Lancashire

Halecath: OE *halh* + ON pers.n. *Katr* [see *Halecote*] (1212) [FJ]

Rigsumerild: ON *hryggr*, OE *hrycg* + ON pers.n. **Sumarhildr* or ON *Sumarliði* or OE *Sumarlidi* (1246–67)

Rudswain: perh. ON *ruð* + ON pers.n. *Sveinn* (1268–79)

Scartherwlmer: ON *skarð* [pl.] + OE pers.n. *Wulfmær* (1190–1213)

Starhouraven: ON **storrhaugr* + ON pers.n. *Hrafn* (1220–50)

Twaitkendenan: ON *þveit* + perh. pers.n. (1318)

Doubtful

Bryning: ON **Bjárstaðr* + pers.n. **Bryning*, or OE **Bryningas* (1200 as *Birstaf Brinning*)

Laithgryme: ON *leið* + ON pers.n. *Grímr* (1230–46)

Leagram: ON *hlaða* + ON pers.n. *Grímr* (1282) [or ON *leið-gríma* FJ]

How Anglo-Saxon Personal Names Work

Peter R. Kitson
University of Birmingham

I should say to begin with that though I am an Anglo-Saxonist and a name scholar I am not a personal-name specialist. There are one or two heavyweight anthroponymists in the Society, but the chairman chose to ask me instead.[1] Perhaps he thought my knowledge of topographic names or even natural history might give me useful perspectives, or perhaps he was just being mischievous. 'Like shepherd, like sheep' often applies to the Vikings and those who study them, in my experience. Anyway here we are, and we must make the best of it.

The best way into an unfamiliar intellectual system can be what modish grammarians call a contrastive approach with the closest corresponding system with which we are familiar. And you want to know, I take it, not only how English personal names worked in the Anglo-Saxon period but how we got from the state of things then to the present one. Archaeologists among you will know that for purposes of radiocarbon dating the present day is defined as AD 1950. That is useful for cultural purposes too, as the 1950s were the last decade when patterns, including naming-patterns, which had held good for several centuries with little change were accepted more or less unquestioningly in English public life. Two classes of personal name have become frequent since, one of which was rare then, the other almost non-existent: the former, names of film-stars and other entertainers, Wayne, Tracy, and the like—my and John Insley's least favourite, Darren, may be counted with these—, the latter, non-Christian immigrant names, of whom iconic recently was Omar

---

Bakri Mohammed. Post-modern English personal naming is epitomized by a fast food shop in Bromsgrove which till recently was Darr's Fish and Chip Bar, but was taken over and is now Rajtani's.

Now cast your mind back to the ordered world of an England that had but recently shrugged off the horrors of war. It may be symbolized not unaptly by our list of speakers.[2] A very large number of people had a very small number of frequent names, most of which were Biblical whether from the New or Old Testament, Peter, David, and the like. Also prominent, but less so, were names of non-Biblical saints and English kings, combined felicitously in George. Even minor names, such as Matthew, were often Biblical. Much the same was true on the distaff side, though there the names in frequent use were even fewer, Mary, Elizabeth, and the like, and categories tend to collapse: even the reigning queens' names were all Biblical except Victoria. All this meant that wherever you lived or worked, quite a lot of the people you knew would have identical Christian names; for clarity of reference you told them apart by surnames. If surnames too should happen to be grossly recurrent, as in the land of Jones and Davies, recourse was had to nicknames, thus Dai the Post. And all this had held more or less since the early thirteenth century. There have been changes in fashion, especially at the Protestant Reformation, and especially among Puritans, who liked minor Biblical figures from Ananias to Zerubbabel, and vernacular devoutness as expressed by Praisegod Barebones. But the big difference is between the state of things after *c.*1200 and before. To that earlier period we now turn.

The big difference can be summed up in six words: The Anglo-Saxons did not have surnames. They did, of course, have as much need to distinguish between individuals as we do. Modern communications may mean you meet more other people altogether, but size of working groups is limited by human capacities, and that of living groups has arguably diminished in our lifetimes, with the spread of private motor transport making it so much easier for people to ignore each other. An adult male Anglo-Saxon was liable to be called up at short notice into a

---

[2] Speakers at the York day conference were Peter Kitson, David Parsons, David Postles, Peter McClure and George Redmonds. The organiser was Matthew Townend.

citizen army of hundreds, or in the worst case thousands, of people. So I labour the point that their naming-system had to do as much work as ours does. They just did it a different way.

How this worked for the better sort of people can be illustrated by about the only group of Anglo-Saxons most modern people have heard of, the kings of Wessex from whom came the first proper kings of England. (See Table 1.) Their official genealogy goes back, as you will be glad to know our own queen's still does, to the heathen god Woden.[3] I enter it not in the very early stages, where it is legendary; nor in the settlement period, where it combines at least two real dynasties, from Winchester and the Thames Valley, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle does not tell us all the truth, and perhaps not very much of the truth, about how they came together; but at the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries, when for nearly forty years the West Saxons were ruled by a king called Ine, the earliest whose laws we possess, and you can't get much more boringly historical than that. His father's name was **Cœnrēd**, he had sisters called **Cwēnburh**, **Quœngȳþ**, and **Cūðburh**, and brothers called **Centwine** and **Ingild**. Some historians are such spoilsports as to call Centwine legendary, but as he was the father of the famously difficult Latin writer Aldhelm, I think we can hardly accept that. The Royal Historical Society's sober Handbook of Dates assigns him a reign from 676 to 685, three years before the beginning of Ine's.

Ine married a lady called **Æðelburh**, but they don't seem to have had any surviving children. So we scroll fast forward to Ingild's great-great-grandson **Ecgbeorht**, the first man who for part of his reign was king of all England. He married a Frankish princess **Rǣdburh** and had sons called **Æðelwulf** and **Æðelstān**. Æðelwulf's queen **Ōsburh** bore him a daughter **Æðelswīð** and five sons, **Æðelstān**, **Æðelbald**, **Æðelbeorht**, **Æðelred**, and **Ælfred**, all of whom successively became king, and most of whom came to bad ends against the Danes, Æðelbald not before he had the royally bad manners to steal his stepmother from his father. This *femme fatale* had the Biblically appropriate name Judith. (She was a Frenchwoman as you might expect, and she ended up as countess of

---

[3] Or did at her accession. It might be imagined that tiresomely reforming Home Secretaries had tidied him away since, but Birmingham history graduates, more up to date in these matters than I am, assure me he is still there.

Table 1

Wessexway: a royal soap-opera mainly after W.G. Searle, *Anglo-Saxon bishops, kings and nobles*

[Woden]
⇓
Cerdic
⇓
Cœnred

Cwenburh   Quængyþ   Cuđburh   **Ini**=Æđelburh   Centwine ("Kenten")   In(i)gild
                         =⊗   (E)Aldhelm
                                            Ecgbeorht=Rædburh

Æđelwulf =(i) Osburh   =(ii) Judith⊗   Æđelstan

Æđelstan   **Æđelbald**   **Æđelbeorht**   **Æđelred**   Æđelswid   **Ælfred** = Ealhswid
              =Judith⊗   =⊕

Æđelflæd   **Eadweard** =(i) Ecgwyn =(ii) Ælfflæd =(iii) Eadgifu   Eadmund   Æđelgifu   Ælfþryþ   Æđelweard
=⊕   =Judith's Flemish son⊕   =⊕

Æđelstan *dtr.* Ælfweard Eadwine Eadflæd Eadgifu Æđelhild Eadhild Eadgyþ Ælfgifu **Eadmund Eadred** Eadburh Eadgifu
=⊕   =©   =⊕   =©   =(i) Ælfgifu =(ii) Æđelflæd   =⊕

Eadwig   **Eadgar** =(i) Æđelflæd   =(ii) Ælfþryþ   =(iii) Wulfþryþ

           Eadweard   Eadmund **Æđelred** =(i) Ælfflæd (Æđelflæd/Ælfgifu) =(ii) Ælfgifu/Emma   Eadgyþ

Æđelstan Ecgbeorht **Eadmund** Eadred Eadwig Eadweard Eadgar Eadgyþ Ælfgifu Wulfhild *dtr. dtr.* Ælfred **Eadweard** Godgifu
                     =⊕   =⊗   =⊕   =⊗   =⊗
                                                          + **Harold** Godwinessunu

| denotes immediate direct descent;
⇓ direct descent through several generations;
=⊕ marriage with issue not shown here;
=⊗ marriage without issue according to Searle;
=© marriage on which Searle is especially unclear;
≈ concubinage not proper marriage.
Kings of England and supreme kings of Wessex are in bold print; Cœnred was probably only a sub-king.

Flanders.)

By this stage, around 900, kings who managed to have families at all were having them almost of Victorian size, though not with such good survival rates. Alfred and his Mercian lady **Ealhswīð** had three daughters, **Æðelflǣd**, **Æðelgifu**, and **Ælfþrȳþ**, and three sons, **Ēadweard**, **Ēadmund**, and **Æðelweard**. The first of these is the king we call Edward the Elder to distinguish him from the Confessor. He according to Searle had fourteen children, by three wives, **Ecgwyn**, **Ælfflǣd**, and **Ēadgifu**. Five were sons, **Æðelstān**, **Ēadmund**, and **Ēadred** who were successively king, and **Ælfweard** and **Ēadwine** who died young, nine daughters, of whom one's name is not known, the rest being **Ēadflǣd**, **Ēadgifu**, **Æðelhild**, **Ēadhild**, **Ēadgȳþ**, **Ælfgifu**, **Ēadburh**, and **Ēadgifu**. Edmund by his queen **Ælfgifu** had just two sons, **Ēadwīg** and **Ēadgār**, both king. Edgar married twice and had three sons, **Ēadweard** by his first queen **Æðelflǣd**, **Ēadmund** who died young and **Æðelrǣd**. One might say that Edward died young as well, since though he succeeded Edgar as king he was fairly soon assassinated, allegedly at the instigation of his wicked stepmother. The invidious position Æðelred was in as the beneficiary of this act probably contributed to the political unsureness for which we best know him. He did, however, live longer than any of the seven kings between him and Alfred, and had no fewer than fifteen children. Two figures so far apart historically as **Ēadmund** Ironside, briefly king in contention with Cnut, and **Ēadweard** the Confessor, last royally descended Anglo-Saxon king, were both among them. We won't bother with the rest except to say that eleven were by his first queen **Ælfflǣd**, three by **Ælfgifu**, a Norman whose real name was Emma (you can read all her spin-doctors wanted you to know about her in the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*).[4] Between Edmund and Edward there came of course the Danish kings, starting with Cnut, who took over Emma as one of the appurtenances of royalty (she sounded right, she was his second queen called Ælfgifu);[5] after Edward an English

---

[4] Conversely Edward the Confessor's sister Godgifu, after her marriage *c.*1020 to a Norman, went by a Norman name 'Etia *vel* Emma', as Keynes (1991.186) points out.
[5] The first was daughter of Ælfhelm earl of Northampton.

nationalist with a Danish name, the ill-fated Harold.[6]

I hope you found this abridged royal soap-opera fun. It reads more luridly in Dickens's *Child's History of England*. I don't expect you to remember all the characters. But you are now in a position to see what I mean when I say that what are significant in this naming-system are not the names as such but name-elements. All these names have two elements, that is, technically, they are *dithematic* names, except for Ine, which has just one: it is *monothematic*. A third formal category, *extended monothematic* names, which have just one meaningful element with a suffix, are much rarer and do not occur in this sample. An example is Ægele, equivalent of Norse *Egill*, who gave his name to Aylesbury. A rule of thumb about the distribution of the types is that the higher you are in society, and the later in Anglo-Saxon times, the more likely names are to be dithematic. Extended monothematic names mainly belong to the heroic centuries before 700.

For the time being we shall concentrate on dithematic names; we'll come on to monothematic ones at the end. Control of samples and historical control are easiest with the dithematic names, and they show the general characteristics of the system most clearly. They also comprise most of the Anglo-Saxon formations you are ever likely to come across in more modern names, mainly as surnames, since that is the only slot in which old names survived the influx of Biblical ones in any number. To appreciate your heritage in this matter, you have to be prepared for a certain amount of adjustment of vowels between dialects, and for attrition especially of consonant-clusters in these degenerate days. A prime case is that celebratedly English composer, Sir Eadweard Ælfgar, or what's-his-name Wulfstan the cantor of the Clerkes of Oxenford.[7] Of course some Old English compounds are still used as Christian names too, mainly in vaguely patrician families: think of Selwyn Lloyd or Selwyn Gummer, depending on your vintage of Tory.[8] (You'd need not Anglo-Saxons but a *Scotichronicon* for New Labour.)

---

[6] Anglicized from Old Norse *Haraldr*, the equivalent of Old English **Hereweald**.

[7] OE **Ēadweard** > Mod.E *Edward*; Ælfgar > Mod.E *Elgar, Algar, Alger*; **Wulfstān** > Wulstan.

[8] **Selewine** 'hall-friend' and **Seolhwine** 'seal-friend' are both attested as etyma for *Selwyn* (but note that **-wyn** in Old English would make it a *woman*'s name).

Fundamental to the Old English personal-naming system is that the individual elements repeat much more than the whole names do. In our highly select population the samples are as in Table 2. Here fifty-five individuals have forty Old English names between them, divided equally between the sexes; but only about a dozen first elements or masculine second elements are represented altogether, and only eight feminine second elements. First elements, *protothemes*, are in principle common between the sexes (though Searle's *Onomasticon* reveals no case of **Cwēn-** in men's names, and the similar-sounding **Cœn-** is exceedingly rare in women's).[9] It is in second elements, *deuterothemes*, that the difference between men and women is expressed. Masculine ones are masculine-gendered nouns, or sometimes adjectives; feminine ones are nouns of feminine gender. That is why the feminine are mostly abstract nouns, most of which are feminine in Old English. The meanings are essentially arbitrary; they could be anything that was felt to be good in some way by the heathen military aristocracy among whom the system originated. The particular elements have nearly all continued in use since Common Germanic times, and the dithematic naming-system as such is inherited from Common Indo-European, several millennia back.[10]

If an Anglo-Saxon stopped to think about it he would have been able to tell the meaning of most elements, though not all of them. Several are obelized in dictionaries as archaic and/or mainly poetic; a few are not found as words in historical Old English, ***flæd**, for instance, whose meaning is reconstructed from Germanic cognates. Here I should say that one-word translations as on the table can be misleading. The cognates imply that what **-Flæd** meant is elegance or daintiness as of a courtly lady, not the radiant beauty which given the right beholder is available to all women, and which is expressed by the adjective **scīene**. Some

---

[9] But one **Cœnburh** with a sister **Cwēnburh** can hardly be a scribal error.

[10] Or to be more exact, dithematic beside simple and extended monothematic names as a combined system have. This is the only reasonable conclusion from Pulgram's (1947) helpful survey of the material, though he like scholars he was concerned to controvert overemphasized one aspect of it. Dithematic names are strongly preponderant in the earliest-attested branches of Indo-European, but as with Old English they belong more to the upper levels of society, and more than with Old English the sample is biassed toward those levels.

Table 2

Names and name-elements in a select sample of mainly dithematic personal names

Names m.		Names f.		First m.	First f.	Second m.	Second f.
Ælfred		Ælfflæd	2	Ælf- "elf" 2	6[3]	-B(e)ald "bold" 1	-Burh "protection" 6
Ælfweard		Ælfgifu	2 [+1 Elfruma, a foreigner]	Æðel- "noble" 9[6]	6[5]	-Beorht "bright" 2	-Flæd "beauty" 5[3]
Æðelbald		Ælfþryþ		Cent- "Kent" 1		-Gar "spear" 1	-Gifu "gift" 6+1[3]
Æðelbeorht		Æðelburh		Cœn>Cēn- "keen" 1		-Gield "payment" 1	-Gyþ "war" 2+1 foreign
Æðelred 2		Æðelflæd	2	Cwœn>Cwēn- "queen"	2	-Mund "bride-price" 4[1]	-Hild "battle" 2
Æðelstan 3		Æðelgifu		Cuð- "known, dear"	1	-Ræd "counsel" 5[4]	-Swið "might" 2
Æðelweard		Æðelhild		Ead- "felicity" 11[6]	7[5]+1 foreign	-Stān "stone" 3[1]	-þryþ "power" 1
Æðelwulf		Æðelswið		Ealh- "heathen fane"	1	[-W(e)ald "rule" 1 ON cognate]	-Wyn "joy" 1
Centwine		Cuðburh		Ecg- "edge"	1	-Weard "guardian" 5[3]	
Cœnred		Cwēnburh		[Here- "army"	1 ON cognate]	-Wig "war" 1	
Eadgar		Quēngyþ		In- (intensifier??*) 1+1 monothematic		-Wine "friend" 2	
Eadmund 4		Eadburh		Ōs- "heathen high god" 1		-Wulf "wolf" 1	
Eadred		Eadflæd					
Eadweard 3		Eadgifu	3				
Eadwig		Eadgyþ [+1 Judith, a foreigner]		Ræd- "counsel" 1			
Eadwine		Eadhild					
Ecgbeorht		Ealhswið		Total protothemes represented:	7+1 9	Total deuterothemes represented:	11+1 8
Harold		Egwynn			12+1		
Ine		Osburh					
Ingild		Rædburh					
Totals: Individuals [Names]							
28[20]		27[20+2]					

*Use of what is plainly the same element as a monotheme for **Ine** appears to tell quite strongly against the standard explanation of it as an intensifier without meaning in itself. It is more likely to have originated as a phonetic variant of **Ing** by dissimilation and/or haplophony in compounds such as **In(g)gild**.

---

elements, too, a native speaker might be liable to mistranslate. Grammatically masculine **mund** is an exceedingly rare word. Its cognates mean in laws of other Germanic nations the bride-price which a bridegroom paid to his bride or father-in-law. Its only occurrence as a word in Old English is in poetry,[11] in a bridal context but one where that meaning is only dubiously applicable; Gollancz translates it there 'plighted troth'. But Old English-speakers would have been likely to link it with a fully current grammatically feminine word **mund** which means 'palm of the hand' and also 'protection',[12] and to think of it as the protection offered by a lord with a strong hand,[13] as opposed to the feminine element translated 'protection', **burh**, whose underlying sense is that of a fortified place.

In combining elements to make whole names, associations of elements were far more important than any idea of through-composed meaning. Whole names had the potential, under external stimulus, to be thought of for their whole sense; the famous case is **Æðelræd Unræd** 'Noble counsel, the opposite of counsel', the king we call Ethelred the Unready, a nickname one would suppose to be contemporary though surviving record of it is not.[14] Yet such etymologizing could equally be of half a name, ignoring the other half. Again it is hard to find strictly contemporary comment, but Woolf (1939.93–94) quotes William of Malmesbury on the mildness and firmness, respectively, which he

---

[11] Fricgað þurh fyrwet   hu ic fæmnanhad / mund minne geheold   and eac modor gewearð / mære meotudes suna. (*Christ* lines 92–94)
'Ye ask enquiringly how I preserved my maidenhood, my plighted troth, and yet became great mother of the Creator's son.' (tr. Gollancz)

[12] Discussed in detail by Hough (1999).

[13] According to Holthausen *mund* m. is actually a derivative of *mund* f. Prof. Chr. Wickham remarks that in continental Germanic, especially Lombard, laws, Latinized *munda* typically means protection of women.

[14] The earliest written evidence found by Simon Keynes is in two Latin texts, *c.*1180 Walter Map [garbled] <*nullum*> *consilium* and s.xiii[in.] Leges Anglorum *Ethelredus Unrad*. Warnings against the perennially seductive error of assuming Old English (or Germanic) dithematic names in general to be semantically through-composed include Woolf (1939.263–64) and Redin (1919.xxxvii–xxxviii).

thought the names of Mildþryþ and Dunstan implied. 'Mild power' as a whole would be something slightly different; and firmness is not more proper to a dun stone than to any other colour stone. Then again, there are names which understood as a whole would make nonsense. Half a dozen persons are on record called **Friþuwulf** 'peace-wolf' (one of them in the genealogies as son of Woden, that deceitful god). If the semantics were meant seriously this is worse than modern politicians with their 'fights for peace' (or perhaps a wolf in sheep's clothing?).

Above all, we must never forget the religious woman **Ēadwulfu**. Her name as you can see from Table 2 would, but for its final -*u*, be a well-formed man's name. It is a common one: Searle has more than two double-columned pages of men bearing it. The -*u* is a feminine grammatical ending. It's strictly only proper after short stem-syllables as in *Eadgifu*, but quite a few late texts do put it sporadically after long ones as here. The charter from which we know about her, S448, is dated 939, on the early side for this as a random linguistic development.[15] But of course it is not random. The overwhelmingly likely human explanation is that her parents meant to have a boy they'd call **Ēadwulf**, and when the desired child turned out to be a girl, they used with minimal adaptation the name they'd intended anyway. They were obviously not bothered by masculine predatory overtones of the name-element, any more than were parents of women with the moderately common name **Wulfrūn** (such as the eponymous foundress of Wolverhampton).[16]

Name-compounds are not, then, closely conditioned semantically. But neither are they random. One conditioning factor is family association. West Saxon royalty down to Ine's generation mostly have names beginning with *C*-, after him nearly all with vowels (mainly the elements **Æðel-**, **Ēad-**, and **Ælf-**). Second elements, and whole compounds, both tend to recur in families too. Thus five of Æthelwulf's children repeat his prototheme, one echoing the whole of his brother's name; and even the youngest, Ælfred, shares a deuterotheme with one of the others. This

---

[15] S448 grants Brightwalton *cuidam religiose femine vocitato nomine EADULFU*. The *W*- of deuterothemes in -*Wulf* is normally lost by about 900: see Kitson (1994) Table 17.
[16] Also worthy of mention is the Franco-Romance hybrid *Vulfemia* Morlet I 231 cites from Rheims.

repetition with variation does in a rough and ready way the same sort of job as our surnames do. It explains the fact, which you may think I skated over too glibly, that name-compounds in our royal sample contradict the generalization about less variety among feminines. The men were named within the family. About half the women married into it; their name-patterns are of the wider nobility, and indeed of Anglo-Saxon and continental Germanic royalty at large.

Also loosely a conditioning factor is level in society. Thus the proto-theme **Æðel-** 'noble' is commoner in the royal family than in any other family. Not common there is the element **Wine** 'friend'; ordinary **Mann** does not, I think, occur among them at all. Numismatists have remarked, however, on the frequency of deuterotheme -**Wine** in moneyers' names. Veronica Smart[17] notes **Lēofwine** and **Gōdwine** particularly, but **Ælfwine**, **Æðelwine**, and **Ēadwine** are also prominent in her sample. We may choose to think that their being of the class of people who form trade guilds and associations has something to do with it. (You may grant this for townsfolk in general, which most moneyers certainly were, even if you do not share my instinctive belief that kingship is not the only trade which runs in families.) Going down again, turn to my favourite sample, qualifying elements of boundary features in land charters. Some circumspection is necessary with these, because they involve landowners as well as peasants, some figures from the past, even the far heroic past, as well as many from the rural present. But the samples are large enough (more than 1500 features with personal-name qualifiers altogether, of which more than 700 with dithematic names),[18] and types have enough correlation with kinds of feature, to make reasonably well controlled inferences about some of them. People with 'boundaries', who must be contemporary landowners, have vastly more dithematic names than people with 'trees', for instance.[19] Well, an interesting group of these

---

[17] Smart (1981.xv); cf. Kitson (1994.47–48) and refs.
[18] The figures, rounded here, are from Kitson (1994) Table 1, and need to be increased somewhat from charter boundaries newly discovered since that was written.
[19] If you perform a χ^2 test on the monothematic names in the two categories, it gives a difference between them of more than six times the standard error, which means 99 point several 9s per cent certainty that they do not come from

qualifiers are dithematic with second element **-Mann**. (See Table 3).
More than half the protothemes do not occur with any other deutero-
theme in this material. And most of those seem to be either diminutive
or derogatory in some way. 'Short man', 'son-man', 'sprig-man', 'mule-
man' (mule meant a hybrid of races, not necessarily an equine hybrid),
'fool-man', 'black man' and maybe 'dun man', 'Northman'. (**Tātemann**,
'cheerful man', is an exception; his apple-tree must have done him
good.)[20] This group, especially **Dol(e)mann**, give a context for one of
my favourite of all farmland features, 'Sotceorl's acre'.[21] You would
not get a royal prince called **Sotceorl**. (Though **Ceorl** as a monotheme
does occur for royal persons; and by a circuitous continental route it is
the same as our name Charles.)

  There is sound-patterning as well as sense-patterning in name-
compounds. Table 3 shows some, from the charter sample. Only two
dithematic names there begin with *Hw-*; they are **Hwætmund** and
Hwītmund. The names beginning with **Þ-** stick to a rounded version of
-Weald as deuterotheme, except that one also uses another element in
W-, **-Wulf**. Two like-sounding elements **Strūþ-** 'stiff' and **Stūt-** 'gadfly'
both combine with deutoretheme **-Heard** 'hard', **Stūt-** also with another
H- element, **Here**. Since Searle finds neither **Strūþ-** nor **Stūt-** in any
other name anywhere, the sense-link 'stiff-hard' for **Strūþ-** may be
significant; if so, both **Stūt-**compounds will have been coined as
successively chiming in sound. Sense- and sound-patterning can work
together, as they seemed to with **Cēn** and **Cwēn** in our royal sample.
Cent- as name-element almost exclusively combines with deuterotheme
-Wine, as there. (The name means 'Kent-friend': step forward, Paul

the same population.

[20] Sussex 947 S525(i) *tatmonnes apoldre.*

[21] Hants 961 S689(ii), s.x² S359 *sotceorles æcer.* If, as is imaginable, this
should happen to be proverbially bad ground (local investigation at SU 446540
needed!) **Sotceorl** might not be the birth-name of an actual living person but an
invented name for an over-optimistic farmer. But whether denoting a real or a
mythic person, linguistically it is well-formed as a dithematic personal name and
is not well-formed as anything else. Cf. modern Buggins, Juggins, etc., which
work for their shades of tone because they sound like real names, Huggins and
so on.

Table 3

Aspects of patterning in dithematic personal names

Names with second element *-mann*	
Æscmann	Æscbeorht, Æschūn
Blæcmann	———
Dol(e)mann	——— [Cf. the name *Sotceorl* unique in both elements]
Dun(e)mann	"Dunferhd" (="Domferhd")
Ealdmann	Ealdbeorht, Ealdheard, Ealdhūn, Ealdred, "Ealdrig", Ealdwine
Hysemann	———
Lēodmann	Lēodheard, Lēodhere
Norðmann	———
Mūlmann	———
Sceortmann	———
Sunemann	———
Tātemann	———
Tilmann	Tilbeorht, Tilgar, Tilmund, Tilþegn

Names with first element *Lēof-*	Number of other name-compounds with same 2nd. el.	Classification of unique second elements		
		Heroic archaisms	Foreign loans	Scribal error
Leofbeorht	19	Eadgils	Ceardic	Ealdrig
Leofcild	0	Hȳdwalda	Ceadwalla	Barlot?
Leofhere	12	Beornfær?	Sumerled	
Leofmann	13	Hereriht		
Leofnod	3	Healfdene (but like foreign loans in that the 2nd. element is effectively restricted to this one compound)		
Leofric	13			
Leofsige	6	f. Cynedeall?		
Leofstan	14			
Leofsunu	0	Productive contemporary formations		
Leofwine	14	Sotceorl		
f. Leofrun	0	Leofcild		
f. Leofwynn	4	Leofsunu		
		Wihtlufu		
		Leofrun		

Items of sound-patterning

Names with first elements *Ramm* (at least as received), *Rūm*, and *Tūn*:
 Rambold, Rumbold, Rumwold, Tumbald, Tunew[ea]ld.
Names beginning *Hw-*:
 Hwætmund, Hwītmund.
Names beginning *þ-*:
 þēodwold, þrāwold, þūr(w)old, þūr(w)ulf.
Names beginning *St-*:
 Strūþheard, Stūtheard, Stūthere.
Three heroic/archaic names with unique first elements:
 Sæferhd, Sēaxferhd, Swæ(f)ferhd.

Originally published as Kitson (1994) Table 16, and reproduced here by kind
permission of the editor, Prof. Jacek Fisiak.

Cullen.) Searle's one exception has another *W*- theme, **-Weald** (whose intent might also be political). Or inspect the group at the bottom of the table. **Sǣferð**, whose name means 'sea-spirit', ruled the continental tribe of the Secgas,[22] according to the heroic catalogue-poem *Widsith*. Names meaning 'Saxon-spirit' and 'Swabian-spirit' speak for themselves as his peers. These are the only occurrences of these protothemes in charter material, though all three are found in names of historical persons elsewhere.

Having broached the topic of peculiarities of sound, I should mention that there are some in name-elements as such. You would expect people to use them in the forms proper to the corresponding common nouns (or adjectives) in their dialect. So they do for the most part. But where the root vowel is historically *a* followed by *l* + consonant, and the preceding consonant is labial, even West Saxons use wholly or mainly what should by sound-laws be the Mercian and Northumbrian, 'Anglian', form.[23] Thus the element meaning 'bold' is practically always Anglian **-Bald**, not West Saxon **-Beald**. Searle's *Onomasticon* is naughty in this, normalizing to West Saxon forms. Simon Keynes and his cosmopolitan cohorts, who are revising it,[24] will I expect do better; I trust too they will add element-indices, which will make analysis of this kind enormously easier. But be that as it may, most of us may well be greybeards before the new version appears.

One element is dialectally skewed in this way even without a

---

[22] *Ætla weold Hunum, Eormanric Gotum, ... Burgendum Gifica. Casere weold Creacum. ... Witta weold Swæfum, ... Þeodric weold Froncum, ... Oswine weold Eowum ond Ytum Gefwulf, Fin Folcwalding Fresna cynne, Sigehere lengest Sæ-Denum weold, Hnæf Hocingum, Helm Wulfingum, ... Sæferð Sycgum, Sweom Ongendþeow, ... Sceafa Longbeardum* (from *Widsith* lines 18–31). 'Attila ruled the Huns, Ermanaric the Goths, Gibicho the Burgundians, Caesar ruled the [Byzantine] Greeks, Witta ruled the Swabians; Thierry ruled the Franks; Oswine ruled the Aviones and Gefwulf the Jutes, Finn Folcwalding the folk of the Frisians, Sigarr for a very long time ruled the Danes, Hnæf the Hocings, Helm the Wulfings, Sæferð the Secgas, Angantýr the Swedes, Sceafa the Lombards'.
[23] An aspect of this phenomenon better known to literary scholars is discussed by Lutz (1984).
[24] As announced by Keynes (2001).

preceding labial. The word 'elf' should in regular West Saxon theoretically be *ealf*, with breaking. The plural late *ylfe*, derived from early *ielfe*, implies that such a form once existed.[25] It does not seem to occur in prose, though *perhaps* none of the texts with the word is strongly enough 'West Saxon' for this to be definitely significant. In names too *Ealf-* spellings are so rare as to incur suspicion of scribal error, though it is intrinsically likely that some West Saxons spoke broadly enough to use those forms even though their royalty didn't. Still the Mercian flavour of King Alfred's name nicely symbolizes his life's work of unifying free England.

Another phonetic matter that needs comment, more in connection with the forms in which we inherit names, is length of vowels. I have followed the useful convention of marking it where etymologically present. But poetry, where contrast of length is metrically significant, shows that in name-compounds it was only there some of the time. First elements, which bear main stress, preserve length; second elements only do if they have a secondary stress, that is normally if there is an inflectional ending. Thus in *Beowulf* contrast line 61

Heorogar ond Hrōðgar ond Hālga til,[26]

where metrics show that the syllable -*gar* was not long, with line 64

Þā wæs Hrōðgāre herespēd gyfen,[27]

where they show that it was. The spelling *e* which is usual in the second element of Ælfred and Æðelred is due to this cause. It could at first sight be another Mercianism, since in most words, including this one, where West Saxon has *ǣ*, Anglian has *ē*. But the distribution of spellings shows otherwise. Alfred's daughter Æðelflæd, who after her marriage was actually resident in Mercia (and was something not far short of queen there), has many more West Saxon-type spellings to her name than

---

[25] The Anglian plural of *ælf* would be *elfe*. In my opinion the West Saxon plural is probably, via ≈ Warwickshire dialect, the etymon of Early Modern English *ouphe* and Modern English *oaf*, rather than Old Norse *álfr* as held by the *Oxford English Dictionary*.
[26] 'H. [not in Old Norse story] and Hróarr and Helgi the good.'
[27] 'Then was success in war granted to Hrothgar.'

he does. The explanation lies in the medial syllable of hers, which being quite without stress lends the final one a measure of stress by contrast. Alfred's final syllable was unstressed *tout court*. And as in most languages, including Modern English, there was less variety of vowels in unstressed syllables. Original *æ* when unstressed fell together with *e*. In very late Old English and the transition to Middle English, consciousness of the elements as such dwindled and the system came to depend more on known existing compounds. That allowed phonetic attrition to run rampant almost anywhere. You see the results in the native English characters in Ellis Peters. It can be an instructive as well as entertaining exercise to the reader to restore to their pristine Old English forms the dithematic names which nearly all of them bear.[28]

A sort of converse of this is the way Anglo-Saxons deal with Norman names. The Normans as you know were cultural barbarians, who spoke carelessly as such people often do. The chroniclers out of the kindness of their heart restored to them the consonants, less often vowels, which if they were polite Englishmen they think they ought to have had. They were able to normalize thus because Franks and Northmen inherited the same Common Germanic naming-system as the Anglo-Saxons; but only up to a point, partly because different phonetic development in the different languages obscured connections, partly because naming-fashions differed in the different countries, and the Anglo-Saxons knew this. Over time, some new elements were adopted into the system, and old ones dropped out. So only where French pronunciation was close to that of a native element could they confidently restore it; beyond that, they indulged in creative etymologizing which has had less attention from scholars than it deserves.

Thus 'Robert', which had it been current in Old English should have been ***Hrōðbeorht***, appears around 1050 mainly as **Rodbeard**.[29]

---

[28] One you can try is *Meriet*. (You won't find the data in this article.)

[29] ***Hrōðbeorht*** is as far as I know not an attested name. A closely related one which does occur is Durham Liber Vitae *hroeðberct* = **Hrēðbeorht** (Sweet 532). The forms in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle are as follows: 1048E *Rodbyrd* ≈ 1050C *Hrodberd* ≈ 1051D dat. *Rotbearde*. 1051C *Rodbeard*. 1052CD *Rodbeard*, E *Rotberd* x 2, *Rodbert*, gen. *Rodbertes*. 1068D dat. *Rodbearde* ≈ C *Rodberde*. 1071D *Rodbeart* ≈ E *Rodbriht*. 1079E dat. *Rotbearde* ≈ 1078D

French, as you know, doesn't like *th* sounds or *h*;[30] and while the final consonant was not then reduced to vanishing, as it is now in *le bon roi Dagobert* who has the same deuterotheme, still the distinction ±voice there had been lost. To Old English-speakers *h* in consonant-clusters was still important. So the phonetically closest name-element known to the learned was **-Beard**, as in the tribe of the Heathobards in *Beowulf*.[31] Ordinary speakers had sounder instincts than scholars on this name, tending to assimilate both halves to the one current element it resembled, as well as reduce the diphthong in the unstressed syllable. Thus twelfth-century Roberts are nearly always ***Rotbert***, even the highest-ranking, Robert duke of Normandy, with whom efforts for 'correctness' seem to be made in the 1080s and 1090s.

There is a yet more instructive name among William the Conqueror's sons. The third, to whom his father bequeathed uncountable treasures, as the chronicler for 1086 tells us, was called **Hēanrīc**. French *Henri*, or [ʕɛ̃(n)riːɣ] as it may have been pronounced then,[32] has its second

---

Rodbert, Rotbert x 2. 1085E *Rodbeard* x 2, gen. *Rodbeardes*. E *Rodbeard* 1086, 1087 x 3, 1090 x 2/3, 1091 x 2, 1093 x 2, 1094. 1095E *Rodbeard* x 2, *Rotbeard, Rotbert*. 1096E *Rodbeard, Rotbeard*. 1098E *Rodbert*. 1100E *Rotbert* x 2/3. 1101 *Rodbert, Rotbert* x 3, dat. *Rotberte*. E *Rotbert* 1103, 1104 x 2, 1105 x 2, 1106 x 7, etc. Perhaps it is not too much to suggest that there was a change of official spelling or cancellarial house-style from ***Rodbeard*** to ***Rotbert*** when Henry I succeeded William II in 1100. Forssner (1916.216–17) assembles forms for other individuals and from other sources.

[30] Neither of these negatives was categorical in the Old French period, but they apply in preconsonantal positions such as we are here concerned with. On Old French *ð* (<Lat. intervocalic *d*) see Pope §§333, 346–47 (cf.§16: her 'period I' ≡the Anglo-Saxon period). On *h* Pope §§634–35 is a bit over-tidy chronologically.

[31] And the Lombards in *Widsith* as quoted in note 22 above.

[32] You can hunt up data on individual sounds in Pope or Bourciez, though as most of those involved either would not occur in native Romance words or not in these positions, the margins of error are quite large. For our purposes, including for the name *Prentsa* below, the important thing is that French *en* had not yet fallen together with *an*, as it has now in non-final syllables, but had been roughly levelled with *in*, as it still is in final syllables: *Poulenc, Messiaen, Poussin*. The phonetic value of modern *an* is close to a nasalized open *o* (Pope

half restored to the real Old English equivalent, which aptly means 'king'. The first half corresponds etymologically to **hām-** or **hǣm-**,[33] an element which seems to have become obsolete in Old English dithematic names about three centuries earlier; the German consonant-assimilation in the French form would have made it synchronically unrecoverable anyway. So an equivalent was needed to it as pronounced. The chroniclers come up with something that is Old English and is naming-language, enough to keep the logical faculties quiet and sound right; but considered for sense, it's absurd. The word **hēan**, nominative as it must be in personal names, means 'abject', not a good epithet for princes, even ones who prefer treasure to fighting. But the form **hēan** is very frequent in place-names, Hendon and the like, where it is a fossilized dative of the word **hēah** 'high'; much more appropriate. A bit of onomastic legerdemain is going on here, combining the two. Of course linguistic reality has a habit of breaking in. The final consonant was not pronounced [tʃ]; so when a dative is needed, already in 1094 it is *Heanrige* (*ig* in late Old English is more or less the same as *ī*). When he becomes king in 1100 the nominative is standardized as *Heanrig* to match. Reduced forms come in beside it pretty quickly, 1104 *Heanri*, 1106 *Henrig*, and pretty generally from 1107 to 1153 *Henri*, though as late as 1131 *Heanri* occurs. Inflected forms for this name are rare and are reduced more slowly: 1120 *Heanriges*, 1140 *Henries*.

People called Geoffrey fare even worse (the main one is Henry II's

---

§441 etc. says IPA ā̃), that of *in* is a nasalized *æ* (≈ IPA ɛ̃). Neither was so far retracted in the eleventh century. Pope §§448–50 implies that a typical value for *en* was [ɛ̃], but with a good deal of regional variation. Authorities state too (Bourciez §195, Pope §§434–36) that though the vowel was nasalized the *n* was still separately pronounced at this period. You may take that with a pinch of salt if you find the sequence as hard to pronounce as I do, but for present purposes it doesn't matter. Old English had no nasalized vowel except the allophone of *a* before *m* and *n*, so an Anglo-Saxon hearing a French nasalized front vowel would naturally substitute his nearest equivalent vowel plus a separately pronounced *n*.

[33] Meaning 'home' (as in the name of Sam Gamgee's father). The forms 1086 *Heanric* etc. are all from the E Chronicle. Forssner (1916.147) assembles forms for other individuals and from other sources.

---

father). This name shows in an extreme form the pitfalls attendant on tracing Germanic compounds in and through French. Sound-changes in one or both languages lead to variants of one original name being separated and variants of different ones falling together. Differences between French, Latin, and German spelling-conventions exacerbate the difficulties. So Old French *Geoffroi*, *Geufroi*, *Geffrei*, *Jaufre*, etc. and Latinized *Gaud(e)fredus*, *Geothfretus*, *Gausfretus*, *Goisfridus*, etc., which we receive as a single name, scholars have deemed an amalgam of up to three, while disagreeing about which. The second element is unproblematically **-Frið**: *ei* and *oi* are regular French developments of stressed *i*,[34] and loss of the final fricative was also regular.[35] Prevalent spellings for the beginning of names which have been equated with this, in German are *Gau-* and *Gai-*, in Latin *Gau-* and *Go-*, in French *Geo-*, *Jau-*, and *Jo-*.[36] Except for *Gai*, a similar mix is found in either element of a fair number of other names. Kalbow (1913.109) and Withycombe thought the main source of this one *Gawifrið*, Kalbow invoking a variant with *i*-mutation for *Geu-*. Forssner accepted *Gawifrid* but liked alternatives.[37] Equivalents of Old English **Wealhfrið** and **Wealdfrið** account for the *l* favoured by people like *Galfridus Monumotensis* Geoffrey of Monmouth. Withycombe preferred *Walahfrid*,[38] Kalbow and Forssner *Waldfrid*, as you must if *Gawi-* is right to account for the dental consonant. Its *s* variant Forssner ascribed to a root **gaus-* with Old Norse cognates,[39]

---

[34] Including secondary stress, as here. Cf. Pope §§211, 225, 404, 518, etc.
[35] Pope §346.
[36] Förstemann I cols. 616, 623; Morlet I 104–07.
[37] *Gerfrid* and *Gidfrid*, containing equivalents of OE **Gār** 'spear', a good name-element, and **giedd** 'song', not a name-element in Old English and probably not on the continent either. The extremely few dithematic names which appear to contain it probably result from simplification of consonant-clusters like *-ldb-*.
[38] As in names of scholars like Walahfrid Strabo.
[39] *Gjósa*, *geysa* 'to gush', *geysi-* 'exceedingly'; the closest Old English equivalent is **gēotan** (cf. the stream-name and place-name Guiting). Forssner cited Bruckner and Meyer-Lübke for this view, and made a point of denying that *Gaus-* can 'as a rule' be derived from *Gaut-*.

Withycombe hesitantly to the equivalent of **Gīslfrið**.[40] Morlet by contrast explains all these forms except *Gai-* (which she leaves to *Gawi-*) as from the tribal name *Gaut* (=OE **Gēat**), which she translates as 'Goth' (=OE **Gota**). On this view *s* arises simply by the High German sound-shifting of *t*, which applied in most of the part of Germany from which the Franks came.[41] German spellings in *-z* must be so explained.[42] According to Förstemann these equations were proposed by Grimm. Most continental onomasts have followed him.

The picture is complicated by occurrence in deuterothemes of what they allege to be the same element, in phonetic forms for which *Gaut* will not do. There is consistent *-gaudus* not *-gautus* in Latinized names and consistent *-gaud* not *-gaut* in Förstemann's large sample of non-Latinized ones of the eighth century and earlier.[43] Morlet's few with unassibilated prototheme and composition-vowel also seem to have consistently *Gaude-*.[44] French[45] and German both had devoicing of final *d* not voicing of *t*.[46] Such consistency is unlikely as a reverse

---

[40] In a reduced form *Gisfrid*. The existence of *Gis* as a separate word from *Gisil*, as assumed by both Withycombe and Morlet, is very doubtful.

[41] Prokosch (1939.80) gives handy maps.

[42] Where *z* means phonetically *ts*; our *s* and *z* were both then spelt *s*.

[43] Fifty-eight of the seventy-six he lists (cols. 607–08), all as being from France and the Low Countries not Germany. The only argument I know purporting to justify derivation from *-gaut* phonetically is Björkman's (note 46 below).

[44] Since *Gotesmannus* if really containing this element (cf. note 48) must count as an assibilated spelling.

[45] Pope §206.

[46] The logic of Björkman's elliptically expressed argument (1917.163) and *erweichung* 'lenition' (p. 167) is that (i) these forms derive exclusively not from nominatives but from oblique cases, which (ii) were affected by Gallo-Romance voicing of intervocalic voiceless stops (Pope §§335–36). If (i) were granted (ii) would reasonably follow; but since personal names, unlike personal pronouns, are most used in the nominative, (i) is intrinsically unlikely, and lacking demonstrated parallels ought not to be granted. Morlet has a shortage of name-elements ending in *t* other than as reflex of Germanic *þ* or variant of *d* or preceded by a consonant; but a cursory survey of names containing the rare element *Laic-* and the common *Ric-* suggests that voiceless variants (including *-h-* for *-c-*) outnumber voiced ones by at least 2:1, in some names by much

spelling: contrast Morlet's fairly even mix of *-au-* and *-o-*. Förstemann's own theory was the rather far-fetched one of blending between *Gaut-* and Latin *gaudium* 'joy' as in names like Gaudentius. All these scholars seem to have taken *au* phonetically at face value. But it must be remembered that in early Old French *au* was monophthongized;[47] since whenever exactly that happened, the phonetic value of the spelling *au* was normally *ō*. I think a main source for the French deuterotheme was *gōd* 'good', which Morlet only recognizes as a possibility for spellings with *o*.[48] Tenth- and early eleventh-century Anglo-Saxons certainly thought so: names of continentals with this deuterotheme coming to England were fairly routinely naturalized as **-god**, even though in Old English names **Gōd** is only a prototheme not a deuterotheme.[49] Most were moneyers whose exact origin may be unrecoverable, but at least one was certainly French with a name in *-gaud*, the Latin writer called in a tenth-century charter *Freðegod*, by twelfth-century historians and modern scholars Frithegod, originally *Fredegaud* of Briouze.[50] We must reckon with the possibility of substantial blending of *Gaut* and *gōd*, perhaps as early as the eighth century for Förstemann's names in *-gaud*, though his idea of influence from *gaudium* is distinctly less far-fetched to account for choice of spellings for a native element in an already Latin written context than it was for adoption of an element as such. If, as seems possible, there was an increase in the proportion of *s* variants in the tenth and eleventh

---

more. So it is clear that as an explanation for the exclusiveness of voicing in the *-Gaud* names Björkman's argument is not valid.

[47] Pope §505 etc. This did not apply in Provençal.

[48] Even there she prefers *God* 'God' except where German diphthongs *uo*, *ua* forbid it. Her division of forms between the heads *Gaut* and *God* is suspect in both directions, e.g. *Gotesmannus* occurs under both.

[49] Continental onomasts' hostility to *Gōd* as name-element is in part a residue of a controversy about these people's names conducted with characteristic relish by Zachrisson and Björkman. Zachrisson (1917) held not only that the final consonant was not *t* but that they were native Old English. The material of Forssner (1916) and arguments of Björkman (1917) forced him (1918) to retract that conclusion. The phonetic baby seems to have been thrown out with the ethnic bathwater.

[50] Lapidge (1988) treats his career in detail (pp. 46–47 on the name).

centuries, additional factors that might be relevant are Old French
nominative singular inflectional -*s* plus levelling between deuterothemes
and protothemes, and the Scandinavian name *Guþfrið* as borne or
transmitted by Vikings in Normandy, with substitution of sibilants for
Germanic *th* sounds.[51] The assumption usually made, which usually
works, for Germanic names in French is that they come exclusively via
Frankish from continental Germanic. That this was an exception, with
Old Norse contributing to it, is indicated by the fact that Ogier the
Dane's father, based at some remove on an historical prince *Guþfrið*
(='Godfrey') who fought Charlemagne, is *Gaufroi* (='Geoffrey') in the
chansons de geste.[52]

Well, the English equivalent of *Gawi-* was never used in personal
names; it was very early obsolete in the language at large, fossilized as
the final syllable of Surrey and Ely. Neither **Wealh-** nor **Weald-** nor
with Old English palatalized *g*[53] **Gēat-**[54] was at all close to French
Gōd/-z/-s, still less with the French palatalization [ʒ] that *Ge-* and *J-*

---

[51] Best known is *Aðalhaið* > *Azalais* (which is why, to the possible constern-
ation of Australians, Adelaide is the same name as Alice). Against this is the
fact that ladies *Azalais* known from literature are from the south of France,
where the linguistic medium was 'Provençal' not strictly 'French'. Morlet's
Adalaizis, *Adalasia*, and *Adalaisa* are also southern, beside much more frequent
Adeleidis and the like from all parts. The linguistic atlases of Anthonij Dees, for
the strictly 'French' area, regrettably do not cover non-native phonemes like
þ/ð. Yet we may speculate that like most of the native Romance phonemes he
does cover and over the whole Provençal-French dialect continuum, competing
realizations were present in different proportions side by side. Morlet's
presentation hides such substitution where it occurs, e.g. *Blismodis*, *-a*, *-us* is
surely simply 'Blithe-Mood', not a secondary formation from an unattested
hypocoristic in *-s-* as she asserts.

[52] Togeby (1969.48–49, 114); cf. Langlois (1904.265).

[53] ≈Modern English *y*.

[54] Which was almost non-existent as a prototheme anyway: just one rich lady
Geatflæd has it in Searle.

---

indicate.[55] The only prototheme in all those theories to which
chroniclers might have been expected to normalize is **Gōd**, and then only
if the consonants remained as stops. Otherwise creative etymologizing
was in order. The forms the E Chronicle actually gives us are 1087
Gosfrið x 2, 1096 *Gosfrei*, 1127 *Gosfreið*. There is some spelling-
variation in the second half, which looks like compromise between
English etymology and French pronunciation,[56] but not in the first,
which is more distant from both. The sample is too small to argue
confidently from a negative, but we may still note the absence of
spellings *Gois-*, rather frequent for this name in Domesday Book, so
perhaps to be expected were the chroniclers either randomly representing
heard sounds or blindly following scribal precedents.[57] It does look as
if they exercised deliberate choice. The element they came up with was
Gōs-. You may think this slightly curious, especially given the
semantics. May you all at Christmas enjoy good 'goose-peace'.

Perhaps a factor in this was a sense that bird-names in personal names
were characteristically Frankish. Animal-names as a conceptual category
in personal names of course were current throughout the Germanic world
at all periods: think of **Wulf** and its cognates. Some had significantly
more limited currency. A good one is **hrefn** 'raven', not found in
English names but much used in Frankish ones: consider such Latin
scholars as Hrabanus Maurus and Ratramnus of Corbie (nothing to do
with rats, in English he would be **Rædhrefn*). The *Beowulf*-poet knew
this very well. His character **Dæghrefn** is champion of a tribe in the
Frankish realm.[58] The prototheme chimes rightly too; it was used in

---

[55] Which was dialectal and somewhat patchy (Pope §§298–301 and p. 487 §(i))
but must very often have been present in speech even where Latin spellings
Gau- conceal it.

[56] Or possibly variation in the latter; if so the *-eið* form is strikingly late in view
of Pope §346.

[57] *Gois-* is supposed to derive phonetically from formations *Gautio-* and the like
explained as blending *Gaut* with *gaudium*. It is, however, relatively so much
more frequent in Domesday Book as reported by Forssner than its antecedents
are in the material of Morlet or Förstemann as to suggest that what is being
represented is a front rounded vowel not heard as fully identical with *ō*.

[58] The *Hugas*, on the North Sea littoral as the poem makes clear.

England but more so in France: *le bon roi Dagobert* again. Whether historical or not, this Frank was archetypal.[59]

The *Beowulf*-poet was more successful at continental names than the late chroniclers because he operated them from within a still living Germanic dialect continuum of which for heroic purposes England was still part. He composed in the eighth century, not later; the standard linguistic tests have been triumphantly vindicated in Robert Fulk's recent book. Later poets may perhaps have had similar competence, as Townend (1998) showed that Norse skalds did with English place-names, but we don't have positive evidence of it from the English side. The *Beowulf*-poet's linguistic antennae were sensitive on both sides of the North Sea. Most of his names of Scandinavian kings closely match recorded Old Norse equivalents, as is well known. The royal brothers **Hālga** and **Hrōðgar**, whom we have already met, exemplify a point worth making about these correspondences, which is that some obey regular sound-rules exactly, others don't quite. Part of the trouble is textbooks not formulating the rules quite rightly; but here too we encounter phonetic levelling of originally different names. That is why not many people know there is a *Hákon* in *Beowulf*. He is Hygelac's second brother **Hæðcyn** < Germanic **Haðukunja*. The name has to be explained as one of the poem's several from Scandinavia, since the equivalent deuterotheme *-Konr* was productive there, while *-Cyn* is not a deuterotheme in English names, and the variant *Hæð* for **Heaðu-** is extremely rare. We must in reason relate this name of a prince to the very similar *Hákun* common in (West) Norse dynastic names, which can easily derive from the same ancestral form.[60] The reason why this is not

---

[59] It is nice that 'Raven-wolf' and 'Rook-wolf' are on the same page of Morlet!

[60] With loss of the composition vowel by regular syncope early in Primitive Norse (Noreen §153) then loss of element-final *-ð* with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. Noreen §228 presents Primitive Norse loss of *-ð* as a regular phonetic change before *w*, with exceptions 'generally due to the influence of related words'. What his material in fact shows is consistent retention of *ð* before *w* in lexical items (he only gives two) and consistent loss in proper name-compounds of *ð* when element-final before *W-*. His apparent exceptions *Boþuarr* and *Boþuildr* contain a first element ending in *w*, =OE **Beadu-** < Germanic **Baðwa-*. Noreen seems often to have been read as saying

usually done is that some Swedish runestones spell *hakun* with a nasalized *a*.[61] The proper inference is not as usually (if tacitly) drawn, that OE **Hæðcyn** either is unrelated or has element-substitution, but that historical 'Haakon' like 'Geoffrey' continues more than one original name. This fits Insley's (1994.184) observation that Old West Norse *Hákun* is a royal name, but OEN *Hákun* has lower social status.[62] The *Beowulf*-poet used naturally the proper royal form.

A slightly stickier case arises with the supporting cast who aren't mentioned in Norse versions of the stories. The Swedish king **Ongen-**

---

loss of element-final *ð* was restricted to the phonetic context before *W*; in fact his material does not bear on the question whether there was such a restriction. That the same loss occurred in at least some names before velars is shown by the correspondence *Hróarr* = **Hrōðgar** (there is no warrant for positing with Fellows-Jensen [1968.221; but cf. xciv] *G-* > *W-* in the deuterotheme!). It is only reasonable to allow the same for *Hákun* = **Hæðcyn** and to accept the *Beowulf*-poet's accuracy for that name as well.

[61] Not all do, as Björkman (1920a.28), reporting this, notes. The section on **Hæðcyn** in Björkman's posthumous book (1920.51–55) is a variant of the article missing several of the meatier passages including this one.

[62] We should add that the consensus of Norse onomasts is in rather gross error about its etymology. There are several possibilities, canvassed by Björkman (1920.29), for an element **Hanh-*, but the supposed Germanic **hanha-* 'horse' generally cited nowadays is a non-starter. They have hypostatized it from **hanhistaz/ hangistaz* 'stallion'. Much ink has been spilt disputing the origin of that, wastefully through concentrating on the first element whereas the second is crucial. It is an adjectival/adverbial superlative, and it is nothing else: you will seek it in vain in Meid or Kluge. So the first element is an adjective not a noun (Kaufmann 1968.163 faces both ways on this), and the cognate de Vries, Holthausen and Pokorny all cite, Lithuanian *šankùs* 'swift', works perfectly for the etymology: an ungelded stallion is the 'swiftest' kind of horse. 'Swift' is also the kind of positive quality suitable for a personal-name element. That **hanhuz* 'swift' unsuffixed ever could bear a meaning 'horse' is unlikely. Against it tell not only Occam's Razor but more definitely the early chronology implicit in the formation, from a stage of Germanic before the operation of Verner's Law to give the *-h-/-g-* alternation, and before *-ōst-* had supplanted *-ist-* in superlatives in West Germanic. (On this Wright GG §§243–44, OEG §§443–44, is more perspicuous than Campbell §§657, 660.) Cf. further note 72 below.

þēow, =ON *Angantýr*, is slain by two warriors called **Eofor** and **Wulf**. These names mean 'boar' and 'wolf'. Some too sceptical contemporaries of mine hold this to indicate that the characters are invented. Well, it is the nature of the case that where *Beowulf* has more detail than its analogues we cannot know how much is faithfully reworked tradition, how much fiction.[63] But the names as such are certainly not evidence of fiction. This is a migration-period story. Early twentieth-century name-scholarship found that throughout the Germanic world animal-name personal names were commonest in the migration period, whether or not like **Wulf** they remained in use after it. There are a respectable column and a half of prototheme **Eofor-** in Searle. A glance at his references shows they're nearly all continental (you have to be on your guard for this, Searle is naughty in not signalling it). They include one mono-thematic *Eofor*. So at the very worst, if this is fiction, it is fiction with a strongly continental not English flavour. But more, the Old Norse cognate *jǫfurr* is not used as a personal name but it is used as a poetic word for prince or warrior. And words of that kind tend to have been in use as personal names in the heroic age. (Tolkien's kings of the Rohirrim have a lot of poetic truth in them.) An extreme example is French *prince*, which we know was the name of at least one person in England, because a Sussex charter mentions his burial-mound.[64] So the balance of probability in my opinion is that this episode, complete with names, was received by the *Beowulf*-poet as part of Scandinavian tradition, and

---

[63] A related question is whether we should believe with Klaeber (1950.xlii) that the Scandinavian tradition of the slaying of a different Swedish king, *Óttarr*, by two men, named in the *Historia Norvegiae* as *Vǫttr* and *Fasti*, is ultimately the same story. *Beowulf* distinguishes **Ōhthere** from Ongentheow, which suggests not; but Ohthere is Ongentheow's son, which close relationship suggests yes. But even if the two stories are originally the same, it is by no means axiomatic that *Beowulf*, centuries earlier than the Scandinavian witnesses, does not preserve the names better than they do. They disagree substantially between themselves on precisely this aspect, e.g. Ari the Icelander calls Óttar's father Egill. Common origin might be at the level of motifs rather than particular characters anyway: cf. the story of Offa mentioned in *Widsith*.

[64] 934 S425(ii) *prentsan hlaw*. It was (maybe still is) in the Weald, probably not far from Goringlee.

his felicity here as so often lay in selection and arrangement, not invention.

Similar considerations apply to names in early generations of the royal genealogies. Oral genealogies *can* be preserved accurately for very long spans; they can also be drastically reshaped to fit modern tribal politics or an abstract pattern of what a genealogy ought to be, which in Anglo-Saxon England means fourteen-generation sections like genealogies of Christ in the Bible. Where genuine tradition wasn't long enough legend and invention step in. Name studies suggest that more of the tradition is genuine than present-day historians like to believe. Since we are in York let us look at the old line of kings of Deira.[65] My old teacher Peter Hunter Blair's eyebrows were raised to meet there **Sǣfugl**, whose name means 'Seafowl'. But half a dozen historical persons bore that name, down to *Gervasius (filius) Sevugel* a solid burgher of Canterbury around 1200. Nor need **Westorvalcna** be any more legendary than my likewise compass-directed former college fellow the late art-historian Carl Nordenfalk. Or consider *Swefdæg*. *Le bon roi Dagobert* has congeners in England called **Dægbeorht** or other names with prototheme **Dæg-**. What you do not get in England is -**Dæg** as deuterotheme. So this 'Swabian-day' is an archetypally German tribal hero. We can be absolutely sure that English clerics did not invent the genealogy as far back as here.[66] **Sigegār** too is attested as an historical name.

So what about **Wegdæg**? Hereabouts we reach the scissors-and-paste level. Tribal eponyms often are a sign of such activities; in the companion line from Bernicia **Bernic**'s son is **Wegbrand** and father **Bēldæg**. The Deiran *Uegdæg* looks like a conflation of the two. Or it may be the other way round, that those two names were hypostatized from his to make up generations, since *Uegdæg* is son of Woden in the Kent genealogy. There too he looks legendary, great-grandfather of Hengest who figures in story as pretty much a self-made man, though his

---

[65] Sweet (1885.169–71).

[66] Whatever the relations may be, if any, in name or character between this *Suebdæg* and the hero of the Old Norse *Ballad of Svipdag and Menglǫð*. De Vries is agnostic.

father **Witta** may well be the one *Widsith* says ruled the Swabians.[67] Hengest's grandfather is doubtful. The name **Wihtgils** might be etymologized as 'Wight-hostage'; and while Bede asserts a special connection between the Isle of Wight and the Kentish Jutes, it cannot have originated until generations after Hengest's time. On the other hand **Wiht-** in personal names is mainly the word meaning 'creature'; it is too widespread for the Isle of Wight to be usually involved, and occurs in continental Germanic where any such connection is impossible. Anyway it makes little difference whether Hengest had one or two generations of traceable human ancestry compared to Edwin's ten or eleven. The large contrast shows, I think, that Edwin of Northumbria and his rivals of the line of Æthelfrith had very much longer genuine royal descent than Hengest had, going back to somewhere of the order of 300 AD. Thus even the plainly legendary can tell historical truth to onomasts.

I should comment too on **Bældæg**. Scholars naturally identify him with the similar-sounding son of Woden called in Norse legends *Baldr*. Well, **Baldor** as that would be in English is a word meaning 'prince'. **Bældæg** is a dithematic name, but with a very un-English feel because of its deuterotheme as already mentioned. The first element is shown by dialectal variation in the manuscripts to be OE **bæl**, 'bale' in the sense of 'fire'.[68] This might suit the myth of an immortal who was killed and cremated. Of genealogical interest is the fact that Searle only records this prototheme once in an historical name, and its bearer is **Bælrīc** another

---

[67] A point apparently missed by Tolkien (1982.62–76) in what is otherwise the best discussion of Hengest. Really it makes little difference to his view (p. 68) that 'we must inevitably see Jutes in the Finn-story and Hengest among them', because as he emphasizes the sources present Hengest as a **wrecca**, an adventurer who made a military career in exile from his own land. Then again, Nennius says Hengest sent for reinforcements to 'Angeln', by which he may well mean no more than the continental homeland of the English in general, but which if it can be pressed is geographically intermediate between Jutland and Swabia.

[68] It is Anglian **Bēl-** in the earliest and/or most 'Anglian'-coloured manuscripts but West Saxon **Bæl-** in most manuscripts of both the early 'Anglian' ('Northumbrian?') collection of genealogies and the West Saxon dynastic genealogies, as may be seen in Dumville's apparatuses.

son of Ida king of Bernicia.

The censorious among you will be thinking that since these faunal and royal excursions have brought in monothematic names, I ought to stop ducking them as a subject, even though the presentation will be in various ways less exact than for the dithematic. Too many local-name qualifiers may be either lost personal names or lost meaningful elements or corruptions of known meaningful elements, much less easy to restore than corruptions of dithematic names like Kenten for Centwine. Also the generalizations one should make about them probably would not be the same for the late and early periods. My approach is based in the late period when most of the charters are, and is deliberately formal, eschewing affective terms like 'hypocoristic' as a basis for classification. Even so there are problems with types and even individual names shading into one another.

The two main types of strictly monothematic name are dithematic elements used singly (the most frequent in charters are **Wine**, **Mann**, and **Mūl** all of which we've already met), and names of the form *(C)VC,C,a*: with or without an initial consonant, the root vowel followed by a geminate consonant and an ending *-a* for masculines or *-e* for feminines, in the weak declension. The most common of these in charters are **Abba**, **Badda**, **Dodda**, and **Dudda**. I have the impression that back vowels are commoner than front vowels overall as well as hogging these particular examples. If the root vowel is long, the following consonant will be single: thus **Tāta**. Then there are an intermediate type, where a standard element is given a weak ending, thus **Lēofa** or **Manna**, and names that are plain monosyllables like **Cedd** and **Worr**. Rare in my late material but probably commoner earlier are names ending in *-e* from older *-i*, with strong declension, such as **Ælle** name of a king of Sussex in the late fifth century and of a king of York in the late sixth, Edwin's father. He is not to be confused either in name or person with **Ælla** another king of York who came to a sticky end against the Vikings. (Modern scholars sometimes make this error, but no Anglo-Saxon could have done so, though Matthew Townend may tell us that Vikings could.)[69] I should

---

[69] As scholars he quoted (1997.32–33) thought. Alas, on p. 30 he fell heavily into this error himself.

perhaps mention in connection with Ælla that monothematic personal names are one of those categories where normal Old English rules of vowel harmony fail to apply. I'm not sure how far with the names ending in -e the i-mutation of root vowels which you'd expect if they're early is present, remains, is levelled out, or is just not present.

Some anthroponymists call either all these types, or all the weak ones, hypocoristic, pet-names derived from underlying dithematics. It is true that diminutives could be formed in this way. Two more or less West Saxon dynasts around 570, *Cupwulf* and *Cupwine*, both on occasion get called *Cupa* in the early Chronicle. It probably had about the tone of *Monty* in the 1940s. (The late Peterborough Chronicler trying to restore dithematic dignity once in my opinion picks the wrong one.)[70] Yet one look at frequencies like those in Table 4 shows that to historical Old English-speakers there was not in general any relation between these and the dithematic names. If there were, the frequent monothemes would be phonetically close to the frequent dithemes, and they're simply not. Even where the two kinds are phonetically close the record doesn't support much synchronic relation. Only one of Searle's Ællas is recorded as a diminutive of Ælfwine; of his more frequent Æffas none is. The same point is made diachronically by the fact that *Ab-* and *Dod-* are common roots for monothematic names in continental Germanic too, and *Bad-* is for extended monothematic ones. If it was ever true, which I very much doubt, that monothematic names generally were diminutives of dithematic, their separation as productive types goes well back to Common Germanic times. That is only to be expected since standard doctrine is that short names and dithematic ones existed side by side already in Indo-European.

Hang on, you may say, doesn't that remove a crucial element of discrimination in the anthroponymists' view? If there was no constraint of form from underlying dithemes, what was to prevent any monosyllable, with or without a weak or -e ending, being used as a personal name? In my reading of the evidence, nothing could; the supposed comfort of that discrimination was illusory. This is how the enormous number of starred forms of supposed personal names in the back of English Place-Name

---

[70] As victor at *Biedcanford* in 571 (Kitson 1995.112 n. 91 to p. 67).

Table 4

Most frequent qualifying elements in the various classes

Adjectives	Numbers	Position	Landscape/substance	Vegetable	Animal
508[423] ealdan	185[157] ān	207[169] mær	146[129] stān	61[46]+2 wiðig	41[37] wulf
143[119] holan	43[30] prēo	83[71] mearc	70[50] hrycg	55[43]+2 risc	41[32] swīn
135[120] brādan	36[30] twēgen/	58[50] sūð	57[43] wudu	45[36]+2[1] æsc	35[28] hafoc
132[122] lytlan	twā	55[47] ēast	47[32] sand	40[35]+2 fearn	28[21] heort
114[85] smalan	20[17] seofon	52[40] norð	39[33]+6 burh	40[32] alr	25[23] hors
113[90] langan	17[14] ænlipig	50[44] west	30[22] stræt	34[29]+4 porn	25[18] crāwe
98[82] fūlan	15[13] fīf	47[42] ōðer	30[25] æcer	32[24]+1 hrēod	23[19] fox
97[82] hāran	10[8] fēower	31[27] gemær	27[24] port	32[18] ifig	23[14] earn
97[79] hwītan	8[6] twig-	24[22] landsceanu	23[18]+2 cealc	31[23] hæsl	22[19] cealf
96[84] rēadan	7[3] prittig	23[21] middel	23[18] lām	29[25]+1 āc	22[13] dēor
92[80] blacan	5 twelf		19 wæter	26[18] brōm	21[13] scēap
85[72] grēnan			19+34 dic	14[12]+10[7] filed	21[15] wifel
77[71] rūwan				22[17] lin	20[15] fugel
62[54] grēatan				18[14]+1 mēos	18[12] cran
56[44] hæðenan					17[14] henn
55[50] miclan					
52[50] hēah					
51[36] dēopan					
42[33] wīdan					
40[18] riht					

Personal names

Dithematic	Monothematic	Extended monothematic
11[8] Wulfric	14[9] Wine	6[4] Cumbra
8 Ælfric	9 Abba	4[2] Cymen
8[7] Ælfred	7 Mann	2 Ægele
8[6] Wærmund	8[6] Tata	4[2] C(e)otel(e)
6 Lēofsige	8[5] Mul	3[2] Penda
6[5] Æðelwold	7[5] Badda	2 Lulling
5 Wul(f)laf	7[5] Dodda	2 Wicing
5 Ælfheah	7[5] Dudda	2 Martin
5 Ēad<w>ulf	thirteen with 4	2 Cund(e)
5 A.Ed<elw>ulf		
5 Lēofwine		
eleven with 4		

Other common nouns

79[66] cyning	
32[20] sealt	
27[20] biscop	
26[22] mylen	
25[18] winter	
19[7] hunig	
10[9] cyric	
10[8] weall	
10[8] weard	
9[7] trind	
8[6] ealdormann	
8[6] gemōt	
8[5] hyrde	
8[5] eceles	
7[6] cytel	
7[6] hord	
7[6] bryd	
7[6] prēost	
6[5] here	
6[5] spōn	
6[5] gyrd	
6[5] hēafod	
6[5] horn	
6[5] pēod	

Supernatural persons	"Inherited names"	Streets and ways	Plural persons	"?"
13[9] Wōden	7[3] Mælan	2[1] Cāsing+/=2[1] Kāseru	28[25-] hī(ge)na	16[13] bican
10[1] Icenhild	6[3] mægen	2[1] Æt(t)inc	9[7] Weala	4 dunne
9[5] punor	6[2] Pide-	2[1] Ciceling	5 prēosta	3 hildes
8[1] Bugghild	5 Penn	2[1] Drūting	5 pēofa	etc.
7[6] Grendel	4 Cric	2[1] stific	5 sealtera	
6[3] Grīm	4[2] Limen	1 wearcing+/=1 weascing	8[4] ceorla	
five with 3			6[4] loddera	
			6[4] nunnena	
			6[3] ciepmanna	
			4[3] hīred	
			4[3] huntena	
			3 cnihta	
			4[2] Wīchæma	
			3[2] Horninga	
			3[2] Niwanhæma	
			16[1] Wæclinga	
			4[1] Earninga	
			3[1] burhwara	
			etc.	

five with 5,
eleven with 4.

Originally published as Kitson (1994) Table 4, and reproduced here by kind permission of the editor, Prof. Jacek Fisiak.

Society volumes could originate. Not all those are real, by the way; they are being reduced by revisionists identifying lost lexical items, of whom I am at times one,[71] and Carole Hough is the most active currently. Even when that process is finished, though, which it will not be in our lifetimes, the number of such names remaining will be large. The only constraints, in my view, were tradition—what sounded right—and meaning, avoidance of lexical items. You do not on the whole call your children Knife, though you may call your friends Mac(k) the Knife. Even there, quite a few meaningful words could be used without formal distinction as personal names. They include some disyllabic ones, such as **Hengest** 'stallion'.[72] Because it is an irreducible unit as a common noun, it counts as an ordinary monothematic name not an extended one.

The same could be argued for some I put in the extended mono-thematic class, to which we now turn. The classic types here are those containing nominal suffixes, such as **Cymen** and **Ægele**. The suffixal vowel in both is weakened from earlier *i* which has caused *i*-mutation, from *u* and *a* respectively. **Cymen** is thus identical etymologically with the past participle **cumen**, where the underlying vowel has been restored by analogy within the verbal system (meaning effectively not merely a coming man but one who has arrived).[73] Also clearly extended mono-

---

[71] As on Linchmere in note 73 below.

[72] Cf. the end of note 62 above. A complication is that some glossarists Old High German as well as Old English equate *hengest* with Latin words that mean 'gelding'. Whether that was their error or whether the word really had developed two opposite meanings, 'stallion' is the one present across the Germanic world, including Old Icelandic *hestr*, and only it makes sense etymologically and poetically. No-one is going to persuade me that the treacherously resourceful founder of the kingdom of Kent was known by his men by a name whose gist was 'lacking balls'.

[73] It is imaginable that this is not a birth-name but one acquired on campaign or as a public mark of success. This is positively likely for names such as *Port* in the Chronicle: no Anglo-Saxon is likely to have been named Port at birth, but whichever war-leader first gained a particular military strongpoint for his people might credibly have been renamed after it. Cf. *mutatis mutandis* 'Montgomery of Alamein', and **Sotceorl** in note 21 above. Sceptical historians should remember too that in Old English usage an adjective used as if it were a noun can only have as referent a person, not a thing or an abstraction as it would in

thematic is **Lulling**, 'son or descendant of a man called *Lull(a)*'. With it for formal reasons I put **Wīcing**, which means 'Viking', and a number of names whose suffixal structure is problematic: they may not be strictly 'extended', but some are and some may be borrowed from foreign languages, and borrowing may have altered the effective structure. Disyllabic names like *Martin* are once they get into English irreducible units, but poetry shows Old English instinct was to treat them as dithematic. Even 'Adam' is two long syllables, metrically exactly on a par with 'Hrothgar'.

ond Ādōmes ealdgewyrhtum (*Dream of the Rood* line 100).[74]

Cumbra anglicizes a word dithematic in the donor language in a way that changes it to monothematic. Names like **Cund(e)** and **Penda** were grouped with it in the table wrongly, out of mistaken deference to some scholars who hold that they are shortenings of Welsh dithematic king-names, *Cyndeyrn* which does exist and **Pendeyrn* which doesn't.[75] Attempts have been made to save this derivation by positing Anglo-Saxon

---

Modern English. The famous instance is the phrase *þonne won cymeð* in *The Wanderer*, on which the needful comment is made by Dunning and Bliss (1969.27) in by far the best edition of the poem on linguistic matters including syntactic ones. The grammatical point applies just as well in place-names like *Cymenes ora* and Lancing. It is impossible for *Cymen* or *Wlanc* in these formations to be anything other than designator of a person. (The chronicler's form *Wlencing* shows the *i*-mutation proper to a genuinely early 'descendant of *Wlanc*'; it does not imply an unrecorded name *Wlenca* as PNSussex I 24-25 assumes for Linchmere, whose forms fit simply the abstract noun *wlencu* 'pride' [of which *wlencea* as a variant oddly does happen to be recorded]. PNSussex I 199's forms show there was no *i*-mutation in 'Lancing' by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, but levelling out of such distinctions between derivatives and still current base words is a fairly routine linguistic process.)

[74] 'And because of Adam's original sin.' The *o* for *a* before nasal, a kind of alternation which should only occur for short *a* (cf. note 32 above), has evidently been levelled from endingless contexts where the final syllable would be short, just as for *Hrōðgār* above.

[75] There is no Welsh name in *Pend-* at all in the index to Bartrum (1966). A character *Pendaran Dyfed* appears in the Mabinogion; it would be unreasonable to think him relevant to this context.

misprision of a royal title as a personal name. The late Kenneth Jackson (1982.35-40) magisterially disproved this theory as applied to Vortigern. What makes it absolutely impossible for Penda is that any such title would have the vowel *e*,[76] but Welsh forms of his name consistently have it *a*.[77] On the other hand homorganic clusters of *n* + dental consonant are native Germanic, and both elements are actually attested in continental Germanic.[78] These two names should have been grouped with **Cinta** which I count firmly as ordinary monothematic.[79] **Cund** is also found on the continent, as is the equivalent of **Cunda**, continuing a form that before the Primitive Old English sound-changes corresponded to the theme **Cūð** as *Cutha* does in historical Old English.[80] The English and Welsh data for Penda are reconciled naturally on the assumption that his name too was affected by an English sound-change, that of second fronting, proper precisely to the west midlands where he reigned. It is thus related to the common continental compound *Pandulf*. Dithematic names in *Pend-* are very rare. It is satisfying that their distribution is strongly west-midland-centred and that **Pendwulf** is one of them.[81]

---

[76] The operative element would be *penn* 'head'. Jones (1998.54–56) would be happy with either the archaic title *pendevic* 'sovereign', suggested by K. Streit, or an unattested **penndav* 'chiefmost' posited by Hamp (1975.189–90) as underlying it.

[77] Usually *Panna* levelling out the consonant cluster; *Pantha* in the earliest sources, Nennius and the Harleian version of the *Annales Cambriae* (the only one of value for Welsh philology). See further Bartrum (1993.526).

[78] Where they have perhaps been missed because of Förstemann's arrangement, conditioned by the High German consonant-shift, listing many names in *P-* and *C-* under *B-* and *G-* respectively, though admitting explicitly (I 694) that *Cund-* was a separate theme. *C(h)und(h)a/-o* is found as a simplex with derivatives *Cundela* and many others, Penda's in the common compound *Pandulf* (never with *B-*!).

[79] Compare the extended monothematic name of the Visigothic king *Chintila*.

[80] OE **Cūð** < **Cunþ*; **Cund-** < *Cunð-* (fricative after *n* developed differently depending whether voiceless element-final or voiced word-internal).

[81] Jones (1998.54–56) tabulates them, plus one *Pand-* in Cambridgeshire which on the evidence given may be post-Conquest and/or continental, plus one *Pen-* in a Mercian dynast which may well be the Welsh word. Pendwulf is one of two

Like the simple monothematics, extended monothematic names with suffixes other than *-ing* are called diminutive by some authorities, including Redin (1919.138–62) for classificatory purposes though his actual comments largely undercut this. I think it is pretty clear that synchronically none of them were, with a marginal exception in the rare *-uc* which would have had some diminutive force from analogy with common nouns like *hæssuc* and **dunnuc*. Names in *-el(-)*, perhaps those oftenest, and most carelessly, miscalled 'diminutive', were in Old English exactly the opposite, a class hardly still productive but redolent of the heroic past. The best known **Ægele**, named in runes on the Franks Casket, was brother to Weland the legendary smith; and the main known users of these names in the Germanic languages generally were lords of the Heroic Age (especially Ostrogoths in Italy but not forgetting such honorary Germans as Attila the Hun). Even in common nouns *-el* is an agent-suffix[82] not a diminutive. I harbour the perhaps unworthy suspicion that philologists have projected onto Germanic the undoubted diminutive function of *l*-suffixes in Romance languages.[83] The only

---

clerics in *Pend-*, together with one 'queen or abbess', in the Liber Vitae of Lindisfarne. Since queens normally come from outside the kingdom where they operate, and often bring personal chaplains and the like with them, these data are compatible with the view that only in the west Mercian dialect region was the phonetic form *Pend-* ever current. The only West Saxon county with any *Pend-* is Wiltshire, which for a decade or two after 628 was under Penda's suzerainty.

[82] Or instrument-naming, as 'thimble' from 'thumb'. Eckhardt, whose classification Redin follows, has this in a list of diminutives in *-el* (1903.334–35), of which none is clearly diminutive in sense and some cannot be, e.g. *ceosel* 'pebble(s), shingle' implies something larger than an etymon glossed 'gravel' (cf. German *Kies*).

[83] Their infrequency in Krahe's chart of river-name suffixes (1962 opp. 296) would be consistent with the possibility that these suffixes were becoming productive in name-formation at the latest stage of *alteuropäisch* before the final separation of the western Indo-European language-groups. If so, Germanic and Italic would be likely to have developed onomastic functions for them separately. The points I made (1996.110–11) about adjectival origin of the suffixes in river-names are presumably relevant at some level to the origins of extended monothematic personal names, but that is an idea I am not in a position to

genuine diminutive suffix I personally am acquainted with in Germanic names is *-iso* very frequent in Frankish, where note that most of the themes it is used with are the same ones that are protothemes in dithematic names, as is not true of English extended monothematics. The equivalent suffix is almost totally absent from English names, and the exception is of the kind that proves the rule, **Egesa**[84] homophone of a common noun meaning 'awe, horror', exactly the opposite of a diminutive connotation.

Finally I have an awful confession to make. The class I dismissed contemptuously as 'film-star names' cannot be entirely ignored for Anglo-Saxon England. To make matters worse, the nearest eleventh-century equivalent of a film-star is probably involved. *Jómsvíkinga saga* tells how Cnut's father Svein Forkbeard, who had a grudge against the leaders of the military brotherhood at Jómsborg, at the feast marking his accession to the throne of Denmark by plying them with too much too strong wine induced them to utter rash heroic vows, that they would invade and conquer Norway or die in the attempt. Lesser leaders followed them with less political vows, one Vagn Ákason declaring he would kill the magnate Þorkell Leira and go to bed with Ingibjǫrg his daughter. Well, if you announce your plan of campaign at a public event you lose the element of surprise. The Jómsvíkings' invasion of Norway was a total disaster. We scroll forward to see the survivors sitting disconsolately, their ankles tied, upon a log. Earl Eiríkr son of Hákon of Hlaðir, the victor, admires the spirit of some and starts to offer them quarter. Þorkell Leira, who joins the conversation with an axe in his hand, isn't having it. 'You can grant quarter to whom you like, earl, Vagn Ákason is not going to get away with his life'; and he swings at him with the axe. But one of the other captives falls in front of him, he trips, Vagn grabs the axe and deals Þorkell a mortal blow instead. In due course Earl Eiríkr grants him Ingibjǫrg's hand in marriage.

All good jolly stuff, do I hear you say, but what has it got to do with Anglo-Saxon England? The answer lies in a Worcestershire charter of

---

develop here.

[84] Found as witness to one of the earliest charters, 690 S10, probably as qualifier in names of features in Devon S255 and S795, and possibly in Worcs. S786(xv) and S1599.

Edward the Confessor's reign, two lengths of whose boundary march with *Wahgenes gemære*.[85] This is 'Vagn's boundary'. The spelling *Wahgen* may be the kind of gingerly treatment of a foreign name that we saw with Adam,[86] or *hg* may be this scribe's device to render a guttural fricative in a position where you'd have a palatal in a native name. Either way we may properly class this name for Old English purposes as extended monothematic. S1227 grants Shurnock; this *Wahgen* owned part of the north of Inkberrow (presumably Morton Underhill of Domesday Book manors). A man whose rash youth was in the 980s *might* still have been around in the late 1040s; his age might be why the owner was not the same in 1066. More likely this would be a younger man named after the saga hero. Either way you may think of this when you read in the small print in the back of Gordon (1957.236) 'The Jómsvíkings are said to have played a part in the invasions of England in the early eleventh century, and some of their leaders were given estates in Worcestershire'. What Ingibjǫrg thought of it all is as far as I know not recorded. But it is pleasant to fancy she ended her days as a lady in the English county set, under the name of *Ingburh. And *Vagn* is, alas, the origin of modern 'Wayne'.

But let us not finish on a foreign note. Royal Wessex in the late ninth century shows how there may in the end be fairytale magic in personal names. When the varied qualities of the elder brothers had all nobly failed, how apt onomastically was the success of the youngest's elvish redes.

---

[85] 1046 × 1062 S1227 *to wahgenes gemære. of wahgenes gemære...* <*andlang*> *wahgenes gemæres* 'to/from/along Vagn's [=Wayne's] boundary'.
[86] Conceivably with a touch of Welsh wide-boy flavour.

Bibliography[87]

Bartrum, P. C. 1966. *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts*. Cardiff.

Bartrum, P. C. 1993. *A Welsh Classical Dictionary*. Aberystwyth. [prosopographic]

Björkman, E. 1917. 'Ältere englische Personennamen mid *-god, -got* im zweiten Gliede', *Englische Studien* **51** 161–79.

Björkman, E. 1920a. '*Hæðcyn* und *Hákon*', *Englische Studien* **25** 24–34.

Björkman, E. 1920b. *Studien über die Eigennamen im Beowulf*. Halle.

Bliss, A. J. 1958. *The Metre of* Beowulf. Oxford.

Bourciez, E. 1958. *Précis de phonétique française*. 9th edn. Paris.

Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford.

Chambers, R. W. 1912. *Widsith*. Cambridge. [over-romanticizes charter boundaries, excellent on everything else]

Cheney, C. R. 1945. *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History*. London.

Dumville, D. N. 1976. 'The Anglian collection of royal genealogies and regnal lists', *Anglo-Saxon England* **5** 23–50.

Dumville, D. N. 1986. 'The West Saxon genealogical regnal list: manuscripts and texts', *Anglia* **104** 1–32.

Dunning, T. P., and A. J. Bliss. 1969. *The Wanderer*. London.

Eckhardt, E. 1903. 'Die angelsächsischen Deminutivbildungen', *Englische Studien* **32** 24–34.

von Feilitzen, O. 1937. *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, Nomina Germanica 3. Uppsala.

von Feilitzen, O. 1976. 'The personal names and bynames of Winton Domesday', M. Biddle, *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages. An Edition and Discussion of the Winton Domesday,* =Winchester Studies I. Oxford. 143–229.

Fellows Jensen, G. 1968. *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire*. Copenhagen.

Förstemann, E. 1913–16. *Altdeutsches Namenbuch*, 2 vols. I *Personennamen*. II *Ortsnamen*. ed. H. Jellinghaus. Bonn. (repr. Munich and Hildesheim 1967)

Forssner, T. 1916. *Continental-Germanic Personal Names in England in Old*

---

[87] [Editor's note: Although *Nomina*'s normal house-style prefers to give bibliographical references within footnotes, these considerations are outweighed here by the value of a much-needed bibliography on this important area of naming.]

and Middle English Times. Uppsala.

Fulk, R. D. 1992. *A History of Old English Meter*. Pennsylvania.

Gollancz, I. 1895. *The Exeter Book, part 1*. Early English Text Society original series 104. London.

Gordon, E. V. 1957. *Introduction to Old Norse*. 2nd edn. Oxford.

Hamp, E. P. 1975. 'The element *-tamo-*', *Études Celtiques* **14** 187–92.

Holthausen, F. 1963. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd edn rev. H. C. Matthes. Heidelberg. [usually the best dictionary for Old English name-elements]

Hough, C. 1999. 'The widow's *mund* in Æthelberht 75 and 76', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* **98** 1–16.

Insley, J. 1994. *Scandinavian Personal Names in Norfolk*. Uppsala.

Jackson, K. H. 1953. *Language and History in Early Britain*. Edinburgh.

Jackson, K. H. 1982. 'Gildas and the names of the British princes', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* **3** 30–40.

Jones, G. 1998. 'Penda's footprint? Place-names including personal names associated with those of early Mercian kings', *Nomina* **21** 29–62.

Kalbow, W. 1913. *Die germanischen Personennamen des altfranzösischen Heldenepos*. Halle.

Kaufmann, H. 1968. *Ernst Förstemann Personennamen: Ergänzungsband*. Munich and Hildesheim.

Keynes, S. D. 1978. 'The declining reputation of Ethelred the Unready', D. Hill (ed.), *Ethelred the Unready. Papers from the Millenary Conference* [=British Archaeological Reports British series **59**], 227–53.

Keynes, S. D. 1991. 'The æthelings in Normandy', *Anglo-Norman Studies* **13** 173–205.

Keynes, S. D. 2001. 'The prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England', presentation at International Society of Anglo-Saxonists conference, Helsinki.

Kitson, P. R. 1992. 'Old English dialects and the stages of the transition to Middle English', *Folia Linguistica Historica* **11** (for 1990) 27–87.

Kitson, P. R. 1994. 'Quantifying qualifiers in Anglo-Saxon charter boundaries', *Folia Linguistica Historica* **14** (for 1993) 29–82 [+20 tables on unnumbered pages].

Kitson, P. R. 1995. 'The nature of Old English dialect distributions, mainly as exhibited in charter boundaries. Part I: vocabulary', J. Fisiak (ed.), *Mediaeval Dialectology*. Berlin. 43–135.

Kitson, P. R. 1996. 'British and European river-names', *Transactions of the Philological Society* **94** 73–118.

Kluge, F. 1886. *Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte*. Halle.

Krahe, H. 1962. *Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronomie*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz: Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse V. Wiesbaden. =pp. 285–342.

Langlois, E. 1904. *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste*. Paris.

Lapidge, M. 1988. 'A Frankish scholar in tenth-century England: Frithegod of Canterbury/Fredegaud of Briouze', *Anglo-Saxon England* **17** 45–65.

Lutz, A. 1984. 'Spellings of the *waldend* group—again', *Anglo-Saxon England* **12** 51–64.

Meid, W. 1967. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft* ed. H. Krahe, III *Wort-bildingslehre*. Berlin.

Morlet, M-T. 1968–72. *Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du VIe au XIIe siècle*, 3 vols. Paris.

Morlet, M-T. 1991. *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms de famille*. Paris.

Noreen, A. 1923. *Altnordische Grammatik*. 4th edn. Tübingen.

Plummer, C. 1892–99. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the others, on the Basis of an Edition by John Earle*, 2 vols. Oxford. rev. D. Whitelock, 1952. [vol. II contains a seriously good index]

PNSussex 1929–30. A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, with J. E. B. Gover, *The Place-Names of Sussex*, 2 vols. (EPNS 6–7). Cambridge.

Pokorny, J. 1959–69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. Berne and Munich.

Pope, M. K. 1952. *From Latin to Modern French*. Manchester.

Prokosch, E. 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia.

Pulgram, E. 1947. 'Indo-European personal names', *Language* **13** 189–206.

Redin, M. 1919. *Studies on Uncompounded Personal Names in Old English*. Uppsala.

S = charter numbers from: Sawyer, P. H. 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters. An Annotated List and Bibliography*. London.

Searle, W. G. 1897. *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*. Cambridge. [includes continental names unsignalled]

Searle, W. G. 1899. *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings, and Nobles*. Cambridge. [mainly genealogies]

Seltén, B. 1972. *The Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Middle English Personal Names*. Lund.

Smart, V. 1981. *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles 28. Cumulative Index of Volumes 1–20*. London.

Sweet, H. 1885. *The Oldest English Texts*, Early English Text Society original series 83. London.

Tengvik, G. 1938. *Old English Bynames*, Nomina Germanica 4. Uppsala. [includes mapping of where in France Domesday invaders came from]

Thorpe, B. 1861. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle According to the Several Original Authorities*, 2 vols. London. [vol. I has the parallel passages actually in parallel, vol. II a translation]

Togeby, K. 1969. *Ogier le Danois*. Copenhagen.

Tolkien, J. R. R. 1982. *Finn and Hengest*. Oxford.

Townend, M. 1997. '*Ella*: an Old English name in Old Norse poetry', *Nomina* **20** 23–35.

Townend, M. 1998. *English Place-Names in Skaldic Verse*. Nottingham.

Urry, W. 1967. *Canterbury Under the Angevin Kings*. London.

de Vries, J. 1962. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd edn. Leyden.

Withycombe, E. G. 1977. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names*. 3rd edn. Oxford.

Woolf, H. B. 1939. *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving*. Baltimore. [not actually analytic]

Wright, J. 1910. *Grammar of the Gothic Language*. Oxford. 2nd edn 1954 suppl. O. L. Sayce.

Wright, J. 1914. *Old English Grammar*. 2nd edn. Oxford.

Zachrisson, R. E. 1917–18. 'Notes on early English names in *-god*, *-got*', *Englische Studien* **50** 341–58, **52** 194–203.