PERSONAL NAMES FROM ETHNONYMS? SCANDINAVIA AND ELSEWHERE*

Philip A. Shaw

University of Leicester

The body of elements employed in the Germanic dithematic variation system of name-giving includes a number of elements that are evidently related to ethnonyms. We find, for instance, Anglo-Saxons with names such as *Seaxburg* and *Pehtuald* (*PASE*: under *Seaxburg 2* and *Pehtweald 1*), Scandinavians bearing names like *Finnvarðr* and *Gauthildr* (Janzén 1947, 72), or Franks called *Uuerinbretus* and *Engelhart* (Autenrieth, Geuenich and Schmid 1979, 194). We might term such names ethnophoric, although, as we shall see, the relationships between such names and the ethnonyms with which they are connected may well have been various and complex. If we accept the arguments of Schramm (1957; 2013) for the close connection of the dithematic variation system with epithets used in heroic poetry, then we might accept his view of the ethnophoric names (1957, 64–68; 2014, 82–85) as developing in a similar fashion. This is, however, difficult to establish with any certainty, and at least some ethnophoric name elements may have arisen (as Schramm himself argues in relation to Scandinavian *-finnr*; 2013, 84) as secondary developments, reflecting the increased prominence of certain ethnic groups in particular parts of the Germanic world.

In 1994, discussing the problematic name *Swābaharjaz* recorded on the Rö stone, Lena Peterson made a plea for further study of the ethnophoric names: 'I wish someone, some time, would study ethnic personal name elements, where and why they arise, where and how and

why they spread' (Peterson 1994, 154). A study that attempted to do this for the Germanic languages as a whole—and a study of ethnophoric name elements would need to address the Germanic languages in their totality, as far as possible—would be an ambitious undertaking indeed, and certainly more than can be attempted in a single paper. This piece will not attempt anything like a complete study, but will focus instead on attempting to elucidate some of the problems involved, with a particular focus on ethnophoric and potentially ethnophoric names attested in Scandinavia in the Viking Age and before. It will be suggested that some of these names can be seen as part of a very early stratum of naming practice in the Germanic languages, which was inherited in Scandinavia as in other parts of the Germanic-speaking world. Some names of this type have the potential, then, to illuminate the mental geographies of Germanic speakers of the Roman period, or thereabouts, while others reflect later socio-political developments. At the same time, we should be cautious, this piece argues, in our judgements as to whether some names are or are not ethnophoric.

ISSUES IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF ETHNOPHORIC NAMES

The dithematic names are not the only names that we might consider ethnophoric. Some of the same name elements are also employed in forming monothematic names, such as *Finnr* and *Gautr* (Janzén 1947, 56), and forms also occur in which an ethnophoric name element is used to create a name by suffixation, as in *Danila*, which consists of the ethnonym *Dane* plus a diminutive suffix (Garcia Moreno 1974, 44 n. 40; Köbler 1989: appendix 3, under *Danila*). The relationship between such forms and dithematic names employing these elements cannot be straightforwardly characterised. We can envisage a number of possi-bilities, such as development of monothematic or suffixed forms as hypocorisms of dithematic names, creation of ethnic by-names that are later re-interpreted as part of the stock of name elements (Bach 1943, 208) and simple adoption of an ethnonym into the stock of name elements, so that it comes to be employed in forming monothematic, suffixed and dithematic names.

The relationship between a personal name element and the corresponding ethnonym is also problematic. While it is undoubtedly the case that ethnonyms sometimes come to be employed as personal name elements (whether via by-names or directly), we must also bear in mind that some personal name elements may simply share an etymon with an ethnonym. Looijenga (2003) makes several identifications of names in

early runic inscriptions as ethnophoric. Her concern is to support an origin of the runes in the Rhine frontier area, and she therefore makes a series of connections with names of tribal groups from this area: **wagnijo** < *Vangiones*; **niþijo** < *Nidenses*; **harja** < *Harii*; **leugaz** < *Lugii*; **swabaharjaz** < *Suebi*; **fozo** < *Fosi*; **iuþingaz** < *Iuthungi*; **saligastiz** < *Salii*; and **haukoþuz** and **hakuþo** possibly < *Chauci* (Looijenga 2003, 98–99). Leaving aside the possibility that Looijenga's preferred theory for the origin of the runes colours her identifications, some of these pairings demonstrate very clearly the problem of shared etyma. The ethnonyms of Germanic tribes are in the great majority of cases derived from pre-existing Germanic lexical items, and the same is true of Germanic name elements. There is, therefore, clearly the possibility for a name element and an ethnonym to derive independently from the same lexical item, rather than one from the other. If we believe, for instance, that the ethnonym *Chauci* derives from the Germanic adjective whose Present Day English reflex is *high* (Old Icelandic *há*, Old English *hēah*; see, for instance, Neumann 2008, 325), then we could conceivably treat Old English names such as *Hēahberht* as ethnophoric names (compare Bach 1943, 209 on the name *Angilhōh*). In Looijenga's identifications, we find elements such as **sali-* and **-harjaz* that can be related to words meaning 'hall' (Old Norse *salr*, Old English *sele*) and 'army' (Old Norse *herr*, Old English *here*) respectively—elements that are not usually interpreted as ethnophoric. Perhaps Looijenga's implicit claim that these name elements are ethnophoric is correct, but there seems no compelling reason to prefer this interpretation over one that sees these elements as deriving directly from the lexicon.

This raises the question of the extent to which identifications of names as ethnophoric rely on a number of unspoken assumptions: that name elements that relate to lexical items that continued in use in the historically attested forms of the Germanic languages are less likely to be ethnophoric (as, for instance, in the treatment of names in *Há-/Hēah-* 'high'); conversely, that name elements related to lexical items that fell out of use early in, or before, the written records of the Germanic languages are more likely to be ethnophoric; and that name elements related to better-known or more successful or admirable tribes are more likely to be ethnophoric than those related to less well-known or less successful tribes (see Bach 1943, 208–09 for the argument that names in *Warin-/Werin-* reflect the quondam prestige of the *Varini*). While these assumptions are not necessarily entirely unjustified, we should recognise that they are not immutable rules of naming practice. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, they may furnish a plausible working

hypothesis (which, like any hypothesis, must be tested), but we should beware of placing too much weight on them. We need also to distinguish between name elements originating as ethnophoric elements—as interpretations of them as deriving from ethnonyms imply—and elements that are not originally ethnophoric, but come to be interpreted by their users as ethnophoric. This is clearly not an easy thing to determine, but, as we shall see, there are sometimes clues that indicate whether or not users of a name are interpreting it as ethnophoric.

In view of the tendency to make assumptions about ethnophoric names reflecting connections with the tribes referenced, or with areas associated with them, we should also consider the question of external influence on Scandinavian personal names. There has been some important debate over the extent to which personal names evidenced in the pre-Viking Age Scandinavian material reveal influences from elsewhere in the Germanic-speaking world. Insley (1991) maintains that there is evidence for fairly considerable external influences on Scandinavia, whereas Peterson (1994) and, following her, Nielsen (2000, 190–96), take the rather more cautious view that we cannot identify cases of influence with certainty. Insley (2006, 123–24) modifies his earlier views, accepting that the evidence for external influences is problematic, but he does note some cases where Continental influence of some kind can probably be identified in early Scandinavian runic inscriptions. There are, moreover, cases in the Viking Age material where a name from another Germanic language can be identified with confidence on linguistic grounds. For instance, the form **ailmer**, employed in the coinage of Svend Estridsen (Nielsen 1994, 169), appears to imitate the coinage of Cnut, whose moneyer Æthelmær's name frequently appears in the form <ægelmær> (*EMC* 1014.1509, 1014.1510, 1027.0398, 1027.0399, 1036.0689, 1048.1000, 1051.0686, 1014.1511) and occasionally in the form <æglmær> (*EMC* 1984.0002, 1014.1512). This name can be certainly identified as an Old English name on the grounds of its spelling, which reflects the late Old English phonological simplification of the name element *Æþel-* identified in Smart (1983) and evidenced in the spellings of Cnut's moneyer's name. Similarly, a phonological feature has been proposed as evidence for the West Germanic character of the form **harja** on the Vimose comb (Looijenga 2003, 96), although other interpretations seem possible: this form could, for instance, represent a hypocoristic form of a dithematic name in *harja-* or *-harjaz*, following the weak inflexional pattern (Antonsen 1975, 32 n. 8; Antonsen 2002, 61; Peterson 2004: under *Harja*).

Where there is clear phonological evidence of the sort presented by **ailmer**, we can be assured that a name reflects external influence in one form or another. However, in cases where such evidence is lacking, we should exercise caution: where a name in the pre-Viking Age material has relatives in all or most of the extra-Scandinavian Germanic languages, but none in Viking Age Scandinavian material, there is little reason to prefer an interpretation of the name as an import over treating it as a Scandinavian reflex of a Common Germanic name element. The Viking Age evidence clearly points to the development of various new name elements within the Scandinavian variation system (see, for instance, Insley 1991, 333; Vikstrand 2009; Shaw 2011b), and we should not, therefore, be surprised to find that the development of Viking Age naming fashions also involved Common Germanic name elements falling out of fashion. This is by no means to deny the possibility of diffusion of name elements from one area to another, but rather to argue that one should not too readily assume this process where there is evidence that a name element was very widespread: such evidence is at least consistent with an interpretation of the element as a Common Germanic inheritance.

Along with the assumptions noted above, we should also question our assumptions about the direction of influence between personal and group naming practices. Where personal name elements are treated as ethnophoric, they are usually assumed to derive from the ethnonym. There are, however, cases in which the direction of influence is quite the opposite. An example in recent history is the name *Geordie*, applied to the inhabitants of Newcastle in the north-east of England. This group-name derives from a hypocoristic form of the personal name *George*, reflecting the use of this form of the name in the north-east of England, possibly a well-known bearer (or bearers) of the name, and its dissemination through popular song (Wales 2006, 133–35). Yet such developments are not a uniquely modern phenomenon. Similar developments can be observed in the use of terms such as *Karlenses*, deriving from the Carolingian dynasty, and the name *Lotharingia*, from Lothair I and II (Goffart 1981, 97–98). At an earlier date still, the Ubii came to bear the alternative name *Agrippinenses* (Tacitus, *Germania* 27.5), deriving from the name of Agrippa's granddaughter Agrippina (Derks 2009, 267–68). This does not, of course, mean that we should assume that this is the usual—or even a common—direction of influence; and we certainly need not enthusiastically embrace the historical reality of eponymous ethnic founding figures such as Saxo Grammaticus's Dan (Davidson and Fisher 1996, 14). Nevertheless, in considering how any apparently ethnophoric

personal name may have developed, we should bear in mind the possibility that personal names—whether those of conspicuous individuals in a group, or simply those employed frequently by members of the group—can develop into group-names.

ETHNOPHORIC NAMES RELATED TO NAMES OF GERMANIC TRIBES

Any study of the ethnophoric personal names in the early Germanic languages must allow not only for the various issues discussed above, but also for the problems presented by the evidence for Germanic personal names during this period. Such problems include the production and the preservation of texts from the period, as well as the difficulties of relating name forms across different languages and dialects, where both phonological and orthographic factors may affect the representation of a name. This is not the place for an exhaustive discussion of the problems presented by the available evidence, and the gaps in it, across all the Germanic languages, but it will be useful to discuss briefly the early medieval Scandinavian sources around which this discussion will centre. The two main corpora employed in what follows are Peterson (2004) and Peterson (2007). The latter gathers together personal names evidenced in Viking Age runic inscriptions (Peterson 2007, 9). The former covers earlier Scandinavian runic inscriptions, but also includes some names from *Beowulf*, as well as personal names that are preserved in place-names with the generic *-lev*. Clearly there are limitations to both of these corpora. Viking Age runic inscriptions, for instance, are not evenly distributed geographically throughout Scandinavia, and we should therefore expect some areas, such as Uppland, to be better represented than others (Sawyer 2000, 11). The pre-Viking Age material is, of course, considerably scarcer than the later evidence, which makes it more desirable to draw on as full a range of types of evidence as possible. This approach, however, is not without its problems, such as the difficulty of distinguishing, in a text such as *Beowulf*, between Old English cognates of Scandinavian names, Old English approximations of Scandinavian names and names invented by the Anglo-Saxon poet (for instructive discussion of some cases, see Kitson 2002, 114–17).

The pre-Viking Age material assembled in Peterson (2004) includes a small number of names that might be considered ethnophoric. Those identified by Peterson as possibly related to ethnonyms are *Finnō*, *Fōzō*, names in *Gauta-/-gautaz* (see under **Gautaharjaz*, **Gauta* and

*Þunragautaz),[1] *Swābaharjaz* and *Winiþharjaz*. The asterisked name forms all derive from place-names, while the other three appear in runic inscriptions. Two of these appear on rune-stones, while the name Fōzō appears on a bracteate. The latter name Peterson (2004, 7) compares to the ethnonym *Fosi*, mentioned by Tacitus, but the resemblance between the two may well be fortuitous, and there is therefore little reason to suppose that this is an ethnophoric personal name. To these we should probably add names in *Hraiþ-* (see under *Hraiþ-*(*Hraid-*)*gaizaz/ -harjaz/-warjaz*), and we might also wish to consider the names *Hūna* and *Hūnaz*, as well as the form **igijon** from the Stenstad stone, which is perhaps to be identified as related to the ethnonym *Ingaevones* recorded in Tacitus's *Germania* (see under *Igjō* (?), *Ing(w)ijō* (?); Tacitus, *Germania* 2.3). Looijenga's (2003, 84) suggestion that the forms **niþijo** and **wagnijo** should be associated with the Nidenses and the Vangiones respectively does not seem compelling: plausible etymologies can be advanced without recourse to these ethnonyms (see Peterson 2004: under *Nīþijō* (?), *Niþjō* (?) and *Wagnijō*). Moreover, as we shall see, the other ethnonyms involved in Scandinavian naming practices tend to reflect a tribal geography centred on the western Baltic littoral.

The Viking Age runic evidence assembled in Peterson (2007) demonstrates some overlap with the ethnophoric names noted above in the pre-Viking Age runic material. Again, we find names related to the ethnonyms *Finn*, *Geat*, *Ingaevones* and *Suebi* (Peterson 2007: under *Finn-*, *Finnr/Fiðr*, *Gaut-*, *Gautr*, *-guti*, *Ing(i)-* and *Svāfa*). We also find names in *Hrœið-*, which we may wish to consider as deriving from an ethnonym, and there is an instance of the element *Hūn-* in the name *Hūnviðr*: an element whose potential relationship with the ethnonym *Hun* will be discussed below. There are, however, a number of names and elements that Peterson identifies as ethnophoric (or potentially so) that do not appear in the earlier evidence: *DanR*, *Sigdan*, *Æist-* (see under *ÆistulfR*), *Iūti*, *Saxi* and *Varinn*.[2] To these we might also add *Ængli*, which Peterson derives from the word meaning 'fish-hook', but, as Kuhn (1973, 285) points out, the ethnonym is probably to be derived from the word. We might therefore prefer to see this name as related to the ethnonym. Another possible case is the name *Frakki*, which Peterson

---

1.   See also p. 46, where Peterson raises the possibility of deriving *Gauta* from the appellative with the sense 'man'.

2.   In addition to the ethnonyms noted here, Peterson (2007) relates a small number of personal names to names of areas within Scandinavia: for instance, *Harðr*, which may be related to *Hordaland*. Such names are also discussed very briefly in Janzén (1947, 56), but will not be considered here.

identifies as deriving from the adjective meaning 'brave': a connection with the ethnonym *Frank* is not inconceivable.

The task of distinguishing between personal name elements that derive directly from ethnonyms, and those that are simply related to ethnonyms, is not straightforward. Elements such as *Gaut-* or names such as *Ængli*, *Saxi* and *Frakki* do not provide many clues: names formed from the same elements are common in the Germanic-speaking world, and could as easily derive from the words meaning 'man', 'hook', 'knife' (or 'short sword') and 'brave' as from the related ethnonyms. Other terms with similar semantic values are employed in forming Germanic personal names (see, for instance, Peterson 2007: under *Manni*, *-hvatr* and *KrōkR* for 'man', 'brave' and 'hook'; *PASE*: under *Billfrith 1*, *Billheard 1*, *Billnoth 1* for 'sword'). Nevertheless, it seems likely that these elements were at times interpreted by their users as ethnophoric, but how they came into being is difficult to establish. On the other hand, some ethnophoric name elements do provide clues. The ethnonym *Dane* tends to be etymologised as deriving from a landscape term relating to low-lying land (Andersson 2006, 2; Neumann 2008, 330–31). If the personal name element were derived directly from the landscape term, this would be unusual, as such terms are rarely employed in the Germanic variation system of personal naming. Perhaps more decisive is the case of names such as *Varinn*: the tribal name that Tacitus records as *Varini* (*Germania* 40.1) may be related to the root that produces verbs such as Old Icelandic *verja*, *vara* and *verna* (Old English *werian*, *warian* and *wiernan*; Schönfeld 1911: under *Varini*), but it is of course not formally identical with any of these verbs, and the personal name element coincides in form with the ethnonym. The element *Hraiþ-* is discussed in more detail in Shaw (2011a, 84–94), but the usual etymological account of it as deriving from a word meaning 'nest' (Peterson 2007: under *Hræið-*) seems semantically odd for a personal name element. It would make more sense to see it as an ethnophoric element deriving from the alterna-tive name for the Goths that appears in Old Norse texts as *Reiðgotar* and in Old English texts as *Hræda*[*s*] or *Hreðgotan* (Shaw 2011a, 88–90).

The possibly ethnophoric elements relating to the names of Germanic tribes noted above from Peterson (2004; 2007) largely reflect the tribal geography of the western Baltic coasts. The Angles, Saxons, Geats and Danes are, of course, well known, and the term *Hraiþ* applied to the Goths appears to be particularly a part of the traditions of this part of the world, reflected in the Rök stone and in Anglo-Saxon traditions through poems such as *Widsith* (Malone 1962, 26 lines 109–22; Shaw 2011a, 88–90). The implications of this, and of the fact that these name elements are

not peculiar to those parts of the Germanic-speaking world strongly influenced by the traditions of this region, cannot be explored in detail here, but this is an area that would repay further work. It would, for instance, be worth considering whether traditional narrative might function as a vehicle for the creation and dissemination across the Germanic-speaking world of name elements reflecting the tribal entanglements of a specific region, reflecting the kinds of narrative movement identified by Haubrichs (2004).

NAMES RELATED TO NON-GERMANIC-SPEAKING NEIGHBOURS

walha-

One name element that is not usually considered an ethnonym, strictly speaking, nevertheless warrants discussion here. This is the reflex of Primitive Germanic *walha-*, which appears across the Germanic languages. It is variously applied in different parts of the Germanic-speaking world: for instance, to the pre-Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of England and to later speakers of Brittonic languages in Old English, to Romance speakers in Old High German and in the Scandinavian languages to Celtic-speakers and the inhabitants of northern France (Weisgerber 1948, 105–12; De Vries 1977: under *Valir*). It is of interest in relation to ethnophoric names because it derives ultimately from the name of the Celtic tribe referred to in Latin sources as the *Volcae*, and thus could have been originally an ethnophoric name element. Of course, it is also possible that the development of the name element postdates the development of the ethnonym into an appellative in the Germanic languages. It is difficult to decide which of these two possibilities is the more plausible.

The borrowing of the tribal name *Volcae* into the Germanic languages can be dated to a very early period: Green (1998, 162) suggests 'before the third century BC' for Germanic interaction with the Volcae on phonological grounds (see also Krahe 1954, 43–44 and Rübekeil 1992, 63). Weisgerber (1948, 92–94) seeks to bolster the phonological argument for this dating with the evidence of classical authors and coin finds. This suggests that the appellative *walha-* has a long history in the Germanic languages, and we might therefore expect to see the related name element in widespread use in the Germanic languages, whether it developed directly from the tribal name, or from the appellative. On the other hand, the development of *Volcae* into an appellative among Germanic speakers did not, presumably, occur immediately on contact with the Volcae. Indeed, the conditions for development of the ethnonym

into an appellative seem more likely to be the loss of contact than its establishment. Germanic speakers for whom the Volcae were immediate neighbours would be in a position to maintain a clear association between the name and the specific group. On the other hand, after losing contact with the group, they would have less reinforcement of the specific ethnic reference of the name, and might begin to use it more broadly as an appellative. Alternatively, spread of the name from closer to more distant Germanic-speaking groups might provide another context for the dissolution of the link between the ethnonym and the group to which it referred. It is possible, then, that there was a relatively extended period of contact with the Volcae during which the name element might have developed directly from the ethnonym.

How widespread the name element *walha- was in the Germanic languages is difficult to ascertain. Peterson (2007) identifies the name *Vāli* as containing the personal name element *walha-, but her material is lacking dithematic names that could contain this element, although names that could be interpreted as containing this element as prototheme are not uncommon in Old Norse; consider, for example, the names *Valbrandr*, *Valdís*, *Valgarðr* and *Valgerðr*, all attested in *Landnámabók* (Jónsson 1925, 33, 127, 12 and 28, respectively, among others). Peterson (2004) identifies no instances of this name element in her pre-Viking Age material. Whether these Scandinavian names actually contain the element *walha- is, however, unclear. De Vries (1977: under *val 4* and *valr 1*) accounts for such names partly in terms of borrowings of West Germanic names in *walha- and partly as containing an element deriving from Old Norse *val*/*valr* 'the slain'.[3] Green (1998, 163), perhaps following Weisgerber (1948, 95), claims that *walha- does not occur in Gothic names, but Köbler (1989: under *wal-a- (1)*) lists a number of Gothic names that could be interpreted as containing this element, such as *Walamēr*, *Walaravans* and *Walarius*. It is also possible, however, to interpret such names as containing an entirely distinct name element *wala-, related to the Gothic verb *waljan* 'to choose' (Kaufmann 1968, 378, 381; see also Weisgerber 1948, 137 n. 28). It is possible, therefore, that *walha- was restricted to the West Germanic languages, with some borrowing of names containing this element in Scandinavia.

---

3.   Interestingly, De Vries (1977: under *valr 1*) suggests that an element formed on the Old English cognate *wæl* might exist in the name *Wælræfen*, but the evidence for this comes from the very end of the Anglo-Saxon period and the post-Conquest period (*PASE* under *Wælræfn 1–4* and *Wælhræfn 1*) and this is therefore probably best explained as an Old English spelling of a Scandinavian name.

On the other hand, the absence of this element in the pre-Viking Age material (Peterson 2004) does not demonstrate decisively that this name element was not native to Scandinavia, as Cleasby, Vigfusson and Craigie (1957: under *val-*) suppose. As we know, undoubtedly Common Germanic name elements appear in Viking Age material but are lacking in pre-Viking Age Scandinavian sources. The corpus of pre-Viking Age Scandinavian names assembled in Peterson (2004) is notably lacking some name elements that are well attested across the Germanic-speaking world, and also in Viking Age Scandinavia. For instance, *-hildr* is lacking in Peterson (2004), but is a fairly frequent female deuterotheme in Viking Age Scandinavia (Peterson 2007: under *-hildr*), and also quite common in England (see, for instance, the ten individuals named *Ælfhild* in *PASE*) and on the Continent (Reichert 1987–90, 542–45). As Vikstrand (2009, 18–19) points out, the same considerations apply to the name element *Guð-*. The obvious inference from these instances is that absence of a name element from the pre-Viking Age evidence is no guarantee that it did not exist in Scandinavian naming practices at this time.

It is possible that a more detailed examination of the whole range of names that may or may not contain the element **walha-* will be able to arrive at a more definite conclusion, but for the present we must suppose that this may or may not originally have been an ethnophoric name element. It is possible that this element existed across the Germanic languages, and, if so, it may have been an early development directly from the ethnonym. Alternatively, it may have existed only in the West Germanic languages, suggesting that it was a later development. This might initially suggest that it came directly from the appellative, but in fact it is also consistent with development directly from the ethnonym, since contact with the Volcae presumably took place within the area within which the West Germanic dialects initially evolved. It would be possible, then, for the ethnonym to have been borrowed twice within this area, once as a name element, which then spread only within the West Germanic dialects, and once as an appellative, which spread more widely across the Germanic-speaking world. Whatever the precise order of developments, however, it seems probable that this name element developed quite early on in West Germanic (if not in Common Germanic), and it may therefore have been important in paving the way for some of the other name elements that relate to names and terms for non-Germanic tribes or peoples.

Wend

The ethnonym *Wend* is employed in the pre-Viking Age Scandinavian material, although the evidence for this is a single place-name (Peterson 2004: under **Winiþharjaz*). This name element relates to the name *Venedi* (Tacitus, *Germania* 46.2 uses the form *Venethi*) applied to a tribal group living in the eastern Baltic region. This name was later applied more widely in the Germanic languages and in medieval Latin sources to eastern neighbours of Germanic-speaking groups, especially Slavs (Steinacher 2002, 28–29). However, as Rübekeil (1992, 50–58) points out, the application of very similar names to a number of different groups in different parts of Europe can be best explained on the view that the name is not one that groups apply to themselves, but rather a term employed by neighbouring groups. Names in **winiþ-* can therefore be seen as developing differently from **walha-* names in that they do not draw on a neighbouring group's own name for themselves. The semantic development, on the other hand, may be rather similar, in that in both cases these groups seem likely to have been respected by their Germanic-speaking neighbours (Rübekeil 1992, 54–55, 64; Green 1998, 163), which may have prompted the creation of name elements related to them.

The name element to which *Wend* gives rise, however, is not as common as the name element **walha-*. Despite the sparseness of the evidence, this name element does appear to be relatively widespread: it appears on the Continent in names such as *Uuenethardus*, *Uuinidheri*, *Uuinetlandus* and *Uuinidolf* (Autenrieth, Geuenich and Schmid 1979, 175) and in the Gothic name *Winitharius* (Holthausen 1934: under **Winiþ-s*), but does not appear to be attested in Anglo-Saxon England. It is noteworthy that this element is often combined with the deuterotheme **-harjaz* 'army' (as in *Uuinidheri* and *Winitharius*), but it is nevertheless clear that this element was employed within the variation naming system, albeit with a particular preference for one specific combination. The distribution of the element is consistent with an interpretation of it as a Common Germanic name element, but it also seems that the frequency of occurrence of the element in different parts of the Germanic-speaking world may reflect the local salience of groups identified by Germanic speakers using the ethnonym *Wend*. Thus the relative frequency of **winiþ-* names in some continental sources, such as the confraternity book of the Abbey of Reichenau (Autenrieth, Geuenich and Schmid 1979, 175), contrasts with the total lack of evidence for this name element in England. In some areas on the Continent, Germanic speakers were quite likely to be aware of or come into contact with non-Germanic neighbours to the east, whereas in England this was highly unlikely.

Est

There are a number of names that Peterson (2007) relates to the ethno-nym *Est*. *Æistfari*, *Æisti*, *Æistmaðr* and *Æistr* might be taken as by-name formations indicating an individual's ethnicity or, in the case of *Æistfari*, their having journeyed to Estonia. In addition to these names, however, Peterson also records the name *Æistulfr*, which cannot be understood in these terms. It is possible that compound by-names such as *Æistfari* and *Æistmaðr* were reinterpreted as variation names, leading to the adoption of *Æist-* into the stock of variation elements and its use in names such as *Æistulfr*. We might expect such names to be restricted to Scandinavia, reflecting the areas of contact between Germanic speakers and Ests. The situation is potentially complicated, however, by a Roman-period inscription from Petronell-Carnuntum in modern-day Austria, which records an individual called *Sept*(*imius*) *Aistomodi*[*us*] and describes him as a *re*[*x*] *Germ*(*anorum*) (Mommsen 1873, 555 no. 4453). If we accept that this name has the same first element as *Æistulfr*, then we have evidence here for the use of this element as a variation element long before the Viking Age runic examples noted by Peterson. It is, of course, possible that the first element of *Aistomodius* bears an entirely coincidental resemblance to *Æist-*. If the two elements are identical, however, then a number of possibilities arise; the name element may be unrelated to the ethnonym *Est*, or the name element and the ethnonym may have a shared etymon (a view implied by Schönfeld (1911, 273 and under *Aistomodius*), who relates both to Gothic *aistan* 'to reverence'), or the name element may derive from the ethnonym. In the latter case, this name element represents one of the earliest ethnophoric name elements in the Germanic languages, dating back at least to the Roman period. In the two former cases, the name element must be equally ancient, but not ethnophoric.

The etymology of the ethnonym *Est* is not necessarily helpful in choosing between these possible interpretations. It does not appear to be a name used for themselves by the Baltic tribes whom Germanic speakers termed *Ests* (Loit 1989, 594), but its etymology is unclear. It has sometimes been interpreted as deriving from the Germanic root **aust-* 'east', which yields Old Norse *austr*, Old English *ēast* and Old High German *ost* (see, for instance, Kallasmaa 2002, 66 and references therein). More cautiously, Grünthal (1997) simply suggests that 'an original common noun source might be sought in a (Proto) Germanic or (Proto) Baltic language'. It is very difficult to accept an etymological origin in the Germanic term for 'east': its various developments in the

early Germanic languages clearly point towards a root with the diphthong */au/, whereas Tacitus's term *Aestii* (*Germania* 45.2), and the Scandinavian personal name element discussed above, can best be explained as beginning with Proto-Germanic */ai/. The hunt for possible Baltic etymologies for the ethnonym *Est*, on the other hand, must await the attentions of a specialist in that area. While we can be clear, then, that in Viking Age Scandinavia there were by-name formations deriving from the ethnonym *Est*, it is unclear whether these gave rise to a rare use of the ethnonym as a variation name element, or whether there was already a variation name element in existence that was either etymologically related to, or coincidentally similar to, the ethnonym.

Hūn

The name element *hūn* is usually explained as unrelated to the ethnonym *Hun* (Bach 1943, 209; Janzén 1947, 80; Peterson 2007: under *Hūnviðr*). However, Neuß (2008) argues persuasively that names containing this element should be seen as related to the ethnonym, pointing out that the ethnonym is in fact applied more widely than simply to the group we now term the *Huns*. This argument suggests that *hūn* is in fact similar to terms such as **walha-* and *Wend*: like them, it does not designate a single ethnic group consistently, but is variously applied to non-Germanic-speaking groups. As a name element, it might therefore be seen as essentially similar to **walha-*, **winiþ-* and (possibly) **aist-*, and we might best characterise these elements not as strictly ethnophoric, but as drawing on terms applied without strict ethnic significance to groups identified by Germanic speakers as foreign. As we have seen, **walha-* may originally have been ethnophoric in the strict sense, but we cannot be sure of this, nor can we demonstrate such a development with certainty for the other elements. Since **walh* is widespread and well attested as an appellative with the sense 'foreigner', we might hypothesise that **walha-* is the prototype for the 'foreigner' name elements in the Germanic variation system. This hypothesis would suggest that **walha-* originated as an ethnophoric element just like other ethnophoric elements (although referring to a non-Germanic tribe) but as the ethnonym developed at an early stage in the Germanic dialects as an appellative with the sense 'foreigner', the name element was reinterpreted as deriving from the appellative. This reinterpretation would then have paved the way for other terms used to refer to foreigners to be employed, on the analogy of **walha-*, as elements in the variation naming system.

NAMES RELATING TO THE SUEBI AND THE SVEAR

The converse of name elements drawing on the names of, or terms applied to, non-Germanic neighbours are perhaps those name elements which appear to derive from terms with the sense 'our own', or from names deriving from such terms. Here we return to the name *Swābaharjaz* from the Rö stone, which is usually interpreted as having an ethnophoric prototheme related to the ethnonym *Suebi*. In discussing this name, Peterson (1994, 153) writes at length about the difficulties of interpreting the apparently ethnic element in the name:

> If, for a moment, we accept that the name is a 'meaningful' name and not a name of the variation type, i.e. a name meaning 'Swabian warrior' or 'the one who has a Swabian army', I would like to ask: What does it mean when a person whose name indicates Swabian extraction or a connection with the Swabians is referred to in a Scandinavian inscription? What, in fact, is there to prevent us from regarding this man as a Scandinavian and his name as one created in Scandinavia? We can imagine him having participated in Swabian battles on the Continent or even having brought back Swabian warriors, and on his return home this 'nickname' had been bestowed on him. An alternative is that he really was a Swabian warrior, i.e. a man from Swabia—but where was his name created? Ethnic bynames are not created on a person's home ground, but, at the nearest, in lands bordering upon that territory, so he may then have come from one of the regions surrounding Swabia and his name may have been invented there. But, in my opinion, the Scandinavian interpretation is as probable as this last one.
>
> This reasoning is based on the assumption that the man we encounter in the Rö inscription had an individual byname, but of course the name may also be a ready-made one. If this is the case, it is most probably an import from the Continent, and equally so if the name is formed according to the variation principle, because where would a name element like *swāba-* have been created and become popular if not on the Continent?

While ethnic by-names clearly are a possibility that we have to reckon with in Scandinavian naming practices, as in names such as *Danski* 'Danish [man]' (Peterson 2007: under *Danski*), the existence of dithematic names with the prototheme *Swāba-* in various Germanic languages suggests that a variation name is likely in this case. However, it need not follow from such an interpretation that the name is an import. The pan-Germanic distribution of the element indicates that it may have formed part of the Common Germanic onomasticon, and there is therefore no reason why this element should not appear in Scandinavian names through simple inheritance of naming practices, just as other elements such as *Guð-* and *-hildr* are inherited from the Common

Germanic stock of name elements. Scandinavian users of the element might or might not have identified it as related to the ethnonym *Suebi*, but we need not assume that any kind of connection with the Suebi themselves was necessarily involved in the use of the element as part of the variation system of naming within Scandinavia.

The question remains as to whether *Swāba-* is in origin an ethnophoric name element. As Peterson (1994, 153) notes, Antonsen (1975, 43–44 n. 26) treats *Swāba-* not as deriving from the ethnonym but as a meaningful derivative of the ethnonym's etymon, translating **swabaharjaz** as 'war-leader of one's own people'. Antonsen (2002, 124–25) repeats more explicitly that both personal name element and ethnonym derive from the same root. He identifies this root as related to 'O[ld] Ind[ic]. *sab^{h}ā́* "assembly", O[ld] Prus[sian]. *subs* "oneself", Rus. *sobstvo* "characteristic, peculiarity"' (Antonsen 2002, 125; see also Antonsen 1975, 43), and thus understands it as having the sense 'one's own (people)' (Antonsen 2002, 124; see also Antonsen 1975, 44). On the other hand, while the Germanic languages possess lexical items formed on the same reflexive root, such as Gothic *swēs* (Holthausen 1934: under *swēs*) and Old English *swǣs* (Liebermann 1960, I, 12), none of these lexical items are formed with the suffix evidenced in the non-Germanic comparanda cited by Antonsen. The development of the name must therefore be very old: Rübekeil (1992, 211) argues that a formation of this sort must predate Caesar, and should be characterised as pre-Germanic. There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that the bearer of the name *Swābaharjaz* on the Rö stone understood the first element of his name as meaning 'one's own'. Whether or not he recognised a connection with the Suebi is harder to determine, but the name element seems likely to have existed for a long time prior to this inscription, and we need not suppose that it was used in this instance with any particular idea that it was meaningful. Rübekeil (1992, 203–11) may well be right to see the ethnonym *Suebi* as developing originally as an ethnonym, without a prior stage as an appellative, and this would suggest that the personal name element was always ethnophoric. In any case, it must have been understood as ethnophoric from an early stage in the development of the Germanic languages.

A formation with the sense 'one's own' can also be seen as underlying the ethnonym *Svear*, which is also usually interpreted as deriving from the same reflexive root (Andersson 2006, 3; Neumann 2008, 294). It is striking that this ethnonym does not commonly appear as a personal name element in Scandinavia or, indeed, in other Germanic-speaking areas (Holthausen 1934: under **Swēōs* notes the Gothic personal names

Suīmīrus and *Suērīdus*, which may be examples of names formed with a derivative of *Svear* as a prototheme). This is noteworthy in view of the tribal dynamics of Danes, Geats and Svear discussed by Andersson (2004, 14–15; 2006), which suggest that the Svear were of considerable importance in the Scandinavian world from before the Viking Age. Since the ethnonyms *Dane* and *Geat* both relate to frequently used personal name elements in Scandinavia and elsewhere, we might expect a similar reflection of the ethnonym *Svear* across the Germanic-speaking world. The rarity, if not outright absence, of this form seems to agree with Rübekeil's (1992, 152) claim that '*Suiones* ist kein Stammesname, sondern ein Sammelbegriff skandinavischer Germanen' ('*Suiones* is not a tribal name, but a collective term for Scandinavian Germanic peoples'). The fact that the ethnonym *Svear* did not, apparently, develop early on into a personal name element can be accounted for by the view that this was originally not an ethnonym: in contrast with the ethnonym *Suebi*, which is common as a name element and appears always to have been an ethnonym, *Svear* starts life as a term covering various different groups. Nevertheless, the continuing failure to develop an ethnophoric element as the term became an ethnonym is noteworthy. This failure suggests that the creation of ethnophoric name elements was not always and everywhere a possibility in the Germanic languages: anthroponymic inertia may be dominant in some contexts, whereas other forces break this inertia at times. The impression created by the Volcae upon their Germanic neighbours may be a case in point. The unusual conditions of early Anglo-Saxon England may be another, prompting the creation of the new ethnophoric name element *Peoht-*. Pre-Viking Age Scandinavia, it seems, may have been relatively conservative in its development of ethnophoric name elements, maintaining pre-existing ones, but not adding to the stock.

CONCLUSIONS

The phenomenon of ethnophoric names in the Germanic languages is clearly one deserving of attention. As we have seen, however, it is by no means straightforward even to agree on which names or name elements can be considered ethnophoric. For instance, some elements that we might be inclined to think of as deriving from an appellative rather than an ethnonym, such as **walha-*, can perhaps be better explained as deriving from the ethnonym which itself gave rise to the appellative. Such findings are, of course, significant in their own right, but they leave open questions such as the extent to which elements were interpreted as being

ethnophoric by their users in the various contexts in which they occur. In this case, it seems highly probable that the name element was interpreted by its early medieval users as related to the appellative, and this may help to account for the development of name elements related to *Wend*, *Hun* and possibly *Est*. In other cases it may be much harder, or even impossible, to answer the question of how later users of a name element understood it, and no doubt the answers vary considerably in different parts of the Germanic-speaking world and at different periods. In looking at individual naming milieus, we should bear in mind the wider picture outlined here, while also attempting to understand the specificities of the situation under examination.

The importance of specific contexts is also evident in the way that the Scandinavian evidence appears to favour name elements related to the names of tribal groups of the Baltic littoral area, such as the Danes, Saxons and Varini. The tribal geography of the names, however, does not neatly map onto the area of their use, which is much wider. The reasons for this mismatch deserve greater scrutiny, but they may be linked to the cultural impact of particular tribes at quite an early date, in the same way that the adoption of the name of the Volcae may reflect the strong impression made by this tribe on its Germanic-speaking neighbours. The failure of the ethnonym *Svear* to contribute significantly to the Germanic onomasticon, on the other hand, suggests that there was not a continuous principle of formation of variation elements from ethnonyms, but rather certain historical and cultural circumstances prompted the creation of new ethnophoric name elements—as in the Anglo-Saxon *Peht-*/*Peoht-* names—while others did not.

The apparently ethnophoric names in Scandinavia and elsewhere are not, it appears, a homogenous group. They came into being at different times and in different parts of the Germanic world, in historically contingent ways. One group that may belong together are those which occur across the Germanic-speaking world and are formed on the names of Germanic tribes, such as those of the Danes, Varini and Geats. We cannot entirely rule out the development of these names in the area around the Baltic coasts, where most of the tribes involved belong, with subsequent spread of the names to the rest of the Germanic-speaking world. However, on balance it seems more likely that these name elements represent an early stratum in the Germanic onomasticon, and one that allowed for analogous developments later on. Whether the borrowing of the ethnonym *Volcae* should be dated before or after the development of name elements from ethnonyms such as *Varini* and

Suebi is uncertain, but *walha- may have a good claim to be the prototype for other name elements referring to non-*Germani*.

This is by no means a complete treatment of the ethnophoric names in the Germanic languages, but provides some starting points for further research. In addition to addressing the questions of how such names come into being in the first place, we should also seek to examine their ongoing use in various contexts. In doing so, it would be useful to consider questions such as their applicability within families, the social variables that might affect their use and transmission, and the ways in which gender impacts upon their employment. At the same time, as this piece demonstrates, much remains to be done in terms of elucidating how the variety of possibly ethnophoric name elements actually relates to ethnonyms.

REFERENCES

Andersson, T. (2004), 'Svethiudh, det svenska rikets kärna', *Namn och Bygd* 92, 5–18.

Andersson, T. (2006), 'Daner and Svear—tribal rivalry in prehistoric Scandinavia', in *Names through the Looking-Glass: Festschrift in Honour of Gillian Fellows-Jensen July 5th 2006*, ed. P. Gammeltoft and B. Jørgensen (Copenhagen: Reitzel), 1–20.

Antonsen, E. H. (1975), *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Antonsen, E. H. (2002), *Runes and Germanic Linguistics* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter).

Autenrieth, J., D. Geuenich and K. Schmid, eds (1979), *Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau (Einleitung, Register, Faksimile)*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libri Memoriales et Necrologia, nova series 1 (Hannover: Hahn).

Bach, A. (1943), *Die deutschen Personennamen* (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Cleasby, R., G. Vigfusson and W. A. Craigie (1957), *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Davidson, H. E., ed., and P. Fisher, trans. (1996), *Saxo Grammaticus: The History of the Danes, Books I–IX* (Woodbridge: Brewer).

Derks, T. (2009), 'Ethnic identity in the Roman frontier: The epigraphy of Batavi and other Lower Rhine tribes', in *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*, ed. T. Derks and N. Roymans (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press), 239–82.

De Vries, J. (1977), *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill).

EMC = Early Medieval Corpus of Coin Finds, <http://www-cm.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/emc/> (accessed May 2011).

García Moreno, L. A. (1974), *Prosopografía del Reino Visigodo de Toledo* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca).

Goffart, W. (1981), '*Hetware* and *Hugas*: Datable anachronisms in *Beowulf*', in *The Dating of Beowulf*, ed. C. Chase (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 83–100.

Green, D. H. (1998), *Language and History in the Early Germanic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Grünthal, R. (1997), abstract of *Livvistä liiviin. Itämerensuomalaiset etnonyymit*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen laitos. <http://www.sgr.fi/ct/ct51.html> (accessed May 2011).

Haubrichs, W. (2004), '"Heroische Zeiten?" Wanderungen von Heldennamen und Heldensagen zwischen den germanischen *gentes* des frühen Mittelalters', in *Namenwelten: Orts- und Personennamen in historischer Sicht*, ed. A. van Nahl, L. Elmevik and S. Brink (Berlin: de Gruyter), 513–34.

Holthausen, F. (1934), *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: Mit Einschluss der Eigennamen und der gotischen Lehnwörter im Romanischen* (Heidelberg: Winter).

Insley, J. (1991), 'The Scandinavian Runic inscriptions of the Older Futhark and Old English personal names', in *Old English Runes and their Continental Background*, ed. A. Bammesberger (Heidelberg: Winter), 309–34.

Insley, J. (2006), 'Early Germanic personal names and onomastic dialects', in *Langauge and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. A. J. Johnston, F. von Mengden and S. Thim (Heidelberg: Winter), 113–31.

Janzén, A. (1947), 'De fornvästnordiska personnamnen', in *Personnamn*, ed. A. Janzén (Stockholm: Bonnier), 22–186.

Jónsson, F. (1925), *Landnámabók Íslands* (Copenhagen: Thiele).

Kallasmaa, M. (2002), 'Name studies in Estonia', in *History of the Study of Toponyms in the Uralian Languages*, ed. I. Nyirkos (Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem), 47–81.

Kaufmann, H. (1968), *Altdeutsche Personennamen Ergänzungsband* (Munich: Fink).

Kitson, P. R. (2002), 'How Anglo-Saxon personal names work', *Nomina* 25, 91–131.

Köbler, G. (1989), *Gotisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill).

Krahe, H. (1954), *Sprache und Vorzeit: Europäische Vorgeschichte nach dem Zeugnis der Sprache* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer).

Kuhn, H. (1973), 'Angeln. I. Sprachliches', in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. H. Beck *et al.*, 2. Auflage, 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter), 285–86.

Liebermann, F., ed. (1960), *Die Gesetze die Angelsachsen*, 3 vols (Aalen: Scientia).

Loit, A. (1989), 'Estland', in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. H. Beck *et al.*, 2. Auflage, 7 (Berlin: de Gruyter), 586–601.

Looijenga, T. (2003), *Texts and Contexts of the Oldest Runic Inscriptions* (Leiden: Brill).

Malone, K., ed. (1962), *Widsith*, rev. edn (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger).

Mommsen, T. (1873), *Inscriptiones Asiae Provinciarum Europae Graecarum Illyrici Latinae*, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 3.1 (Berlin: Reimer).

Neumann, G. (2008), *Namenstudien zum Altgermanischen*, ed. H. Hettrich and A. van Nahl (Berlin: Gruyter).

Neuß, E. (2008), '*Hûn-* in zweigliedrigen germanischen Personennamen und das Ethnonym *Hunne(n)*', in *Nomen et Fraternitas: Festschrift für Dieter Geuenich zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. U. Ludwig and T. Schilp (Berlin: de Gruyter), 39–52.

Nielsen, H. F. (2000), *The Early Runic Language of Scandinavia: Studies in Germanic Dialect Geography* (Heidelberg: Winter).

Nielsen, M. L. (1994), 'Fremmed inflydelse i det danske runemateriales personnavne-forråd', in *Vikingetidens sted- og personnavne. Rapport fra NORNAs 22. symposium I København 14.–16. januar 1993*, ed. G. Fellows-Jensen and B. Holmberg (Uppsala: NORNA-Förlaget), 165–85.

PASE = Nelson, J. L. *et al.*, *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* <http://www.pase.ac.uk/index.html> (accessed May 2011).

Peterson, L. (1994), 'On the relationship between Proto-Scandinavian and Continental Germanic personal names', in *Runische Schriftkultur in kontinental-skandinavischer und -angelsächsischer Wechselbeziehung: Internationales Symposium in der Werner-Reimers-Stiftung vom 24.–27. Juni 1992 in Bad Homburg*, ed. K. Düwel, H. Neumann and S. Nowak (Berlin: de Gruyter), 128–75.

Peterson, L. (2004), *Lexikon över urnordiska personnamn.* Uppsala: Institutet för språk och folkminnen <http://www.sofi.se/images/NA/pdf/urnord.pdf> (accessed May 2011).

Peterson, L. (2007), *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon*, 5th edn (Uppsala: Institutet för språk och folkminnen).

Reichert, H. (1987–90), *Lexikon der altgermanischen Namen*, 2 vols (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Rübekeil, L. (1992), *Suebica: Völkernamen und Ethnos* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).

Sawyer, B. (2000), *The Viking-Age Rune-Stones: Custom and Commemoration in Early Medieval Scandinavia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schönfeld, M. (1911), *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen* (Heidelberg: Winter).

Schramm, G. (1957), *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache: Studien zu den zweigliedrigen Personennamen der Germanen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Schramm, G. (2013), *Zweigliedrige Personennamen der Germanen: Ein Bildetyp als gebrochener Widerschein früher Heldenlieder* (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Shaw, P. A. (2011a), *Pagan Goddesses in the Early Germanic World: Eostre, Hreda and the Cult of Matrons* (London: Bristol Classical Press).

Shaw, P. A. (2011b), 'The role of gender in some Viking Age innovations in personal naming', *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 7, 151–70.

Smart, V. (1983) 'Variation between *Æthel-* and *Ægel-* as a name-element on coins', *Nomina* 7, 91–96.

Steinacher, R. (2002), 'Studien zur vandalischen Geschichte: Die Gleichsetzung der Ethnonyme Wenden, Slawen und Vandalem vom Mittelalter bis ins 18. Jahrhundert', unpublished doctoral thesis, Vienna: University of Vienna.

Tacitus, *Germania* = Furneaux, H., and J. G. C. Anderson, eds (1939), *Cornelii Taciti Opera Minora* (Oxford: Clarendon Press). [cited by chapter and section number]

Vikstrand, P. (2009), 'Förkristna sakrala personnamn i Skandinavien', *Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica* 27, 5–31.

Wales, K. (2006), *Northern English: A Cultural and Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Weisgerber, L. (1948), 'Walhisk: Die geschichtliche Leistung des Wortes welsch', *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 13, 87–146.