

The Nordic Languages

An International Handbook of the History
of the North Germanic Languages

Edited by

Oskar Bandle (main editor) · Kurt Braunmüller

Ernst Håkon Jahr · Allan Karker

Hans-Peter Naumann · Ulf Teleman

Consulting Editors:

● Lennart Elmevik · Gun Widmark

Volume 1

Offprint

●

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
2002

and images, and the technology of storage and distribution. In an electronic edition it is possible to link several types of transcriptions (e.g. diplomatic and normalized) to one facsimile, and instead of a selective critical apparatus, the editor may include the whole or any part of the manuscript tradition. Also, the complete edition may be stored and distributed on a number of digital media (cd-rom, dvd etc.) and accessed through the Internet.

8. Literature (a selection)

Bekker-Nielsen, Hans (1979), *Norrøn filologi*. In: *Københavns Universitet 1479–1979*, vol. 9, Part 2, Copenhagen, 145–176.

Collijn, Isak (1944), *Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet 1843–1943: Historik*. (vol. 56). Stockholm/Uppsala.

Foulet, Alfred and Speer, Mary Blakely (1979), *On editing Old French texts*. Lawrence, Kansas.

Haugen, Odd Einar (1992), *Stamtre og tekstlandskap. Studiar i resensjonsmetodikk med grunnlag i Niðrstigningar saga*. 2 vols. Dr. philos. diss. Bergen.

Haugen, Odd Einar (1994), *Utgjeving av norrøne tekster i Noreg. Eit historisk tilbakeblikk og ei metodisk vurdering*. In: *Nordica Bergensia* 1, 137–174.

Haugen, Odd Einar (1999), *Datamaskinelle metoder i tekstkritikk og tekstutgjeving*. In: *Datahåndbok for humanister* (ed. Espen Aarseth). Oslo, 147–171.

Holm, Gösta (1972), *Carl Johan Schlyter and textual scholarship*. In: *SoS* 1972, 48–80.

Holm-Olsen, Ludvig (1981), *Lys over norrøn kultur: Norrøne studier i Norge*. Oslo.

Kousgård Sørensen, John (1989), *Om udgivelse af ældre danske tekster*. In: *Forskningsprofiler* (eds. Bente Holmberg et al.), København, 221–237.

Lindroth, Sten (1975), *Svensk lärdomshistoria*. Vol. 2, *Stormaktstiden*. Stockholm.

Maas, Paul (1960), *Textkritik*. 4th ed. Leipzig.

Olrik Frederiksen, Britta (1991), *Variantapparatet og sproghistorien. Om en diskussion med principielle perspektiver, ført af udgiverne af "Danmarks gamle Landskabslove"*. In: *3. Møde om Udforskningen af Dansk Sprog* (eds. Mette Kunøe/Erik Vive Larsen), Aarhus, 75–88.

Olrik Frederiksen, Britta (1994), *Håndskriftet og stamtræet*. In: *I tekstens tegn* (eds. Jørgen Hunosøe and Esther Kielberg), København, 33–64.

Olrik Frederiksen, Britta (1997), *Lidt om dansk sproghistorie og editionspraksis før og nu, med et*

sideblik til det norrøne. In: *Íslensk málsaga og textafræði* (ed. Úlfar Bragason), Reykjavík, 22–40.

Skautrup, Peter (1947), *Det danske sprogs historie*. Vol. 2, *Fra Unionsbrevet til Danske lov*. København.

Solberg, Olav (1996), *Treng vi ei vitskapleg utgåve av norske mellomalderballadar?* In: *MM* 1996, 129–38.

Timpanaro, Sebastiano (1981), *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*. Rev. ed. Padova.

Wollin, Lars (1991), *Ska vi forska om fornsvenska?* In: *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 2 (eds. Sven-Göran Malmgren/Bo Ralph) (Nordistica Gothoburgensia 14), Göteborg, 239–57.

Wollin, Lars (1995), *Konungastyrelsen – en edition i tiden?* In: *SS*, New series 5, 121–51.

9. A few Internet resources

The Medieval Nordic Text Archive (Menota) is a collaboration between ten editorial departments and societies in the Nordic countries. The archive will include electronic texts in Latin as well as in Old Icelandic, Old Norwegian, Old Danish and Old Swedish: www.menota.org

The Arnamagnæan digitization project is presently in its infancy, but aims at making an electronic catalogue of the entire Arnamagnæan collection, with links to digitized images of each manuscript and, where possible, transcriptions and supplementary material: www.hum.ku.dk/ami/amproject.html

The Arnamagnæan Institute in Reykjavík has a survey of Icelandic editions and useful links to libraries containing Old Icelandic manuscripts etc.: www.am.hi.is

Project Runeberg is a fast-growing site which publishes all genres of Nordic literature on the Internet, including a few medieval texts: www.lysator.liu.se/runeberg

The project also has a very useful list of other digital libraries: www.lysator.liu.se/runeberg/admin/foreign.html

Språkbanken, a text archive at the University of Göteborg, offers a number of Old Swedish texts, a large concordance, Söderwall's Dictionary etc.: <http://spraakdata.gu.se/kttext/>

Odd Einar Haugen, Bergen (Norway)

VII. Nordic as a part of Old Germanic

62. Nordic, Germanic, Indo-European and the structure of the Germanic language family

1. Introduction
2. Nordic
3. Germanic
4. Indo-European
5. A critical look at the theory of Old European hydronymy
6. The homeland and structure of Germanic with emphasis on place-names and hydronyms; relations between the Continent and the North
7. Future tasks
8. Literature (a selection)

1. Introduction

In recent years, the widely accepted theories about the relationship between Gmc and the related IE languages (particularly Celtic), the structuring of Gmc, the relation between the North and the Gmc Continent and the home and expansion of the Gmc tribes have been challenged, especially from the onomastic point of view. The fact that the traditional point of view which attributed the major role in this question to the Gmc North was not essentially based on linguistic facts but on archaeological criteria (Kossinna 1896) and may not have received enough attention (see Steuer 1998 for a much more moderate modern evaluation). However, the actual meaning of the term "Germanic" and what it includes can be defined much more precisely by means of the linguistic material, though striking archaeological investigations have been fascinating for their exact dating of the objects found. In addition, the onomastic evidence reveals the region where the separation of the Gmc languages from the IE substrate had taken place. There is also evidence of a hypothetical core area of ancient Gmc settlements, its early structure and indications of the presumed separation of the Gmc languages, among them the Nordic ones.

2. Nordic

The separation of the Nordic languages from the WGmc and extinct EGmc sister dialects has been dealt with in various ways. While there is some correspondence with EGmc (e.g. "Verschärfung" etc.), the separation of WGmc is more easily understandable. Recent publications have indicated that the similarities between Old High German (OHG), Old English (OE), Old Frisian (OFris.), Old Dutch (ODu.) and Old Saxon (OSx.) are so obvious that there are nearly no doubts about our grouping these languages as "West Germanic" and contrasting them almost automatically with the NGmc languages. Even today, dialects in the area of contact between LG and Du. reveal a gradual transition; however, a similar development cannot be found in the Dan.-G area of contact. Many facts, among these the onomastic material, point to a *relatively* homogeneous NGmc. Due to the late written tradition in the North, AN (apart from runic inscriptions) cannot be described precisely; so here we are mainly dependent on conjecture.

Except for EGmc which is attested sufficiently only in Go., it is just the WGmc dialects that may serve as comparative material for NGmc, with OSx. playing a more important role than OFris. From this basis, the question is how the distinct border between the WGmc and NGmc dialects in Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark developed and how this is to be understood. It cannot be interpreted as a transition line, but rather as the result of the contact of two groups of isoglosses originating in different places. This is why the thesis that Gmc developed in Jutland, Schleswig-Holstein and other places has been undermined considerably – and the place-names and hydronyms provide the clues (see 6.).

3. Germanic

Linguists define the term "Germanic" as a group of (partly extinct) languages that differ from the related IE sister languages by a number of distinct features. It is the task of historical comparative linguistics to discover these distinctions, but so far, the important field of geographical names has not been taken into account adequately. Apart from this, the following features are traditionally regarded as characteristic of a Gmc language:

- (1) the fixing of the originally free word accent to a specific syllable;
- (2) the so-called first or Gmc consonant shift;
- (3) the development of the IE sonant nasals and liquids m, n, l, r to *um, un, ul, ur*;
- (4) specific further sound laws known in Gmc languages only;
- (5) the spread of the IE ablaut e. g. to strong verbs;
- (6) the development of the weak declension of nouns;
- (7) the double system of inflection of adjectives (weak vs. strong);
- (8) the formation of a weak present perfect tense.

These very typical features of the Gmc languages must have developed from an IE dialect zone, because the connections to the IE sister languages (especially to Baltic) cannot be missed. This is related to the fact that there are geographical names in this area that *cannot* be explained from Gmc but have to be attributed to an IE language stratum.

The consistency of this reorganization also indicates that this development must have taken place over quite a long period of time in a relatively restricted area. Depending on the dialects the second or OHG consonant shift was realized to varying degrees. A comparison of these different realizations shows that the development of Gmc cannot have taken place in the area ranging from southern Scandinavia to the German low mountains, because we would have expected many more differences over such a large territory (as the HG dialects prove). Similarly, those theses based on the theory of a double origin the first between the Oder and the Vistula, the second between the Vistula and the Dnjepr have also been rejected. Again, supporting arguments could be derived from the hydronymy and toponymy.

Research into the Gmc languages has only just begun. The most important parts of the

Gmc homeland which were also the largest have so far not been investigated with regard to place-names and hydronyms. Suggestive factors have come to light that will have to be verified in the near future.

4. Indo-European

Ever since the neogrammarians ("Junggrammatiker") linguists have tried to find similarities that allow languages and dialects to be seen as coming from one underlying language, as has been done for the IE languages. In this way, most of the languages spoken in Europe (apart from Basque, Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian) were more or less convincingly allocated to the IE language family. Similarities could be observed in the areas of phonology, morphology, lexicology, and only recently, onomastics.

But various questions concerning methodology, the structure of the IE language family datings, the supposed homeland of the parent language as well as other related questions have remained controversial. Recently, there has been a revival of the old debate about a substrate. Here, the key material was provided by place-names and hydronyms.

Hydronymy and toponymy also play a major role in the debate about the relationship between the Gmc and IE languages. The development of the Gmc dialects in the IE language area can only be successfully described – even in broad terms – if research makes use of the language material which in many cases is the oldest existing written material. The great advantage of a specific place-name is its stationary character. It is not possible to exactly define the border between the Sl. and G language areas, which arose in the Middle Ages, on the basis of common nouns (appellatives). Place-names are much more suitable for this purpose. Research results in this field, though, do not always support traditional theories.

5. A critical look at the theory of Old European hydronymy

Research has often been stimulated by the antiquity and special importance of hydronyms in pre- and early history. Hans Krahe's investigations (e.g. Krahe 1964) were greatly influenced by the work of Leibniz, Grimm, Müllenhoff, Förstemann and many others. His in-depth studies of hydronymy started a

new era of research. Until then, hydronyms that could not be interpreted from Gmc had been attributed first to Ce. and later (due to Krahe's earlier investigations) to so-called Illyrian. But it was impossible to explain Fr. and Pol. names from Illyrian. For a description of these controversial hydronyms, linguists had to revert to Baltic roots or words for the Gmc language area, to Ce. for the Sl. area, to OInd. for the Ce. area etc. This is why Krahe himself discarded this theory after World War II. He concluded that these hydronyms could not be explained from a single IE language, not even "Illyrian". This theory had thus become untenable and was replaced by the theory of the Old European (henceforth OEur.) hydronymy.

The meaning of hydronyms which according to Krahe belonged to this group can be associated with so-called "water words", i. e. words denoting "river, flow, stream, brook, run, swamp, mire" etc. Morphologically, these words form groups that are linked through different recurrent suffixes. The most simple and most frequent form consists of one root element which is followed by $-\bar{a}$ and itself serves as the basis of further derivatives like *Ara- *Arva- *Araros- *Arla- *Arant(i)a- *Arsia-, or *Ava- *Avia- *Auma- *Avena- *Aura- *Avanta- *Ausa-. From the structure and scope of these names Krahe came to the conclusion that OEur. hydronymy was rather a West IE phenomenon which could also be supported by morphological and lexical similarities.

Schmid (1968) subjected this thesis to a rigorous examination and then redefined the theoretical basis of OEur. hydronymy. Krahe's theory, which regarded OEur. hydronymy as reflecting a West IE intermediate stage, was disproved by the fact that East IE material had to be used for the etymology of hydronyms (e. g. *Nida*, *Nidda*, *Neth*, *Nidd* etc., which can only be explained from OInd. *nédati* 'flows, runs' < IE **neideti*). And the language presupposed by this stratum of names could only have been IE. There is, though, some uncertainty as to the exact area where OEur. hydronyms would be expected.

Further research into OEur. hydronyms led Schmid (1972) to another conclusion: "No matter whether you choose an ancient name from Norway, England, France, Germany, Italy, or the Balkan peninsula, there will be a more or less precise equivalent in the present or ancient Baltic area" (e. g. *Athesis*, *G Etsch*, Ital. *Adige* with an almost corresponding

name in Lith. *Atesė*, *Atesys*). The Baltic area was gradually revealed as a distinct center of OEur. hydronymy which according to Schmid could be interpreted most easily as the result of a mainly uninterrupted continuity from IE to more recent times. Parallel to Schmid's investigations into hydronyms, Kuhn (1978) tried to postulate a "second Old Europe". Starting from hydronyms (and also place-names), he was convinced that he had found a "Northwest block" between the developing Ce. and Gmc languages. According to Kuhn (1978), this block had at first been largely resistant to Germanization, and as the more or less "last IE" area thus showed traces of IE and even pre-IE relics. Critics pointed out that Kuhn had not paid enough attention to eastern Europe and the special relationship between B and Gmc in his studies and had failed to incorporate a consonant change from earlier Gmc times into his theory.

A final evaluation of Kuhn's ideas will have to wait until the hydronyms of the Gmc countries and adjacent areas (especially those of eastern Europe) have been investigated completely, since eastern Europe plays a major role in the evaluation of Middle European river and place-names (as well as for early Gmc ethnogenesis). This fact did not emerge from a large study of OSl. hydronyms (Udolph 1979) – which still supported Krahe's theories that research on the early beginnings of a language family has to start with looking at the hydronyms and that the oldest hydronyms are derived from so-called "water words" – but rather from a study of the PSI. hydronyms in Poland. The latter provided even more important material in support of OEur. hydronymy. Krahe himself still excluded Sl. from the relevant hydronymic stratum, though.

According to Schmid, a hydronym has to meet the following requirements in order to count as OEur.:

- (1) It cannot be explained from the language it occurs in.
- (2) It consists of lexemes with a C^1eHC^2 -structure and derives its meaning from words denoting 'water, flowing' or similar.
- (3) There is no ancient suffix formation.
- (4) Inflectional elements of the name may have been adapted to the particular language.
- (5) There are strict rules of correspondence between the OEur. river-names.

- (6) Lexemes and suffixes can be explained from IE roots and word formation rules.
- (7) The names reveal the structure of IE nouns, adjectives, and participles, i.e. they are always derived from the *root*, not the *word*.

The critical evaluation of OEur. hydronymy has so far primarily focused on the following issues:

- (1) The *a*-vocalism is overly represented, which cannot be explained from IE (**Alara-* **Alantia* etc.).
- (2) It is interspersed with non-Gmc elements.
- (3) This kind of hydronymy is not a "system" in the strict sense of the word.
- (4) This theory is weakened by individual names that are more likely to be derived from individual languages.

None of the four above-mentioned aspects is very convincing:

- (1) The *a*-vocalism is also encountered in the appellative inventory of the IE languages, e.g. Lat. (*mare, lacus, palus, salus*); nevertheless, there is no doubt that Lat. is an IE language.
- (2) The assumption about non-IE elements has to be proven definitely; both Kuhn's (1969–1978) and Tovar's (1977) attempts to explain this phenomenon start from a southern European point of view, which unfortunately neglects eastern Europe. The same is true of Vennemann's (1994) hypothesis that a "Vasconic" (Basque) substrate can be found in the IE name inventory for Europe. In addition, his etymologies suffer from grave errors. To mention just one example: as long as place names like *Bischofsheim* are linked to Basque appellatives, this kind of criticism cannot affect OEur. hydronymy.
- (3) OEur. hydronymy is not a *closed* and *limited* system, but is *open* to further IE water words and their application in hydronymy.
- (4) The revision of the derivation of individual names does not upset the theory as a whole, since a theory requires continuous verification by additional material, criticism, and counter-criticism.

Apart from these issues arising from various theoretical stages, severe criticism of Krahe and Schmid came from two European regions, namely Poland and Scandinavia. Intensive studies of the hydronyms of the eastern Euro-

pean country (*Hydronymia Europea* 1985; Udolph 1990) have contributed to a weakening of the "anti-OEur." point of view in Poland. On the other hand, criticism in Scandinavia still persists (Andersson 1972; 1977; 1988; Strandberg 1986; Kousgård Sørensen 1972; 1982). This is especially clear in a comparative study (HSK anthology *Namenforschung. Name Studies. Les noms propres. An International Handbook of Onomastics*, 1995–1996), in which leading onomastic scholars independently express their theories of the OEur. hydronymy.

The Scandinavians rejected this theory mainly because there was no evidence of a substrate among the huge number of Gmc names. According to Scandinavian researchers there were no other languages in major parts of the Scandinavian settlement area (i.e. most of Denmark, Norway and Sweden) apart from Gmc and its pre-stages, not even as a component of geographical names. This is why the OEur. theory could not, or at least not entirely, be accepted, and a refinement was requested.

A series of contributions to the above-mentioned anthology strongly contradict to this point of view. Researchers from several countries (Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, Scotland, Lithuania, Bulgaria, and Poland) largely agree that difficult names – i.e. especially hydronyms – cannot be explained without studying the stratum of names preceding a particular language. In this respect, Nordic research takes quite an isolated position. It will have to be asked whether their scepticism is based on the material in exception and will lead to a new orientation for the OEur. theory, or whether it is based on a totally different thesis (see section 1) that has been established firmly for the North and applied to German conditions by Kossinna, namely that a territory of exclusively Gmc names will inevitably have to be regarded as the homeland of the Gmc language (and peoples). A substrate that could be derived from IE material would, according to Scandinavian Germanists and onomastic researchers, be in conflict with and weaken this thesis.

Again, there are striking parallels with earlier theories in Poland. The quite vehement controversy between Vasmer (1929) and Rudnicki (e.g. 1959; 1961) primarily addressed the etymology of names (largely hydronyms). Vasmer's opinion that there were PSl. = IE relics in numerous Sl. and Pol. place-names and

hydronyms led Rudnicki and others to reject these interpretations and suggest 'purely' Slavic etymologies. The sense has changed in Poland, but not yet in Scandinavia.

This development is not only interesting from the point of view of the history of science, but also reveals an important issue that is decisive for the locating of the homeland and early structuring of the IE language family (regardless of whether it is Gmc, Sl., or Ce.). It is the argument that the presence of OEur. hydronyms in the oldest settlement area is *not contradictory* to this interpretation, but in itself *absolutely conclusive*. Similar to the investigations that assume a continuity from IE times of names which can be explained from Sl. (Udolph 1997) and consider it as the basis for the determination of the oldest homes of Sl. tribes. A certain continuity in naming will also have to be presupposed for determining the OGmc settlement areas. The detection of OEur. hydronyms will be part of this.

6. The homeland and structure of Germanic with emphasis on place-names and hydronyms; relations between the Continent and the North

Earlier Krahe realized that the discovery of OEur. hydronymy raised new issues about the development of the IE languages. More than once he stressed the importance of delineating the gradual splitting up of OEur. and its step-by-step evolution into individual languages more precisely.

Investigations relating to the original location and spread of names in the Gmc context as a whole are linked to this question. It proved to be essential to consider the naming of individual Gmc areas (e.g. Scandinavia, Great Britain, and the Continent) as part of a Gmc whole and to explain the place-names of the Scandinavian countries and England on the basis of the Gmc languages and vice versa, which is, however, only possible for the oldest strata of names.

In previous studies on Gmc hydronyms, the search for the oldest settlement areas of Gmc tribes aimed to discover an area where the proportion of non-Gmc relics in the name inventory was relatively small. Of course, this area would have to be the home of the Gmc tribes, as has been suggested more than once. From the point of view of pre- and early history, which was greatly influenced by Kossinna (cp.

the concise description in Hachmann 1970, 456ff.), the theory of a Nordic homeland found more and more support and finally was accepted widely. This theory fitted in with the observation that South Scandinavia and its onomastic material held a special position in Europe. Sometimes, the idea was expressed that all the onomastic material in central and southern Sweden belonged to a single language, which suggested a long and undisturbed development.

Deliberately stressing the "purely Germanic" character of Nordic hydronymy in no way supports the thesis of a Gmc homeland in the North, though. As it was often pointed out, the Gmc languages are closely linked to their IE sister languages at an older intermediate stage (yet to be reconstructed) with its distinctive characteristics, distributed equally among all Gmc languages (see sect. 3). This becomes obvious at all levels of grammar, and it may be taken for granted that this interlinkage can also be observed with place-names, which are important because of their durable and stationary character. We can expect that not only purely Gmc, but also PGmc (= OEur.-IE) hydronyms may be found that reveal the link with both the IE sister languages and the older IE naming processes. But apart from these – in a strict sense – PGmc names, we cannot expect a homogeneous stratum under a layer that may be understood as "OGmc hydronymy". Rather, they are supposed to show distinct traces of different degrees of Germanification: here, one might think of names whose component parts (suffixes, levels of ablaut and others) disclose only minor traces of change to the individual language, whereas others reveal the Gmc influence on a broader scale. And finally, we may expect names that can be explained exclusively by the Gmc material, but at the same time (due to the term "OGmc") consist of forms that make it difficult or even impossible for them to be attributed to an individual Gmc language or language group.

The relics which belong to the first group are especially significant in the search for the oldest Gmc settlements because they reflect a Gmc language that developed from an IE dialect group. An area with almost exclusively Gmc hydronymy and toponymy (particularly observed in Scandinavia) may of course be regarded as a territory that was settled by Gmc tribes for a long time; but due to the neighboring IE languages, it does not lend itself to answering the question of the IE homeland.

Recently, further investigations into OEur. hydronymy and the NGmc hydronyms and place-names (which is only just beginning and will require further years or even decades of studies) have provided results that are of crucial importance for the issues raised in this article.

Certain characteristics which so far have only been mentioned in passing shed a new light on the question of the homeland and early structuring of Gmc, particularly in comparison with its eastern European sister languages. And here B rather than Sl. plays the major role in hydronymy, giving rise to new ideas about the early structuring of the IE languages. The close relationship between B and Gmc was recognized as early as the 19th century. More than 125 years ago it was Förstmann's opinion (1863, 331) that amongst all languages, Lith. had the closest genealogical relation to Gmc, which is supported by modern research. It became more and more evident that the development of the typical Gmc linguistic properties must have taken place in the neighbourhood of the B and that crucial differences on the phonological and morphological level existed between the names in Scandinavia and central Europe.

These differences can be seen in the *-s-*derivatives, e.g., of the root **pel-/*pol-* 'pour' (*Vils*) and other roots (*Glems*, **Verisa*), which are found in Germany but not in Scandinavia; they appear in the *-t-*extension of the root **pel-* 'flow' found in the name *Fulda*, but not in the North, where derivatives of the IE root **ser-/*sor-* 'flow' are also missing, unlike the Continent as is proved by the names *Zorn* and *Saar*.

These examples lead to the question of what the place-names and hydronyms will have to be like in order to show a certain continuity between the IE and OEur. naming practices on the one hand and those of the individual Gmc languages on the other. Initial studies show that the following phenomena appear to be very important:

- (1) the consonant shift in the final position of the root or stem;
- (2) the similarities between B, Gmc and Sl. hydronyms and place-names;
- (3) the distribution of compounds or suffix formations of the OGmc pattern.

6.1. Consonant shift in the final position of root or stem

From the onomastic point of view, German linguists have often supported the thesis of a Scand. homeland of the Gmc tribes ("vagina gentium") because the phonetic inventory of several North German hydronyms seemed to indicate that these names had become known to the Gmc people rather late in time. Various *p,t,k* reflexes witness that these names had not been included in the first (Gmc) consonant shift, such as *Apolda*, *Lippe*, **Lupentia* (in *Lupnitz*), the numerous *apa-*names (*Ennepe*, *Honnef*, *Olpe*, *Aschaffenburg*, *Asphe*, *Hennef*, *Laasphe*, *Lennepe* etc.), *Neetze* near Lüneburg (< **Natisia*), *-wik* in place-names like *Harwich*, *Braunschweig*, *Bardowik* etc.

They were part of Kossinna's (e.g. 1896) thesis of a Scand. homeland for the Gmc tribes. Kuhn, too, used them as evidence for his idea of a late Germanification, and the interpretation that the *p,t,k*-names are unshifted has been widely supported up to the present day. Nonetheless, this is wrong.

Since the early beginnings of IE studies, we have known that there is a shift of consonants which, on the one hand, is likely to occur in final position, and on the other hand, is particularly common in Gmc. A comparison with both non-Gmc and Gmc material may help to demonstrate this phenomenon:

ON *flatr* 'flat' vs. Lith. *platus* 'wide';
 G *Nessel* < **natilon* vs. Lith. *noterė*, Latv. *nātre*, OPr. *noatis* 'nettle';
 G *weiß*, *Weizen* < Gmc **hvīta* vs. Lith. *kvietyš*, OInd. *śveta-* 'white';
 G *naß* < Gmc **nata* vs. Gr. *νότιος*, *νοτερός*;
**dheup-* in OHG *tobal* 'forest gorge' vs. **dheub* in Go. *diup-s*, G *tief*;
 OInd. *vēpa-tē* 'shaking' vs. OHG *wipf* 'fast movement', G *Wippe*, *Wimpel*, *Wipfel*.

The change will have to be assigned to the time before the first or Gmc consonant shift. Place-names and hydronyms with these properties are connecting links between the IE-OEur. stratum and the OGmc naming processes. They include:

- (a) river names with the root **nat-/*not-* like *Neetze*, *Nette*, *Netze*, *Nesse*, *Nathe* etc.;
- (b) derivations of **ueid-/*ueit-* 'bend, flex' like *Wied*, *Weidnitz*, *Weida*, *Weide*, *Vida*, *Wethau*, *Wieda* etc.;
- (c) the group consisting of *Schunter*, *Schondra*, *Schutter*, *Schossen*;

- (d) word formations from the IE root double **ueib-/*ueip-* 'bend, flex' like *Wipper*, *Wipfra*, *Wupper*, *Wipperau*, *Wippe* etc.
- (e) In the light of this consonant shift we can also solve the often-discussed problem of the *-apa-*names *Ennepe*, *Olpe*, *Honnef*, *Aschaffenburg*, *Horpe*, *Elsphe* etc. If we start from an IE root **ab-* (evident in Ce. appellatives and names, cp. e.g. *Avon*), then *apa* is a normal development from Grimm's Law, whereas the OPr. *ape* 'river', cp. *Angerapp*, pursues the root variation **ap-*. This is all the more surprising as the distribution of *-apa-*names (Dittmaier 1955) does not reach Scand. at all.
- (f) The name of the mountain range *Harz*, whose present HG form with *-z-* goes back to LG *-t-* (especially obvious in the place-name *Bad Harzburg* [found in *Hartesborg*, *Hartesborch*, *Hartesburg* only from 1071], is to be linked to – and here experts agree – with HG *hart* 'mountain forest, woody range of hills'. But then the form *Harz* is a violation of Grimm's Law (Förstemann 1863, 56). Of course, Kuhn (1959, 25) used this example as evidence of his "Northwestern block" (as a "half-Gmc" name). The early Gmc consonant shift is well known from appellatives and obvious in the parallel existence of Go. *frapi* 'intelligence, reason', Go. *frapjan*, *frop* 'understand': Go. *us-fratwjan* 'to make intelligent'; **kōt-* in OHG *hadu-* 'fight, quarrel', MHG *hader*: **kōd-* in Go. *hatis* 'hate', OIcel. *hatr*, OHG *haz* 'hate'; **kent-* in OHG *heri-hunda* 'war profit': **kend-* in OE *hentan* 'persecute', *huntian* 'hunt', *hunta* 'hunter' and many more. Taking this into consideration, it is not difficult to draw a parallel between HG *hart* < Gmc **hard*: *Harz* < Gmc **hart*.
- (g) The mountain name *Süntel* which both today's mountain range and the whole western chain of the German central mountain range from Osnabrück to the Deister (a distance of about 100 km) used to be called, presents a similar picture. The name is derived from Gmc **Sunt-ila*. The *-t-* in the final position of the root thus contrasts with the underlying word *south*, G *Süden*, which goes back to **sunþ-* and therefore to *-þ-* (OHG *sund*, MHG *sunt*, Du. *zuid*, OE *sūþ*, E *south*, OSx. *sūth*). If both forms are attributed to a Gmc (IE) form, we are able to derive Gmc **sunt-*: **sunþ-* and the older **sund-*:

**sunt-*, and thus describe this name together with the name for the Harz mountains and the already mentioned north German place-names and hydronyms in terms of the consonant shift described above.

As these examples show, consonant shift in the final position of a root or stem did take place within the Gmc languages. It has to be dated *before* the first or Gmc consonant shift and proves the relationship between IE (i.e. before the existence of individual languages) and Gmc naming practices. The centre of the relevant names is not situated in Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, or southern Sweden, though, but north of the German central mountain range.

6.2. Similarities between Baltic, Germanic, and Slavic place-names and hydronyms

The special relationship between Gmc and the eastern languages, in particular B and Sl., has already been mentioned. We find its traces in names which can be arranged into two groups: the first one containing roots or appellatives which have left toponymic traces in all three IE language families; the second group consisting of names that are of an undoubtedly Gmc origin but whose bases positively reveal relationships with B or Sl. languages.

The first group comprises derivations of root extensions that are definitely confirmed only by an area that was inhabited by speakers of the three language families, for example, the roots **dhelbh-* 'erode, hollow out' in names like *Thulba* and *Delvenau*, **pers-* 'spray, squirt' (versus the zero grade **pfs-* in N-Gmc *fors* 'waterfall') in names like *Veerse*, *Veerßen*, *Vers*, *Verse*, *Versia*, *Viersen*, and **pft-* in *Fulda*. We are obviously dealing with extensions of common OEur. or IE roots of the type **C¹eC²-*, i.e. with a probably younger stratum of hydronyms compared to OEur. names. Names of this type, which again point to a close relation between the OEur. stratum and the Gmc name inventory, are definitely found in northern Germany.

The second group consists of place-names with a special relation to B or Sl. where it is not possible to explain these names completely from the Gmc language, so that B or Sl. words will have to be considered.

Undoubtedly, the Baltic language helps to explain such difficult names as *Bordenau* (near Hannover), *Bortfeld* (near Peine), *Bördel* (near

Göttingen), and *Border* (a deserted settlement near Nienburg). Here, Grimm's Law allows the derivation from a basic form **bhr̥dh-*. A convincing etymology, though, can only be de-ri-ved from B *birdà* 'wet excrements', since Gmc does not provide any source.

The same applies to the place-name *Bründeln* (near Peine). In no way can this name be connected to the G word *Brunnen* 'well'. On the basis of old references (in *Brundelem*, 1100–1200, 1237 etc.), a Proto-form **bhr̥d-l-* can be established, which can most likely be related to the IE root **bhrendh* 'swell, pregnant'. Again, B is a great help, with Lith. *brėstu*, *brėndau*, *brėsti* 'swell, ripe', *brīstu*, *brindau* 'soak' (e.g. of peas) and many more.

Dransfeld, situated west of Göttingen, represents a difficult name. *Trhenesfelde* (with the oldest reference from 960, which probably stands for **Threnesfelde*) is especially important for the interpretation of this name. There is no connection to Gmc, but rather to B: Lith. *trenėi* 'to rot, to decay', Latv. *trenēt* (*trenu* or *trenu*) 'to rot, to decay'.

Sl. also shows a close relationship to Lower Saxon place-names. To name just a few: *Thüste* (near Hameln-Pyrmont), old *Tiuguste*, *Thiuguste*, and *Tuchtfeld* near Bodenwerder (8th/9th century [copy from the 12th century]) *Ducfelden* can be connected to the well-known pass name *Dukla* and Slovak. *dúčel*, *dúčela* 'tube', Sloven. *dukelj*, *duklja* 'high pot with narrow neck'. The little village *Dolgen*, east of Hannover, also belongs to this group and is not related to the Russ. word *dolgij*, Pomeranian-Polabic *dolg-* 'long', but goes back to IE **ilgh-* via Gmc **Tholg-un* (dative plural) and **ihlg-*. It can best be related to **telgh-* 'to swell up, swollen', which is well established in Sl. **tělstь* 'swollen, big' in OChSl. *ilьstь* 'big', Russ. *tolstyj* 'big' (*Tolstoy*). Nouns derived from this root refer to 'hill, elevation, growth'.

The place-name *Empelde* southeast of Hannover, 826–876 in *Amplithi* etc. is also important; it is an *-ithi*-name (Gmc suffix) whose basis cannot be explained from Gmc. **Ampl-ithi* is most likely rooted in IE **omb-l-*. From this, there is a Sl. appellative Polabian *wumbal* 'well', Bulg. *vumbel*, *vubel*, *vubel'*, *vôbel*, *ubel* etc. 'well or spring in a valley', 'spring in a low-positioned place where water is gathered like in a well'. It goes back to ASl. **qbl-*, a word which is not documented in Gmc. The suffix *-ithi* indicates that Germans have the name; thus *Empelde* is a reliable connecting link between an IE stratum and Gmc naming practices.

A whole group of place-names contains the element *-hude* (*Hude*, *Steinhude*, *Fischerhude* etc.), based on *-hÿth*, *-hÿð* (e.g. in *Chelsea*, borough of London, 785 *Cealchyþ*, 801 as *Caelichyth*) in England, with an underlying meaning 'a port, ferry place, little harbor, landing place'. A satisfying etymology has not been found yet. But taking **-hÿth-* as a starting point with the *-n-* missing (typical of Ing. languages), **-hunþ* is obtained, which has to be derived from IE **kunt-* and thus provides a connection to ChSl. **kqtъ*, which is still documented in the present Russ. word *kut* 'end of a river arm reaching far back into the country', in Ukrain. *kut* 'narrow inlet in the shape of an angle' and in Pol. *kąt* 'area of water lying between two shallows or reaching into the land from where you cannot steer a ship downstream; usually the remains of an old river bed or river arm'.

And finally, place-names in Lower Saxony and Thuringia like *Ifeld*, *Ilten*, *Ilde*, *Ilse* need to be mentioned. With their Gmc basis forms **Il-tun-*, *Il-feld*, **Il-ithi*, **Ilis-ithi* they point to a root **il-*, which also cannot be explained from Gmc. Here, a brief glance at the Sl. languages is valuable: almost all of them have a word, e.g. Ukrain. *il* 'clay, dirt, silt', Beloruss. *il* 'thin dirt of organic origin in water, on the bottom of a water hole, swampy, gray, or white-colored land', Russ. *il* 'dirt' etc. The word is an old *-u*-stem probably related to Latv. *ils* 'very dark', but certainly to OGr. *ἰλύς* 'dirt, excrements', *εἰλύ·μελαν* ('black' as mentioned by Hesych).

The above-mentioned examples (which can easily be extended) are toponymically limited to a broad stretch of land north of the German central mountain range from the river Elbe to the Rhine. They are right in the middle of a dense layer of Gmc names. Together, they show that Gmc tribes have been continuously settled in this area since the formation of the Gmc languages from an IE dialect zone.

6.3. The distribution of compounds or suffix formations of an OGmc pattern

Since the beginning of scientific research on Gmc languages, linguists have recognized that throughout history there has been a change in the word formation processes, as Jacob Grimm (1826, 403) mentioned: "At a later stage it is the unmistakable direction of language to give up derivation and replace it by composition. This proves our assumption that now extinct derivations had once been alive,

and now unintelligible or ambiguous ones had once been perceptible and clear". In other words, in more recent times compounds (made up of two nouns) are predominant, while at earlier stages it was suffixation (added to a basic element). This is also true in the field of place-names (but not personal names!). Hydronyms that are attributed to OEur. hydronymy belong to the suffixed type.

If one takes a closer look at Gmc hydronymy and toponymy from this point of view, it is surprisingly easy to find a simple pattern of distribution. On the Continent, we find both compounds with ancient base words (like *-aha*, *-mar*, *-hude*, *-lar*-, *-leben*, *-loh*, *-tun*, *-lage*, *-hlaiw*) and the older suffix forms like *-ung*, *-r*-, *-s*-, *-st*-, *-str*-, *-ithi*-, some of them extending as far as England (*-aha*, *-mar*, *-hude*, *-loh*, *-tun*, *-str*-) or Scandinavia (*-a(a)*, *-lev*, *-lo*, *-tun*-, *-hlaiw*, *-ung*, *-st*-, *-str*-).

For the determination of the oldest settlements of Gmc tribes, the distribution of suffix types that are exclusively or at least almost exclusively found on the continent is crucially important. These are, e.g., the *-r*-, *-s*-, *-st*-, *-ithi*- forms.

6.4. Results

The examples of Gmc hydronyms and place-names gathered so far definitely reveal that there are numerous reflexes in northern Germany (especially on the northern edge of the central mountain range in the areas of fertile loess soil) of an old IE-OEur. stratum from which a Gmc system of place-names has developed. Therefore the evidence of PIE relics in this area is no contradiction, but is necessarily conditioned by the widely known fact that Gmc as an IE language is linked to its IE sister languages in many ways.

In pre-Christian times, there was a movement away from this central area to the west (in post-Christian times as far as England) and to the north, which is clearly proved by numerous Continental names that can only be explained by referring to Scand. words, e.g. names like *Elbe*: ON *elfr*, Swed. *älv*, Norw. *elv*; *Rhön*: ON *hraun*; *Dragen* (near Gifhorn), *Drahe* and many more: Dan. *drage*, *drag* 'small promontory connecting a peninsula to the main land'; *Engensen* near Hannover, **Engisa*: Dan. *eng*, Sw. *äng*, ON *eng* 'grassland, meadow'; *Frohse*, *Frose* (Sachsen-Anhalt): Olcel. *fræs* 'blow', Norw. *fræsa* 'blow, gush, bubble'; *Ohrum* (**Ör-hēm*), *Oerie* (**Ör-ithi*) require Gmc **Aur-hēm* and **Aur-ithi*: ON *aurr*

'sandy ground, gravel', Icel. *aur* 'clay, dirt; mud; scree, rubble', *Schöningen* < *Skahaningi*: ON *skagi* 'promontory'.

Thus the situation in northern Germany is in sharp contrast to Scand. hydronymy and toponymy, which have a large number of Gmc word forms but show hardly any signs of continuous development from an OEur. substrate. Maybe this is connected to the small number of OEur. names in Scandinavia. There are several indications that the lack of continuity in the development of Scand. hydronymy is due to a turning point which may have been caused by immigration, most possibly of Gmc tribes.

7. Future tasks

The investigation of Gmc place-names and hydronyms in the Gmc settlement area is still at its beginning point. Large areas of the continent (Thuringia, Sachsen-Anhalt, Lower Saxony, Northrhine-Westfalia, Hestia) have not been examined yet, while Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, and Scandinavia have been studied much more intensively. Hence, the lack of ancient names, e.g. in Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark, is all the more remarkable. The theory that this lack is due to a gap in settlement patterns is not very convincing. It will be the task of future comparative studies of place-names and hydronyms from the North and the Continent to look into this problem.

8. Literature (a selection)

- Andersson, Thorsten (1972), Norden och det forna Europa. In: *NoB* 60, 5–58.
- Andersson, Thorsten (1977), Alteuropäische Hydronymie aus nordischer Sicht. In: *Namenkundliche Informationen* 30, 18–35.
- Andersson, Thorsten (1988), Zur Geschichte der Theorie einer alteuropäischen Hydronymie. In: *Probleme der Namenbildung, Rekonstruktion von Eigennamen und der ihnen zugrundeliegenden Appellative*, hrsg. v. Th. Andersson. Uppsala, 59–90.
- Bandle, Oskar (1984), Zur Typologie der germanischen Flußnamen. In: *Florilegium Nordicum*. Stockholm, 18–29.
- Dittmaier, Heinrich (1955), *Das apa-Problem*. Louvain.
- Förstemann, Ernst (1863), *Die deutschen Ortsnamen*. Nordhausen.
- Grimm, Jacob (1826), *Deutsche Grammatik*, 2. Teil, 3. Buch. Göttingen.
- Hachmann, Rolf (1970), *Die Goten und Skandinavier*. Berlin.

Hydronymia Europaea, Lfg. 1 ff. (1985 ff.), hrsg. von W.P. Schmid. Wiesbaden.

Kossinna, Gustav (1896), Die vorgeschichtliche Ausbreitung der Germanen in Deutschland. In: *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* 6, 1–14.

Kousgård Sørensen, John (1972), Danmark og Gammeuropa. In: *NoB* 60, 59–77.

Kousgård Sørensen, John (1982), Danmark – del af Krahes Gammeuropa? del af Kuhns Gammel-europa? In: *SNF* 63, 47–59.

Krahe, Hans (1964), *Unsere ältesten Flußnamen*. Wiesbaden.

Kuhn, Hans (1959), Vor- und frühgermanische Ortsnamen in Norddeutschland und in den Niederlanden. In: *Westfälische Forschungen* 12, 5–44.

Kuhn, Hans (1969–1978), *Kleine Schriften* 1–4. Berlin.

Kuhn, Hans (1978), *Das letzte Indogermanisch*. Wiesbaden.

Kvaran, Guðrún (1981), *Undersøgelser til den Gæssernamen i Jütland og Schleswig-Holstein*. Göttingen.

Namenforschung (1995–1996), *Namenforschung. Name Studies. Les noms propres* 1–3. Berlin/New York.

Rudnicki, Nikolaj (1959–1961), *Prasłowiańszczyzna-Lechia-Polska* 1–2. Poznań.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. (1968), *Alteuropäisch und Indogermanisch*. Wiesbaden.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. (1972), Baltische Gæssernamen und das vorgeschichtliche Europa. In: *IF* 77, 1–18.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. (1994), *Linguisticae Scientiae Collectanea. Ausgewählte Schriften*. Berlin.

Steuer, Heiko (1998), Die Germanen und der Norden. In: *Germanen, Germania, Germanische Altertumskunde (Studienausgabe)*. Berlin, 138–147.

Strandberg, Svante (1986), Kontinentalgermanische Hydronymie aus nordischer Sicht. In: *Probleme der Namenbildung, Rekonstruktion von Eigennamen und der ihnen zugrundeliegenden Appellative*, (ed. Th. Andersson). Uppsala, 17–57.

Tovar, Antonio (1977), *Krahes alteuropäische Hydronymie und die westindogermanischen Sprachen*. Heidelberg.

Udolph, Jürgen (1979), *Studien zu slavischen Gæssernamen und Gæsserbezeichnungen*. Heidelberg.

Udolph, Jürgen (1990), *Die Stellung der Gæssernamen Polens innerhalb der alteuropäischen Hydronymie*. Heidelberg.

Udolph, Jürgen (1994), *Namenkundliche Studien zum Germanenproblem*. Berlin.

Udolph, Jürgen (1997), Alteuropäische Hydronymie und ur-slavische Gæssernamen. In: *Onomastica* 42, 21–70.

Vasmer, Max (1929), Die slavische Ortsnamenforschung in Ostdeutschland 1914–1927, Teil 1–2. In: *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 6, 173–204, 464–495.

Vennemann, Theo (1994), Linguistic reconstruction in the context of European prehistory. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92, 215–284.

Jürgen Udolph, Göttingen (Germany)
Translated by Karin Beifuß

63. Nordic-Gothic linguistic relations

1. The most important lines of research
2. Theory and practice: Criteria for subgrouping
3. The Goths and Scandinavia
4. Goths and prestige: on the history of Gothicism
5. Literature (a selection)

1. The most important lines of research

The primary reason to search for a possible connection between Gothic and Nordic is a non-linguistic one. Firstly we have Jordanes' statement (*Getica* 4, 25) that the Goths came from "*Scandza (insula)*" i.e. Scandinavia.

Secondly, we have evidence of the name of the South Scandinavian tribe *Gēatas* in the Old English epic *Beowulf* and of certain place-names such as *Götaland*, *Västergötland*, *Östergötland*, *Gotland* in Sweden. The Old English name for the southern Swedish tribe *Gēatas* is the exact equivalent of Old Nordic *Gautar* (Klaeber, 1950, xxxviii ff.). All these names seem to indicate that 'Goths' once lived in the aforementioned geographical areas.

On the basis of this evidence scholars such as Neckel have looked for linguistic features peculiar and common to Gothic and Nordic. Neckel proceeded from the assumption that "Der nordische Charakter des Gotischen und die nordische Herkunft der Goten" [The Nor-

dic character of the Gothic language and the Nordic origin of the Goths] (1927, 2f.) was an incontestable fact.

Schwarz undertook a reconstruction of the common Gotho-Nordic prototype, devoting about 100 pages to this subject. He argues: "Das Gotische [...] muß auf die Ausgangslandschaft zurückbezogen werden" (1951, 5). "Urheimat" and reconstruction of the original dialect are two aspects of one and the same reality.

In a review of Schwarz's book, Betz (1953, 309) particularly criticized it for its dependence upon the obsolete "Stammbaumtheorie", 'theory of the family tree'.

Kuhn disagreed both with Schwarz's method and with his results (1952, 45ff.). He revisited the same topic in his article *Zur Gliederung der germanischen Sprachen* (1955, 8-16). In this connection he coined the expression "das Sorgenkind Gotonordisch" (cf. also Penzl 1972 b, 1233). Kuhn concluded that East Germanic (Gothic) was neither a branch nor a cognate of Nordic but rather an early offshoot of Proto-Germanic (1955, 16).

Antonsen (1965) quotes Zhirmunskij and adheres to the theory of "a division of Proto-Germanic into a pre-North-Germanic and an East-Germanic dialect" (1965, 36, in a footnote).

Kufner (1970) examines the whole matter of grouping and separation of the Germanic languages. Leaving aside Maurer's view of a special relationship between Nordic and Alemannic (1943; 1952), Kufner (1972, 94) summarises the views prevailing in current scholarship under four headings:

- (1) Adherence to the traditional tripartite division. Examples: Krause 1953, ²1963, ³1968; Mossé ²1956.
- (2) Assumption of a first division into North(east) and South(west) Gmc. Examples: Karsten 1928; Schwarz 1951 and 1956; Rosenfeld 1956; Zhirmunskij 1964; Lehmann 1966. Rösel (1962) belongs to this group although he includes the precursor of OE within North(east) Gmc.
- (3) Assumption of a first division into EGmc and NWGmc. Examples: Kuhn 1952 and 1955; Adamus 1962; Antonsen 1965; Makaev 1965.
- (4) The view that our present knowledge and methods do not suffice to solve the problems of the Gmc Ausgliederung. Examples: van Coetsem 1970; Marchand 1970.

In the last twenty-five or thirty years, scholarly opinion about the Nordic-Gothic linguistic relationship has generally inclined to this fourth view. The absence in Germanic of something corresponding to Classical Latin and Vulgar Latin in relation to the Romance languages renders it impossible to trace the evolution of each Germanic language, language group or subgroup from its earliest stage of development. As Jasanoff states (1994, 253): The map of the Germanic languages is [...], from the beginning of the historical record, crisscrossed by dialect divisions whose interpretation and significance have traditionally been a source of controversy. The old view that North and East Germanic are more closely related to each other than to West Germanic is no longer widely held.

2. Theory and practice: Criteria for subgrouping

2.1. Theory

Fox (1995, 217f.) writes:

The basic question here is that of SUBGROUPING, that is, the intermediate relationships that may exist between the individual languages on the one hand and the single proto-language on the other. These intermediate relationships can be at several levels; although English, for example, is assumed to be an Indo-European language and therefore ultimately derived from Proto-Indo-European, it is customary to recognize at least Germanic as an intermediate grouping, which also includes German, Icelandic, Gothic, and so on. But it is also possible to recognize, for example, a West Germanic intermediate between English and Proto-Germanic, which includes German and Dutch but excludes the Scandinavian languages and Gothic, while some scholars have recognized an Anglo-Frisian group between English and West Germanic, consisting of English and Frisian. Similarly, there has long been a debate about the relationships between groups such as Slavic, Baltic, and so on, within the Indo-European family with the possibility of intermediate groupings such as "Balto-Slavic" and "Italo-Celtic", as well as the possibility of grouping together Indo-European, Semitic, Finno-Ugrian, and other language families into a larger "Nostratic" group. The furthest in this direction that we can go is to assume that *all* the languages of the world are ultimately related.

The methodological problem here is that of finding suitable criteria for such groupings, and the continuing disagreements in this area are indicative of the fact that such criteria are in practice often difficult to identify and to apply.