

Men and women in the older runic inscriptions of Scandinavia

Stefan Jacobsson

The corpus of the 24-type futhark inscriptions of Scandinavia appears to contain names of both women and men (cf. Peterson 2004: 3–19). For most of the supposed women’s names alternative interpretations as men’s names have, however, been suggested.¹ The names of uncertain gender, which all belong to the *n*-stem class, have been interpreted as men’s names with feminine gender,² as names of West Germanic origin³ or as native masculine *n*-stem formations with a short or long *o* sound in the suffix.

Out of a total of 19 possible instances of women’s names in Peterson 2004 and Williams 2006: 278 f., 10 are explained alternatively as men’s names and 6 have merely doubtful interpretations as names. Out of the 10 possible men’s names, there are 8 instances ending in (nom.) *-o* and 2 in (gen.) *-on*. Three names (N KJ49 **boro**, Ög KJ54 **braido**, N KJ89 **mairlǫ**) are only interpreted as female. (See Table 1.) Due to deficient knowledge both of the context of the sources and of morphological and phonological features of the language of the older runic inscriptions of Scandinavia, discriminating between men’s and women’s names has in these cases been proven a hard task. Among more recent scholarly attempts to give the names uncertain as to gender a satisfying interpretation as men’s names, especially two appear appealing. The first one concerns the much-debated but still quite unclarified formal development of the Indo-European *n*-stems in the Germanic dialects, the other one the less discussed phonological development of the unaccented low and back vowels in Proto-Norse.

In this paper I firstly aim to give a very brief account of these attempts and secondly to shed light on an aspect of the problem not much discussed by concerning the names as parts of an anthroponymic system common to the various old Germanic varieties. Syrett (2004: 144 f.) has briefly touched upon this topic, pointing out that “it raises some uneasiness that there is so little convincing evidence throughout the urnordisch inscriptions for grammatically strong feminine names which would probably be recognisable by the nom.sg. ending in *-u*”.

Table 1. (Possible) women’s names (Peterson 2004:3–19 with ref., Williams 2006: 278 f.).

Name	Inscription	Dating ⁴	Possibly female	Possibly male
agilamudon (gen.)	N KJ 69 Rosseland	160–400	x	x
aluko (nom.)	N KJ 49 Førde	520–570	x	x
boro (nom.)	N KJ 76 Opedal	160–400	x	
braido (nom.)	Ög KJ 54 Himmelstalund	160–400	x	
eho (nom.)	Düwel & Roth 1977 Donzdorf	–550	x	x
fozo (nom.)	IK 76 Hitsum	400–650	x	x
fino (nom.)	Sö 24 (KJ 86) Berga	375–570	x	x
hariso (nom.)	DR 232 (KJ 9) Himlingøje	210–320	x	x
igjjon (gen.)	N KJ 81 Stenstad	375–470	x	x
lamo (nom.)	DR MS1995;322 Skovgårde	210–260	x	x
lepro (nom.)	DR 18 (KJ 42) Strårup	160–400	x	x
mairlǫ (nom.)	N KJ 89 Tanem	160–400	x	
witro (nom.)	DR EM85;93 Fælleseje	375–570	x	x

¹ See, e.g., Jacobsen & Moltke 1942: 662, 682, Krause 1966: 31, 96, Düwel 1983: 129, Stoklund 1991: 85, Peterson 1994: 145, Seebold 1994: 62 ff., Nedoma 2004: 290 f., 2005: 161 f., Bjorvand & Lindeman 2007: 628.

² As pointed out by Syrett (1994: 146), “the theory has little in its favour, especially on the widespread scale”.

³ Thus Krause 1966: 96 (DR 232 **hariso**, DR 18 **lepro**), Düwel (in Düwel & Roth 1977: 413: **eho**, DR 18 **lepro**, IK 76 **fozo**). Syrett (1994: 143) however argues that “on the whole there is little evidence which might indicate that the names in *-ō* represent a West Germanic ending”; cf. also the same tendency in Stoklund 1994: 106.

⁴ According to Imer 2007 1–2 passim, Düwel 1970, 1991: 274.

Masculine names with the nominative in Proto-Germ. $*-\bar{o}(n)$?

By reasons of the shape of Germanic loanwords in Fenno-Ugric and of comparative Indo-European evidence, Lid (1952) regards Proto-Norse $-a$ in the nom. sg. of masc. n -stems as developed from $*-\bar{o}(n)$. Likewise, Kortlandt (2006: 5) posits a development with an original $*-\bar{o}n$ turning gradually towards $-a$: “If $-o$ and $-a$ represent consecutive stages of a nasal vowel [ãⁿ] which developed from original $*-\bar{o}n$, we may conclude that the delabialization was under way at the time of our earliest records and was completed in the 5th century” (5 f.).⁵ The $-o$ of Proto-Norse $\bar{o}n$ -stems is explained by Kortlandt (5), as by Boutkan (1995: 290 f.), as a result of paradigmatic levelling.

Antonsen (1970: 315) instead posits that the original element $*-\bar{o}(n)$ was replaced in Proto-Scandinavian by an analogical $-a$ levelled from the acc. sg., a view that “seems to be widely accepted” (Stiles 1984: 16). In this connection Grønvik (1987: 180) mentions “*leprō* K. 42 Strårup og *harisō* K. 9 Himlingøje I [...], som av semantiske grunner antagelig [...] bør oppfattes som mannsnavn.” DR MS1995;322 **lamo** is likewise interpreted by Grønvik (1994: 48) as a man’s name “med den lydrette endelsen $-\bar{o}$ i nominativ singular”. He regards (1987 ib.) “sideformene på $-\bar{o}$ i mask. sg. nom. som de siste utløpere fra et eldre språktrinn”. “The early evidence” (“Say, up to c. 400”), Syrett (1994: 152) argues, “clearly indicates that $-o$ and $-a$ could be used side by side to represent the masculine n -stem nom.sg., but in the later period, as exemplified above all by the bracteates, $-a$ predominates.”

Nevertheless, in a previous work (1981: 207), Grønvik argues that “den gamle form på $-\bar{o}$ kan ha holdt seg i isolerte (ikke lenger analyserte) navn og spesielle navnetyper”, referring to “navnetypen *Sturla*, *Gnúpa*, *Krúsa*, *Erra*” in Old Norse. Grønvik (ib.) asks himself “om ikke den som type kanskje går tilbake på slike svake maskuliner på $-\bar{o}$ (med lydrett bevart nom.sing., som her måtte ha særdeles høy frekvens, og ellers omdannet etter $\bar{o}n$ -stammene).”

Another view in the matter of the presence of both $-o$ and $-a$ is held by Krause (1971: 51), who mentions the possibility that “bei dem N. Sg. m. der n -Stämme noch beide Ausgänge $-\bar{e}n$ und $-\bar{o}n$ (bzw. $-\bar{o}$) nebeneinander bestanden, wie z.B. im Griechischen”⁶ As Andersson (1995: 30) points out, “ist es umstritten, wie $-a$ in Transkription wiederzugeben ist. Nach herkömmlicher Auffassung steht $-a$ für $-\bar{a}$ [...]. Diese Wiedergabe der Endung läßt sich mit der Runenorthographie gut vereinbaren”.

Nedoma (1995a: 65 ff., 1995b: 112 f., 2004: 290 f.) connects $-a$ and $-o$ to the hystero- and amphidynamic (hystero-, holokinetic) accent-ablaut class respectively, represented by varying n -stems formations in several Indo-European branches.⁷ “Nach heutiger *opinio communis* ist bei den belebten n -Stämmen des Urindogermanischen ein Nominativ Singular auf $*\bar{e}(n)$ bei hystero-kinetisch flektierten Paradigmata [...] neben einem Ausgang $*\bar{o}(n)$ des holokineticischen Akzentuationstyps [...] anzusetzen”, Nedoma (1995a: 65 f.) states. As Germanic hystero-dynamic n -stems he identifies (1995a: 63 ff.), i.a., the individualizing formation DR MS1995;334c **swarta** (nom.) and, tentatively, TEIVA in the inscription of Negau B, a “Kurzname” formed from a dithematic man’s name “mittels Erweiterung um ein individualisierendes n -Suffix” (1995: 63).⁸ Concerning DR MS1995;322 **lamo**, DR MS1995;336b **nipijo** and DR MS1995;334a, 334b, 335b **wagnijo** “ist $-o$ als Nebenform (von regulärem $*-\bar{a}(n)$ [...]) zu fassen, die aus der urindogermanischen holokineticischen Klasse stammt” (Nedoma: 1995: 67). Düwel & Roth 1977 **eho** is in Nedoma’s (2004: 288 ff.) opinion likely to be a Scandinavian “Kurzform” formed “mit n -Suffix” to a dithematic name.

Nedoma (2004: 290, 2005: 162) argues that “urn. $-o$ (neben $-a$) im Nominativ Sg. der maskulinen n -Stämme nicht auf das älteste Stufe des Urnordischen beschränkt war, wie man bisher anzunehmen pflegte, sondern bis in das frühe 6. Jahrhundert weiterbestand [...]: ob als

⁵ Cf. Kortlandt (6): “If Proto-Germanic $*-\bar{o}n$ developed into the nasal vowel of [French] *bon* and then into that of *blanc* [ãⁿ] while original $*-\bar{o}$ was raised to $-u$, the spellings $-o$ and $-a$ are quite appropriate.”

⁶ The derivation of $-a$ of the runic inscriptions as well as of the Old Norse $-i$ from $*-\bar{e}(n)$ is posited already by, among others, Streitberg (1896: 191), Walde (1900: 63 f., 103 f.), Lane (1963: 161 f.), and later also by, e.g., Hollifield (1980: 46), Laur (1983: 125 f.), Euler (1985: 11), Jón Axel Harðarson (1987: 119), Bammesberger (1990: 166, 171), Andersson (1995: 30 ff.), Schaffner (2001: 525 f.), Tremblay (2003: 49 f.).

⁷ For evidence from Balto-Slavic, Greek, Hittite, Italic, Celtic and Tocharian see Nedoma 1995a: 66, 2005: 164 f., 178 with ref.

⁸ The Negau word is, however, quite convincingly, rendered by Markey (2001: 122 f.) as a thematic formation.

freie Variante und/oder auf eine Sprachvarietät (Dialekt?, Soziolekt?) beschränkt, kann aufgrund der Dürftigkeit des vorliegenden Materials nicht festgestellt werden.”⁹ As late examples Nedoma (ib.) mentions, i.a., DR AUD1997;259 **rawsijo** (ca. 400) and Düwel & Roth 1977 **eho** (6th century).

Masculine names in obl. *-ōn-*, nom. *-ō?*

“To all appearance”, Syrett (1994: 140) argues, “the endings in **-a** offer [...] an even larger spread than those in **-o** and there seems to be no distribution pattern specific to each.” He also states (212): “There is [...] nothing within the texts to suggest that the **-on** forms should be feminine, and likewise there are no pressing reasons to argue the **-an** endings are exclusively masculine.”

In Syrett’s opinion (216 ff.) the connection between **-on** in N KJ 69 **agilamudon**, N KJ 81 **igijon** and Old Norse *-u*, Old High Germ. *-un* (in, e.g., acc. *tungu*, *zungūn* f.) is problematic, since the *u*-sound in the latter cases should have developed by the means of raising due either to an (early syncopated) high vowel in the following syllable (van Helten 1891: 463) or to nasalization (Kock 1921: 340 f.). The assumption of raising due to an old high vowel is contradicted by the evidence of the two attested names; and, concerning nasalization, it “seems likely that the normal result of Germanic **-ōn* in Norse is represented by *kalla*, the infinitive being from urnordisch **-ōn*” (Syrett: 220).

“If we prefer, on the other hand, to see **-an** and **-on** as different spellings of the same ending, then various phonetic and orthographic mechanisms could be proposed to account for the fluctuation”, Syrett writes (221), suggesting (258) that “the various *n*-stem desinences attested in our corpus, namely nom.sg. **-o/-a** and oblique sg. **-on/-an**, might profitably be seen as competing orthographic representation of the same underlying phonemic sequence.” The sound represented by **o** and **a** according to Syrett is [ɔ] or the like, and, again, nasalization or a following high vowel would have caused the sound change. In the case of raising due to a high vowel, “something like [-ɔn] [...] later fell together with **-a(n)*, ON *-a*. When this stem vowel was transferred by process of paradigm levelling into the nom.sg., the fluctuation continued in **-o/-a** before being levelled out to **-a** with subsequent loss at syncope.” (259.)

However, unless we wish to posit a distinct short unaccented unit simply for this one ending, it seems better to assume that nasalisation may have been responsible for preserving the allophonic distinction between /a/ = [a] and /a(n)/ = [ɔ], and that this nasalisation was transferred also to the nom.sg. The triumph of forms in **-a** may perhaps then be linked to the loss of nasalisation and the establishment of this vowel’s phonemic identity with /a/. (Syrett ib.)

Against Syrett’s thought-provoking approach may be raised the objection that it does not seem implausible that the vowel of Old Norse *-u*, Old High Germ. *-ūn* in the oblique cases of the *ōn*-stems would be due to a sound change younger than the inscriptions containing the writing **-on** (i.e. after the 4th or 5th century), viz. raising caused by (partial) assimilation of the *ō* vowel with the nasal consonant (cf. thus Baesecke 1918: 153 f., Boutkan 1995: 289 f., Kortlandt 2006: 4, 6). The assumption of a connection between **-on** and Old Norse *-u* then might imply that the infinitive of verbs of the *ō* class (Old Norse *kalla* etc.) – at least if represented by the athematic variant in **-ōn*¹⁰ – can not be developed regularly but must have had its final element replaced arguably with the *-a* of the verbs in (inf.) **-an*. Likewise, the vowel of the corresponding Old High German infinitive and 3 pers. pl. pres. opt. in *-ōn* “must be explained analogically, e.g. after the 2/3s[g. ...]. This is not problematic”, Boutkan (1995: 290) argues.

Somewhat problematic for Syrett’s approach is furthermore that the two Proto-Norse instances of **-on** both represent the genitive. Supported by Reis’(1974: 42 ff.) view that “schwachtoniges urgerm. *ō* in der Position vor *n* + Hochzungenvokal zu ‘spät-gemeingerm.’ *ū*

⁹ Cf. Grünzweig (2004: 49), who likewise objects to the tradition “[...] *-ō*-Formen als vereinzeltete Reste eines älteren Zustandes’ zu sehen”.

¹⁰ But cf., e.g., Old Engl. *sealfian* : Old High Germ. *salbōn* ‘anoint’, Old Fris. *talia* : Old High Germ. *zalōn* ‘count’, Old Sax. *thionioian* ~ *thionon* ‘serve’ (Streitberg 1896: 286, Orel 2003: 315, 400).

gehoben wurde”, Nedoma (2005: 177) accounts for *-ūn* as originally belonging to the accusative and dative only: “Im Genetiv Sg. [...] deutet urn. **-on** auf *-ōn(n) < *ōnz < urgerm. *ōnaz*, für an. (aisl.) *-o*, *-u* sowie für ahd. *-ōn* [sic!], as. *-un* wird man am ehesten mit analogischer Übernahme aus dem Dativ/Akkusativ Sg. zu rechnen haben”.

Masculine names in **-ōn-?*

Antonsen (2002: 272) regards N KJ 69 **agilamudon** and N KJ 81 **igijon** as masc. or fem. *ōn*-stems. Though perfectly unacceptable as to its details,¹¹ Antonsen’s account draws attention to important problems concerning the origin of Indo-European and Germanic *ōn*-stems. “Die formale Differenzierung zwischen Maskulina und Feminina, die bei den germanischen *n*-Stämmen zu beobachten ist, muß das Resultat einer Neuerung sein”, Bammesberger (1990: 165) argues. According to Brugmann (1889: 322) “darf angenommen werden, dass die mit *n*-Suffixen gebildeten Nomina einstens nur masculinisch und neutral gebraucht waren”; in Indo-Aryan they are still “meist masc. oder neutr.” (321).

Eine umfangreichere Kategorie von Feminina zeigen das Ital., Kelt. und Germ. in den mit *-jen-* (*-jōn-*) gebildeten Abstracta, wie lat. *cap-iō men-tiō*, air. *er-mitiu* ‘Ehre’, got. *ga-run-jō* ‘Wasserflut’ *ra-þjō* ‘ratio’. Man darf annehmen, dass diesen, eine verhältnismässig junge Bildungsschicht darstellenden *n*-Stämmen ihr Genus durch ihre Function als Abstracta zugeführt wurde. Auch alle andern fem. *n*-Stämme, die das Germanische aufweist, sind als solche ohne Zweifel jung; sie entsprangen infolge davon, dass die Suffixgestalten idg. *-ōn-* *-jōn-* *-īn-* nach Analogie des zwischen germ. *-an-* *-jan-* und *-a-* bestehenden Verhältnisses sich zu den fem. germ. *-ō-* *-jō-* (= idg. *-ā-* *-jā-*) und *-ī-* in Beziehung setzten. In manchen Fällen, wo die Sprachen zwischen masc. und fem. schwankten, erweist sich jenes Genus als das ältere [...]. (Brugmann: 321 f.)¹²

The origin of what looks like the lengthened *o* grade through the paradigm in some categories of *n*-stems outside Germanic has long remained unclear. Hoffmann (1955) proposes that these formations contain a suffix **-He/on-* (**-h₁e/on-*; more plausibly with **h₃₋*, Hamp 1972) with possessive function, secondarily used also in individualizing and agential formations. Concerning Germanic, Hoffmann (37) suggests: “Zeitweiliges Nebeneinander der germanischen Entwicklungen wie z.B. von **sedon-* und analogischem **sedōn-* hat wohl durch Parallelisierung mit den idg. *o-* und *ā-* Stämmen (germ. *-a-*, *-ō-*) die germanische Verteilung von *-an-* (*-en-*) auf das Maskulin und *-ōn-* auf das Feminin ermöglicht.”

A different approach is found in Olsen (2004), according to which the prototypes of the “Hoffmann formations” are to be understood as substantivized possessive compounds with a noun to a root **h₃enh₂₋* ‘load, charge’ as the second member (Olsen: 237 f.; cf. similarly Pinault 2000, Dunkel 2001) and endocentric collectives or place-designations respectively (Olsen: 238), the latter differing formally from the exocentric compounds by (“internal derivation”, Olsen: 238, i.e.) having the accent on the second member (the “Hoffmann suffix”) instead of on the first (the root). According to Olsen (239 f.) the group of feminine “Abstracta” referred to by Brugmann (see above) belongs to the “Hoffmann” type originating from endocentric compounds.

Now, a remaining question is how long masc. “Hoffmann” formations – possessives of the original type and secondary individualizing and agent nouns – still existed in Germanic. Olsen (231) refers to Old Norse *kampi* m., a possessive personal designation derived from *kampr*, *kanpr* m. ‘moustache’ (Fritzner 1886–96 2: 252 f.; cf. as a male byname and principal name

¹¹ Antonsen’s fundamental hypothesis appears to be that since there are morphological classes of the nominal system (*h₂₋*, certain variants of *n*-stems) represented by both masculine and feminine formations in some Indo-European languages, there should have been no formal distinction between masc. and fem. *n*-stems in the language of the older runic inscriptions of Scandinavia (though on the other hand the *h₂₋*-stem names (in **-u**) found in the same sources are by Antonsen (272), in view of the argumentation rather puzzlingly, considered “[o]f course, unequivocal female”).

¹² Cf. Boutkan’s (1995: 275) statement: “The category of the *n*-stems originally contained masculines and neuters. The feminines represent a Germanic innovation”.

Kampi, Lind 1920–21, 1905–15 s.v.), as reasonably belonging to the exocentric “Hoffmann” type; its inflexion indicates that a reshaping to *an*-stems had happened in Old Norse in these masc. formations (i.e., assumedly, in the masc. formations that did not, by way of formal analogy, turn into feminines). The state of affairs in the time of the older runic inscriptions is, however, not known, which seems to allow an attempt to identify names in *-o* and *-on* as masculine formations of the “Hoffmann” type.

There is furthermore a group of male byname formations that (together with West Germanic borrowings) appear to constitute a masculine *ōn*-stem category in Old Norse (see Jacobsson mscr.a), a fact that could possibly support the assumption of masculine *ōn*-stems in Proto-Norse – rather than, as posited by Grønvik (see above p. 2), the existence of *an*-stems with **-ō(n)* in the nominative.

Considering the anthroponymic system

Old Germanic like other Indo-European personal names form a system with formally differentiated names linked to different functions. The (*i*)*ō*-stem class (partially evolved from *ī*-stems) is, among Old Germanic women’s names, to be considered as the formal category par excellence, mainly occurring in the very frequent dithematic names. The *n*-stems are among Germanic personal names mainly found in byname formations and hypocorisms. Female byname formations appear, by contrast with male ditto, extremely rare in older Germanic sources (cf. Jacobsson mscr.b).

In the corpus of 74 certain Scandinavian personal names in Beowulf and as the first member in place names formed with the element *lev* (Peterson 2004: 20–40), there are 10–14 hypocoristic and 4–8 non-hypocoristic men’s names of the *n*-class,¹³ and only one woman’s name on the whole (viz. a dithematic formation of the *ō*-class). The South Germanic runic inscriptions (Nedoma 2004) contain 62 instances of personal names, 10–13 of which are hypocoristic and 3–7 non-hypocoristic men’s names of the *n*-class; the women’s names occurring in these inscriptions consist of 13 *n*-stems, all of which are hypocoristic formations, and 12–17 *ō*-stems (13 of which are dithematic). In addition to exhibiting a higher rate of women’s names, the South Germanic corpus contains more *n*-stem names than the other sources. Nevertheless, roughly half of the South Germanic women’s names are *ō*-stems. As the Scandinavian inscriptions contain but one certain *ō*-stem (N KJ 89 **mairl̥ju**), caution appears advisable against interpreting uncertain *n*-stems as feminine.

Furthermore, it seems most important to pay attention to the derivational types of the *n*-stem names occurring. According to the interpretations given in Nedoma 2004 (passim) and Peterson 2004 (passim), there are, among the men’s names of the *n*-stem class, in the South Germanic inscriptions: 9–13 hypocoristic and 4–7 non-hypocoristic (viz. 2–6 byname and 1 *lallname*) formations; in the *lev*-names: 12–17 hypocorisms and 5–9 non-hypocorisms; and in Beowulf: 0–2 hypocorisms and 2–3 non-hypocorisms. On the other hand, all women’s names of the *n*-stem class (13) occurring in the South Germanic inscriptions are interpreted as hypocorisms, whereas there are no instances of female *n*-stem names in Beowulf and in the *lev*-names.

As stated above, the *n*-stems are, among Germanic personal names, mainly found inside two categories: hypocorisms (including ‘Kurznamen’) and byname formations (cf. Remmer 2009: 298 ff.). Now, as non-hypocoristic women’s names seem to be rare among the *n*-stems (cf. the South Germanic inscriptions and the non-runic Scandinavian sources discussed above), it appears plausible that most of the non-hypocoristic *n*-stem names of uncertain gender (viz. Ög KJ 54 *Braiðō*, DR 18 *Leprō*, DR MS1995;322 *Lamō*) are men’s names. The only *n*-stem name appearing more or less with no doubt as feminine is N KJ 76 *Borō* (cf. Antonsen 2002: 271). This name, interpreted as ‘daughter’, fits semantically well into a group of Germanic female names (Old Norse *Dōttir* ‘daughter’, *Mār* ‘girl’, *Systa* ‘sister’ etc., Peterson 2007a s.v.). On the other hand, instances like *Braiðō* ‘the broad one’, *Lamō* ‘the lame one’ etc. (Peterson 2004 s.v.) remind very much of male byname formations found in other Germanic and Indo-European sources (cf. Ekbo 1947: 279 ff., 271 f., Schmitt 1996: 625 f.). As to the hypocoristic formations, on the other hand (viz. *Alukō*, *Harisō*, *Ehō* etc.,

¹³ The lower number indicates certain instances according to Peterson 2004, the higher number includes the uncertain instances as well.

Peterson 2007a s.v.), they could be either feminine or masculine. However, it still seems quite suspicious that not a single dithematic woman's name encounters in the inscriptions.

It is most interesting to make a comparison with the larger corpus of Scandinavian personal names of the Viking Age runic inscriptions. Among the *n*-stem names given a secure interpretation in Peterson 2007a (passim), there are 251 instances of hypocoristic men's names and 659 instances of non-hypocoristic men's names (27 of which are dithematic); and, on the other hand, 148 instances of hypocoristic but only 26 instances of non-hypocoristic women's names (4 of which are dithematic).

The prevailing status of the (*i*)*ō*-class formations among the Viking Age women's names – there are 533 certain instances in Peterson 2007a (passim) – represents an archaic feature (see Remmer 2009: 296); and the almost complete absence of this class among personal names in the older Scandinavian inscriptions also contributes to the conclusion that the number of women's names in these inscriptions is probably extremely small.

Name interpretations

In the light of the results above concerning both the question of gender of the various *n*-stem formations and the features of the Proto-Norse anthroponymic system I will now make an attempt to give plausible interpretations of the 13 names in Table 1 as to their etymology, gender and place in the system.

I) **agilamudon** *Agilamundōn(n)/-mundōn(n)*, according to Peterson (2007b) “det enda på nordisk botten existerande kvinnonamnet på *-mund-*”, an *ōn*-stem being a “movering till ett svagt maskulint **-mundan-*”, though “de kontinentala feminina namnen på *-mund-* tillhör *ī-/ijō*-deklinationen”¹⁴ (Peterson op cit.: 15, 7). Sanness Johnsen (1969: 46) holds that the name bearer was a person of the highest station and that the inscription thus “gir oss viktige opplysninger om kvinnens sosiale stilling og prestisje i folkevandringstiden”. The only other old *n*-stems reminding of **-mudon** are the men's names Old Norse *Āmundi*, *Ōmundi*, a “västgotiskt nom. mask. *Gerimundo* bland många andra namn på *-mund-* [...] och den fhty. personbeteckningen *fora-mundo* m. ‘advokat, sakförare’” (Peterson op. cit.: 12).

It seems quite likely that **agilamudon** could be connected with Old Norse *Āmundi* (possibly < **Ag-*, Peterson 2007a: 22; concerning the first member **Agi(la)-* see Nedoma 2004: 148 ff. with ref.). It would then most likely be a “Hoffmann” formation (**-ōn-*) or, as posited by Syrett, an *an*-stem with an [ɔ] sound in the suffix. The etymology of *-mundi* etc. is, unfortunately, rather obscure (cf. Peterson 2007b with ref.).

II) **aluko** *Alukō(n)/-o(n)*, probably a hypocoristic formation with a *kVn*-suffix to a personal name in *Alu-* (cf. Peterson 2004: 6). Either a fem. *ōn*-stem, a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- (< **-ōn*) or hystero-dynamic (the nom. **-ō* being levelled from oblique cases) type or a “Hoffmann” formation. The last-mentioned type is found in Greek masculine hypocorisms (*Āndrōn*, *Klēōn*, *Níkōn* : men's names *Andro-*, *Kleo-*, *Niko-*, Solmsen 1909: 116 ff.), whereas in Germanic fem. hypocorisms are known to be formed with the *ōn*-suffix (cf. Remmer 2009: 298 ff.).

III) **boro** *Borō(n)*, probably a woman's name (cf. Antonsen 2002: 271), being an *ōn*-stem possibly identical with a word **borō* f. ‘daughter’ (cf. Peterson 2004: 7).

IV) **braido** *Braiðō(n)/-o(n)*, an *n*-stem formation to (Old Norse) *breiðr* ‘broad’ (Peterson 2004: 7), being probably a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hystero-dynamic type or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation (secondarily used for individualizing) or, possibly, a fem. *ōn*-stem. Cf., e.g., the male bynames Gr. *Plátōn* ‘the broad one’ (a “Hoffmann” formation, Schmitt 1996: 626; cf. Olsen 2004: 231), Old Norse *Breiði* ‘id.’ (Lind 1920–21 s.v.).

V) **eho** *Ehō(n)/-o(n)*, probably a hypocoristic formation to a personal name in **Ehūa-* (Old Norse *Īō-*) or a byname formation (cf. Hellquist 1912: 97, 100) to **ehūaz* m. ‘horse’ (Peterson 2004: 6), if Proto-Norse (possibly rather West Germanic, Peterson ib.) being a fem. *ōn*-stem,

¹⁴ The interpretation thus seems problematic. Cf. Peterson (op. cit.: 8): “Det enda feminina namnet på *-mund-* funnet på nordisk botten är alltså detta gen. *Agilamundōn* [...], om vilket Schramm [...] säger: ‘Der *n*-Stamm urnord. *-mundon* könnte dazu [dvs. till *ī-/ijō*-klassen] eine frühe Variante sein (vgl. *-gunnr* : *-gunna*, *-hildir* : *-hilda*).’ Vad Schramm inte är medveten om här är att de svaga sidoförmerna fvn. *-gunna* och *-hilda* är relativt sena skapelser som beror på en medeltida ljudutveckling [...] och knappast kan ha något att göra med den urnordiska *n*-stamsböjningen.”

a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation. Cf. **aluko**. If a byname formation, rather individualizing than possessive.

VI) **fozo** *Fōzō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, possibly a formation connected with Lat. *Fosi* (an ethnic designation), if Proto-Norse and not West Germanic (cf. Peterson 2004: 7) either a fem. *ōn*-stem, a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type (if an old *n*-stem formation, the *-z*- would indicate a hysterodynamic **fuzēn*) or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation.

VII) **fino** *Finnō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, probably a byname formation connected with Old Norse *Finni* (a male byname and principal name, Lind 1905–15, 1920–21 s.v., Söderwall 1884–1918: 251), *Finna* (a female principal name, Lind 1905–15 s.v.), *finnr* m. ‘Lapp, Finn, sorcerer’ (Fritzner 1886–96 1: 417), *Finnr* (a man’s name, a dwarf name, Lind 1905–15: 272 ff.), Gr. *Phínnoi*, Lat. *Fenni* (an ethnic designation, Hellquist 1948: 211) or a hypocoristic formation to a personal name in (Old Norse) *Finn-*, *-finnr* or *-finna* (Lind 1905–15: 268 ff.). Either a fem. *ōn*-stem (cf. Old Norse *Finna*) or a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation (cf. Old Norse *Finni*). Cf. **eho**, **aluko**.

VIII) **hariso** *Xarisō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, probably a hypocoristic formation with a *sVn*-suffix to a personal name in *Xari-* (Peterson 2004: 9), being a fem. *ōn*-stem, a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation. Cf. **aluko**.

IX) **igijon** *Ing(ū)ijō̄n(n)/Igiijō̄n(n)/Ing(ū)ijō̄n(n)/Igiijō̄n(n)*, probably a hypocoristic formation with a *kVn*-suffix to a personal name in **Ingūija-* or (West Germ.) *Ig-* or a (byname) formation connected to Gr. *ékhis* m. ‘viper’ (cf. Peterson 2004: 12). Either a fem. *ōn*-stem or a masc. “Hoffmann” formation or *an*-stem. Cf. **aluko**.

X) **lamo** *Lamō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, probably a byname formation to Old Norse *lami*, Old Sax. *lamo*, Old Engl. *lama* ‘lame, limping, crippled, paralysed’ (Hellquist 1948: 557; cf. Bjorvand & Lindeman 2007: 628), either a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type, a masc. “Hoffmann” formation or, possibly, a fem. *ōn*-stem. Cf. **braidō**.

XI) **lepro** *Leprō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, probably a byname formation to Old Norse *leðr* (< **lepra-*) n. ‘leather’ (Peterson 2004: 13), the *-þ*- reasonably maintained from the derivational basis rather than due to the accentuation of the *n*-stem, which is either a masc. “Hoffmann” formation, an *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type or, possibly, a fem. *ōn*-stem. Possessive, agential or individualizing. Cf., e.g., Old Norse male byname *Skinni* (: *skinn* n. ‘skin, fur’), *Hvítaleðr* (: *hvítr* ‘white’, *leðr* ‘leather’), *Leðrungr* (: *leðr* ‘läder’, som torde ha varit faderns binamn”) (Lind 1920–21 s.v.).

XII) **mairlǰu** *Mārlingu*, probably a woman’s name, being an *ō*-stem formation (cf. further Peterson 2004: 14).

XIII) **witro** *Uitrō̄(ⁿ)/-oⁿ*, probably a byname formation to (Old Norse) *uitr* ‘wise’; cf. the Old Norse bynames *Hinn vitri*, *Hin vitra*, masc. and fem. respectively (Lind 1920–21: 404, Williams 2006: 278 f.). Either a masc. *an*-stem of the amphi- or hysterodynamic type, a masc. “Hoffmann” formation or a fem. *ōn*-stem. Cf. **braidō**.

Table 2. The names of Table 1 reclassified as to gender and (original) place in the name system.

Name	Inscription	Most plausible classification(s)
aglamudon	N KJ 69 Rosseland	man’s name, > Old Norse <i>-mundi</i> ?
aluko	N KJ 49 Førde	hypocoristic man’s or woman’s name
boro	N KJ 76 Opedal	woman’s name, byname formation
braidō	Ög KJ 54 Himmelstalund	man’s name, byname formation
eho	Düwel & Roth 1977 Donzdorf	hypocoristic man’s or woman’s name; or man’s name, byname formation; or West Germanic man’s name?
fozo	IK 76 Hitsum	man’s name, byname formation? West Germanic man’s name?
fino	Sö 24 (KJ 86) Berga	hypocoristic man’s or woman’s name; or man’s or woman’s name, byname formation
hariso	DR 232 (KJ 9) Himlingøje	hypocoristic man’s or woman’s name
igijon	N KJ 81 Stenstad	hypocoristic man’s or woman’s name; or man’s name, byname formation
lamo	DR MS1995;322 Skovgårde	man’s name, byname formation
lepro	DR 18 (KJ 42) Strårup	man’s name, byname formation
mairlǰu	N KJ 89 Tanem	woman’s name, unclear type
witro	DR EM85;93 Fælleseje	man’s or woman’s name, byname formation

Bibliography

- Andersson, Thorsten, 1995: "Nordische und kontinentalgermanische Orts- und Personennamenstruktur in alter Zeit." In *Nordwestgermanisch*, eds. E. Marold & C. Zimmermann. Berlin–New York.
- Antonsen, Elmer H., 1970: "Toward a new runic grammar." In *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics*, ed. Hreinn Benediktsson. Reykjavík.
- , 2002: *Runes and Germanic linguistics*. Berlin–New York.
- Baesecke, Georg, 1918: *Einführung in das Althochdeutsche*. München.
- Bammesberger, Alfred, 1990: *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens*. Heidelberg.
- Bjorvand, Harald & Fredrik Otto Lindeman, 2007: *Våre arveord. Etymologisk ordbok*. Rev. og utv. utg. Oslo.
- Boutkan, Dirk, 1995: *The Germanic 'Auslautgesetze'*. Amsterdam.
- Brugmann, Karl 1889: *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen 2*. Strassburg.
- Dunkel, George, 2001: "The Sound-Systems of Proto-Indo-European." In: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, eds. M. E. Huld et al. Washington D.C.
- Düwel, Klaus, 1970: "Die Runen des Brakteaten von Hitsum." In: *Goldbrakteaten aus Siversn*, ed. K. Hauck. Mit Beiträgen von K. Düwel et al. München.
- & Helmut Roth, 1977: "Die Runenfibel von Donzdorf." In *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 11.
- Ekbo, Sven, 1947: "Nordiska personbinamn under vikinga- och medeltid." In *Personnamn*, ed. A. Janzén. Nordisk kultur 7. Stockholm–Oslo–København.
- Euler, Wolfram, 1985: "Gab es ein ostgermanisches Sprachgebiet in Südsandinavien? (Zur Frage gotisch-ostgermanischer Runeninschriften in Südschweden und Dänemark.)" In *Nowele* 6.
- Fritzner, Johan, 1886–96: *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog*. Omarb., forøget og forbedret Udg. 1–3. Kristiania–New York–Leipzig–London–Paris–St. Petersburg.
- Grünzweig, Friedrich E., 2004: *Runeninschriften auf Waffen. Inschriften vom 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. bis ins Hochmittelalter*. Wien.
- Grønvik, Ottar, 1981: *Runene på Tunesteinen. Alfabet. Språkform. Budskap*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø.
- Hamp, Eric, 1972: "Palaic *ha-a-ap-na-aš* 'river'." In *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 30.
- Hellquist, Elof, 1912: "Fornsvenska tillnamn." In *Xenia Lideniana. Festskrift tillägnad professor Evald Lidén på hans femtioårsdag den 3 oktober 1912*. Stockholm.
- , 1948: *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*. 3 uppl. Lund.
- van Helten, W., 1891: "Grammatisches." In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 15.
- Hoffmann, Karl, 1955: "Ein grundsprachliches Possessivsuffix." In *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 6.
- Hollifield, Patrick Henry, 1980: "The phonological development of final syllables in Germanic." In *Die Sprache* 26.
- Imer, Lisbeth M., 2007: *Runer og runeindskrifter. Kronologi, kontekst og funktion i Skandinavien's jernalder og vikingetid*. 1. Katalog. 2. Tekst. København.
- Jacobsson, Stefan, mscr.a: "Fornnordiska mansnamn med *ōn*-stamsböjning." Manuscript.
- , mscr.b: "Personbinamn i vikingatida runinskrifter." Manuscript.
- Jasanoff, Jay H., 1989: "Old Irish *bé* 'woman'." In *Ériu* 40.
- Jón Axel Harðarson, 1987: "Das uridg. Wort für Frau." In *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48.
- Kock, Axel, 1921: *Svensk ljudhistoria* 4. Lund–Leipzig.
- Kortlandt, Frederik, 2006: "The inflexion of the Germanic *n*-stems." In *Nowele* 48.
- Krause, Wolfgang, 1966: *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark* 1. Mit Beiträgen von Herbert Jankuhn. Göttingen.
- , 1971: *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften*. Heidelberg.
- Lane, George S., 1963: "Bimoric and trimoric vowels and diphthongs: laws of Germanic finals again." In *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 62: 1.
- Laur, Wolfgang, 1983: "Akzente und Intonation in den baltischen und nordischen Sprachen." In *Sprachwissenschaft* 8. *sprogvidenskap* 16.
- Lid, Nils, 1952: "Den nordiske nominativ singularis av maskuline *an*-stammer." In *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap* 16.
- Lind, E. H., 1905–15: *Norsk-isländska dopnamn ock fingerade namn från medeltiden*. Uppsala–Leipzig.

- , 1920–21: *Norsk-isländska personbinamn från medeltiden*. Uppsala.
- Melchert, H. C., 1983: “A ‘new’ PIE *men suffix.” In *Die Sprache* 29.
- Nedoma, Robert, 1995a: *Die Inschrift auf dem Helm B von Negau. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Deutung norditalischer epigraphischer Denkmäler*. Wien.
- , 1995b: “Neues zu älteren Runeninschriften.” In *Die Sprache* 37.
- , 2004: *Personennamen in südgermanischen Runeninschriften*. Heidelberg.
- , 2005: “Urnordisch -a im Nominativ Singularis der maskulinen n-Stämme.” In *Papers on Scandinavian and Germanic language and culture published in honour of Michael Barnes on his sixty-fifth birthday 28 June 2005*. Nowele 46/47.
- Oettinger, Norbert, 1980: “Die n-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Ausgangspunkte.” In *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94.
- , 1982: “Reste von e-Hochstufe im Formans hethitischer n-Stämme einschließlich des ‘umna’-Suffixes.” In *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. E. Neu. Wiesbaden.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette, 2004: “The complex of nasal stems in Indo-European.” In *Indo-European Word Formation. Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Copenhagen October 20th–22nd 2000*, ed. J. Clackson & B. A. Olsen. Copenhagen.
- Orel, Vladimir, 2003: *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden–Boston.
- Peterson, Lena, 2004: *Lexikon över urnordiska personnamn*. <http://www.sofi.se/1465>.
- , 2007a: *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon*. Femte, rev. utg. Uppsala.
- , 2007b: “Om de urnordiska Agilamundō, Kunimunduz och fornnordiska mansnamn på -mundi.” In *Studia anthroponymica Scandinavica* 25.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean, 2000: “Védique *dāmūnas-*, Latin *dominus* et l’origine du suffixe de Hoffmann.” In *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95.
- Reis, Marga, 1974: “Phonologie des spätgemeingermanischen Vokalismus unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nebensilbenvokale.” In H. Penzl et al.: *Probleme der historischen Phonologie*. Wiesbaden.
- Remmer, Ulla, 2009: “Germanisch.” In *Indogermanische Frauennamen*, eds. K. Stüber et al. Heidelberg.
- Sanness Johnsen, Ingrid, 1969: “Kan runeinnskrifter bidra til å belyse kvinnens stilling i det førkristne Norden?” In *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 84.
- Schaffner, Stefan, 2001: *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger, 1995: “Morphologie der Namen: Vollnamen und Kurznamen bzw. Kosenamen im Indogermanischen.” In *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik* 1, ed. E. Eichler et al. Berlin–New York.
- Seebold, Elmar, 1994: “Die sprachliche Deutung und Einordnung der archaischen Runeninschriften.” In *Runische Schriftkultur ... Internationales Symposium in der Werner-Reimers-Stiftung vom 24.–27. Juni 1992 in Bad Homburg*. Berlin–New York.
- Solmsen, Felix, 1909: *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung* 1. Straßburg.
- Specht, Franz, 1932: “Die Flexion der n-Stämme im Baltisch-Slavischen und Verwandtes.” In *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 59.
- Stiles, Patrick, 1984: “On the interpretation of older runic *Swestar* on the Opedal stone.” In *Nowele* 3.
- Stoklund, Marie, 1994: “Von Thorsberg nach Haithabu. Ein Überblick über die dänischen Inschriften unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der möglichen Spuren von kulturellen und sprachlichen Kontakten nach außen.” In *Runische Schriftkultur ... Internationales Symposium in der Werner-Reimers-Stiftung vom 24.–27. Juni 1992 in Bad Homburg*. Berlin–New York.
- Streitberg, Wilhelm, 1896: *Urgermanische Grammatik. Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der altgermanischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg.
- Syrett, Martin, 1994: *The unaccented vowels of Proto-Norse*. Nowele, supplement 11. Odense.
- Söderwall, K. F., 1884–1918: *Ordbok öfver svenska medeltids-språket* 1. Lund.
- Tremblay, Xavier, 2003: *La déclinaison des noms de parenté indo-européens en -ter-*. Innsbruck.
- Williams, Henrik, 2006: “Runinskriften från Fælleseje: en urnordisk annons eller ett personnamn?” In *Namn och runor. Uppsalastudier i onomastik och runologi till Lennart Elmevik på 70-årsdagen 2 februari 2006*, eds. L. Peterson et al. Uppsala.
- Walde, Alois, 1900: *Die germanischen Auslautgesetze. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung mit vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung der Zeitfolge der Auslautveränderungen*. Halle (Saale).