*, E *lich*, OFris. *līk*, *like*, WFris. *lyk*, OIcl., Icl., Far. *lík*, ODan. *lyk*, Dan. *lig*, Norw. *lik*, OSwed. *līk*, Swed. *lik*.[57] The substantive is seen as a substantivation of an unattested adjective PGmc. *līka-* 'alike'. That such an adjective existed is not only clear from Lith. *lýgus* 'similar', but also from Germanic verbal derivations that presuppose this adjective: PGmc. *līkōi̯e/a-* and PGmc. *līkai̯-/-i̯e/a-*. If *leiks* is a separate word, this presupposed adjective seems then indeed to be attested in the *Codex Bononiensis*.

[54] Cf. Snædal (2013: 335).
[55] Cf. Falluomini (2014: 297).
[56] Cf. Heidermanns (1993: 381–383); *EWA* (4, 299–300).
[57] Cf. *EWA* (5, 1263–1265).

5. Conclusion

All in all, the linguistic status of the *Codex Bononiensis* is as could be expected. It mirrors to a large extent the classical Gothic language. The most noticeable feature in the phonology is the loss of *h* (which is also found in other manuscripts and is a late feature in Gothic). Only a few deviations are found in the morphology of the fragment (*Saudomos*, *handam*, *usbugjondane*). Of primary interest are, however, the new words that appear in the manuscript (*agisleiks**, *dagands**, *fairjan**, *jiuht[s]**, *skaps**, *liuþ** and *leiks*).

References

Braune, Wilhelm, and Frank Heidermanns. 2004. *Gotische Grammatik. Mit Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis*. 20th edition. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Casaretto, Antje. 2004. *Nominale Wortbildung der gotischen Sprache. Die Derivation der Substantive*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Ebbinghaus, Ernst A. 1989. The Gothic material from the cemetery at Hács Béndekpuszta. *General Linguistics* 29, 79–83.

EWA = Lloyd, Albert, Otto Springer, Rosemarie Lühr, et al. 1988ff. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen. Bd. 1ff. und Wörterverzeichnisse zu Bd. 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Falluomini, Carla. 2014. Zum Gotischen Fragment aus Bologna. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 143, 281–305.

Fick, August. 1909. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Teil 3: Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit*. Unter Mitwirkung von Hjalmar Falk gänzlich umgearbeitet von Alf Torp. 4th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Finazzi, Bianca Rosa, and Paola Tornaghi. 2010. *Gothica Bononiensia*: Analisi linguistica e filologia di un nuovo document. *Aevum* 87, 113–153.

Glaue, Karl Leopold Paul, and Karl Helm. 1910. Das gotisch-lateinische Bibelfragment der Großherzoglichen Universitätsbibliothek Gießen. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 11, 1–38.

Haffner, Franz. 1971. Fragment der Ulfilas-Bibel in Speyer. *Pfälzer Heimat* 22, 1–5.

Heidermanns, Frank. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Krause, Wolfgang. 1968. *Handbuch des Gotischen*. 3rd edition. München: C.H. Beck.

Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

LIV = Rix, Helmut, et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. 2., erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin J. Kümmel und Helmut Rix*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Lühr, Rosemarie. 1985. Zur Deklination griechischer und lateinischer Wörter in Wulfilas gotischen Bibelübersetzung. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46, 139–155.

Marchand, James. 1973. *The sounds and phonemes of Wulfila's Gothic*. The Hague: Mouton.

Neri, Sergio. 2003. *I sostantivi in -u del Gotico. Morfologia e Preistoria*. Innsbruck: IBS.

NIL = Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, and Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Orel, Vladimir. 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Schulze, Wilhelm. 1966. *Kleine Schriften*. 2., erweiterte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Snædal, Magnús. 2010. *Uns / unsis* and Colloquial Gothic. *NOWELE* 58/59, 302–322.

Snædal, Magnús. 2013. *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic. II: Concordance*. 3rd edition. Reykjavík: University of Iceland.