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On the Etymology of Jómsborg

JÜRGEN UDOLPH

The place name Jómsborg and all its variants are to be found exclusively in northern and North Germanic sources, by which I mean in Old Norse sagas, such as Knýtinga saga from c. 1250. According to Laur (2005: 14), the place name is further recorded in Jómsvíkinga saga (written in the first third of the thirteenth century in Iceland). Additionally, a corrupted form, Hynmesborg, is documented in the Danish chronicle, Historia brevis regum Ducie, written by Sven Aggesøn c. 1180. A detailed list including all essential historical records of the place name is provided by Petrulevich (2009: 91–96). I will refer to this later in the text.

The place name Jómsborg also became known through the Jómsvíkingar who are mentioned in Jómsvíkinga saga. According to this source, which is not very informative concerning historical events, the Jómsvíkingar are said to have fought with a particular contempt for death in the battle against Earl Hákon Sigurðarson near Hjörungavág (Hjórunngavág).

At an early stage a connection was made that identified Jómsborg with the legendary Vineta and Wollin (for example by Virchow in 1872). For a long time, it was not possible to localize the exact position of the site denoted by these names. Speculation was fuelled through the different accounts of a great and wealthy (harbour) city that were written by by Ibrāhīm Ya‘qūb at-Ṭartūsī and Adam of Bremen. The speculation about and interpretations of at-Ṭartūsī and Adam of Bremen’s accounts have resulted in popular English-language websites stating the following: "Jomsborg’s exact location has not yet been established, though it is maintained that Jomsborg was somewhere on the islands of the Oder estuary."

Following the achievements of Hofmeister (1932, 1932a, 1960), the site is nowadays often identified with the city and island of Wollin, Polish Wolin (Brather 2007; Schmidt 2000; and others). However, Schmidt (2000: 121) emphasizes:


Nevertheless, this statement does not clarify the problem at all. For the place names Wollin, Wolin, Jöningsborg, and Vineta, numerous different forms are recorded. Some of them show great spelling differences such as Vinuwe, Viinne, Jumneeta, Jumineem, Julinum, Uineta, at Jömi, and Vinneta.

It is therefore evident that uncertainty about the correct place name form already existed in earlier times. Yet, with some probability it can be stated (as summarized by int. al. Rzetelska-Feleszko 1977: 561–64; Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma 1991: 88–89) that in the course of history, the island and the town Wollin were named differently by the inhabitants of the surrounding Baltic rim. This is also supported by several historical records (Brüske 1955: 203–04; Fürstemann 1913: 1617; Rzetelska-Feleszko 1977: 561; Pommersches Urkundenbuch 1868–1970; Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma 1991: 88–89; Rospond 1965: 35 and 1984: 435–36; Słownik Starożytności słowiańskich vol. 6: 561; and most accurately Petrulevich 2009: 91–96). Below are listed the attested forms that I will be discussing in more detail:

1012–1018 (copy fourteenth century; Thietmari) a civitate magna Liulini; c. 1075 (Adam of Bremen) nobilissima civitas Junne, viinne, iumne, viinne, jumne (according to Adam of Bremen [Scholia] the famous civitas Junne is the largest city of Europe); 1088 urbs Julin; 1124 (copy) Julin, Volin (variant: Waldin); 1140 in civitate Walinensi; ciuitatem Willin; twelfth century (copy fourteenth century) Jumnetta (multiple occurrences), Vinueta (Helmold), in copies also recorded as Vineta (uncertain spelling); c. 1160 (Herbordi vita Ottonis) Julinae, Julina, Julin, Volin; 1175 Woliyn; 1178 castellano Juliensi; around 1180 (Sven Aggesøn) Hyymesborg, 1184 de Wolin; 1188 castrum Wolin; 1195 Volin; provincia Wolin; c. 1200 (Saxo Grammaticus) Julinum; twelfth/thirteenth centuries alud vero Julin quod nunc Volin dicitur; 1216 Volin; provincia Volin; 1217 Wolin; first third of the thirteenth century (Jómuvíkinga saga) Jómingsborg; before 1223 circa Velen; 1232 Wolin; 1243 Wolin; c. 1250 (Knýtlinga saga) Jóningsborg; 1260 Wolin; 1277 Wolin; thirteenth/fourteenth centuries several records of Wolin, Wolyn, Wollin, Wolyñ, sometimes spelled as Woltyn, since the fifteenth century, it is mainly Wolin.
According to some scholars (for example Leciejewich 1977), this list should also include Velunzani, the name of a tribe that can be found in the document called Bayerischer Geograph (Bavarian Geographer) (written in the mid-ninth century and preserved in a copy from the tenth century). This tribe's name is also documented in the tenth century as Vulcini, and Widukind of Corvey writes Vuolini. The so-called Großpolnische Chronik from the twelfth century interprets the name as "Welunezq, quod alias Julin dicebatur [Welunecz, also called Julin]".

The relation between the former records and the examples with the name of the Velunzani tribe is most questionable. The authors of the Real und Sachwörterbuch zum Altrussischen (1995) explain the place name Velunzani as the name of the Volynjane tribe in Volhynia.

In the following, I will first concentrate on the different name types and then their variants and discuss them in more detail. Later on, I will deal with the Scandinavian forms Jómbsborg, Jónlat Jómí, and a new interpretation suggested by Alexandra Petrulevich (2009).

However, it is important to note that it will not be possible to combine all the different spelling variants of the place name such as Liulii, Julin, Jumne, Jumneta, Vineta, Willin, Velin, Vulin, and Wolin into one single etymological background (Udolph 2007: 219). Laur (2005: 14) comes to this conclusion as well when he says:

Die Namenformen Jumne und Wolin werden wohl kaum auf einen Nenner zu bringen sein. Vogel vermutete ein *Vinne als ursprüngliche Form bei Adam von Bremen, die man dann später als Jumne verlesen hätte. Wir werden aber mit zwei eigenständigen Namenformen zu rechnen haben, wobei wir von einer einheimischen *Jumna ausgehen können [It is unlikely that the name forms Jumne and Wolin can be taken back to a common denominator. Vogel suspected *Vinne as the original form in Adam of Bremen, which was later misread as Jumne. But we will have to reckon with two separate name forms, for which we can assume a native *Jumna].

When discussing the various records, one has to bear in mind that the letters i, u, m, and n consist of minim strokes (such as uuu). Therefore, it is particularly difficult to distinguish between these letters in medieval texts. However, this problem provides an explanation for the spelling differences in forms such as vinne-e, iumn-e, wimm-e. The minim strokes have been interpreted differently by various writers. This phenomenon is apparent in all medieval texts and has to be taken into account when discussing the etymologies of Vineta, Jumneta, Jumne, Vinne, and others.
According to the majority of scholars, the following records are to be considered erroneous forms: 1088 urbs Iulin; 1124 (copy) Iulin; c. 1160 (Herbordi vita Ottonis) Iulinae, Iulina, Iulin; 1178 castellano Juliensi; c. 1200 Julium (Saxo Grammaticus); twelfth/thirteenth centuries alius vero Julin ... (quod nunc Volin dicitur).

Therefore, they are not relevant for the etymological investigation of the place name forms (Udolph 2007: 219). As stated by Rzetelska-Feleszko (1977) and later again by Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma (1991: 88–89), records such as Julin, Iulin, and other similar forms are results of reinterpretations by scholars or popular etymology and are not suitable for the etymological analysis. According to these studies, such forms originate in an alleged stay of Julius Caesar. Laur (2005: 22) comments:

In diesem Zusammenhang müssen wir noch auf eine weitere Namenform für Wolin eingehen, nämlich 1088 urbs Iulin, 1124 Iulina bei Herbord von Frizlar, Iulium beim Annalista Saxo um 1160, Iulin sedein episcopalem von 1347 in der Genealogia christianitatis ducum Stetiniensium oder apud Iulinum im Compendium Saxonis aus dem 14. Jahrhundert. Hieran knüpft sich die unhistorische Überlieferung, daß die Stadt von der Schwester des Julius Cäsar gegründet sei. Wahrscheinlich liegt eine Kontamination vor, eine Vermengung der Namenform Wolin mit einer, die mit einem j beginnt wie Junne und Jönshorg [In this context we have to deal with yet another name form for Wolin, viz. 1088 urbs Iulin, 1124 Iulina in Herborn of Frizlar, Iulium in the annalist Saxo c. 1160, Iulin sedein episcopalem from 1347 in the Genealogia christianitatis ducum Stetiniensium, or apud Iulinum in the Compendium Saxonis from the fourteenth century. Connected to this is the unhistorical tradition that the city was founded by Julius Caesar’s sister. It is likely that there is contamination here, a blending of the name form Wolin with one that starts with a j such as Junne and Jönshorg].

Petrulevich (2009: 75) is also sceptical and says that “[...] Julin is most likely a spelling variant [...]”. We can therefore disregard these place name forms in the present discussion.

2. Jumne

In contrast to the toponyms discussed above, the form Jumne, which also appears as Jomne in Scandinavian sources, seems to be more reliable (for the
Tab. 1. Forms of *Junne* etc. in various sources according to Labuda, 1964: 187; cf. also Petrulevich 2009: 93. Lib., c., p. = book/scholion, chapter and page, respectively, in Adam of Bremen’s *Gesta Hammabenburgensis Ecclesiae pontificum*. A, A1 etc. = the different text versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 22 (79)</td>
<td>Uinnæ</td>
<td>Jumne, Jumne, Uinnæ</td>
<td>Jumne, Jutinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 22 (80)</td>
<td>Uinnæ</td>
<td>Iumnen, Iumne, Jumneoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 22 (80)</td>
<td>Uinnæ</td>
<td>Iumnen, Iummen, Iunnæm</td>
<td>Iunnæm, Iuminem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 22 (81)</td>
<td>Uinnæm</td>
<td>Iumnen, Iummen</td>
<td>Iuminem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 27 (87)</td>
<td>Iumnæ (Uinnæ?)</td>
<td>Iumne, Iumneoe</td>
<td>Iulinunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schol. 56 (137)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iumnæ</td>
<td>Iuminem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schol. 121 (245)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iuminæ, Iumme</td>
<td>Iunne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, 20 (249)</td>
<td>Iumnæm, Iümnen</td>
<td>Iuminem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

discussion of *Jomne*, see also Petrulevich 2009: 68). This form can be found in the following records according to Adam of Bremen c. 1075 (Tab. 1):

It is significant when Petrulevich (2009: 69) states:

The form *Hynnisburgh* is most likely a result of copyists’ mistakes. However, I do not accept the original form *Hynnisburgh* suggested by some scholars. I am convinced that the genuine form was a logical development of *Jumne*, which was seen as an *ia*-stem by the Danish author. Irrespective of the root vowel and the gender, one can expect a form *Jumnesborg/*Jumnisborg in the circumstances.

Therefore, a possible original form *Junne* is also supported by the clearly erroneous form *Hynnisburgh*. The same also applies for the forms *Jomni* and *Jomuna*: “Clearly, *af Jomni* and *ath Jomna* are late orthographical variants of *Junne*" (Petrulevich 2009: 70).

Laur (2005: 14) regards the spelling variations in the various traditions as follows:

So kennt Adam von Bremen […] die Namenform *civitas Iumne*, so nach der
Wiener Handschrift, und auch in den anderen ist nach Schmeidler der Name eher so zu lesen als Ümme bzw. Vonne [Adam of Bremen knows [...] the name form civitas Jumne, as in the Viennese manuscript, and according to Schmeidler the name is more likely to be read as Jumne or Vonne in the other (manuscripts)].

Since Laur refers to historians in this statement, his remark is of a certain significance. Historians are the most reliable scholars when evaluating the problem of how to read the different writings of Adam of Bremen’s texts. Laur thus concludes that, the form Jumne and its variants are to be preferred to the Vonne-forms. Laur (2005: 14) summarizes: “Wir werden [...] von einer einheimischen Form *Jumna ausgehen können [We can [...] assume a native form “Jumna]”.

The place name variant Jumna has already been analysed several times by different scholars. At this point, I wish to provide a brief summary of the main views and discuss them later in the text:

1. Schmid (1979: 266) explains the place name with an underlying base form Jumna or Jumina. According to him, there are two approaches from which this form may have developed. It can either be traced back to Latvian jumis with the meaning ‘zwei zu einer Einheit verbundene, zusammengewachsene Dinge [two things grown together into one unit — to be understood in this context as suggesting confluences or branches of rivers located at estuaries]’. This Latvian word is regarded as a pre-Slavic formation of the Indo-European root *jem- ‘Zwei aus, in, zu Einem [two things out of, in, into one]’. The second approach for a base form Junna or Jumina originates in a participle construction *Ju-mina with a root *yu- ‘to move’. This root can be observed in Vedic (Sanskrit) yavya ‘stream’, Old Persian yauviya- ‘channel, waterpassage’, Old Indic ud-yōḍhati ‘waltt auf’ (vom Wasser) [to foam, to bubble (of water)]’ and also (mostly) in river names such as Jūra, Jūra in the Baltic States, Jūras in Thrace, Jurata on the Hel peninsula (northern Poland), Jühnde near Göttingen (Germany), Jona, Jounne and other examples in France and along Lake Constance as well as in Juvavus, which is the old name of the river Salzach near Salzburg (Austria).

Some years later, Schmid (1982: 64) tried to include the river name Inn, German Ihna into this discussion by tracing it back to *Jumna. Yet, I cannot accept his suggestion since initial *ju- in West Slavic dialects changes to *ju-, this form, however, would not have developed...
into I-, but more likely into je- or jo- (Udolph 1990: 126). This can be exemplified with place names such as Jäglin/Jaglino and Jizbunken.

2. In my article (Udolph 2007: 219) about the place name Wollin, I considered a possible Indo-European (participle) suffix *-meno-l-mono for the form Junne < *Jumina, which is also expected in the river name Ihne near Hannover (Ohainski & Udolph 1998: 231–33). I will get back to this suggestion at the end of this article. In my opinion, the place name Wollin has to be separated from Junne/*Jumina since it seems to denote the town rather than the river.

3. Laur (2005: 14–15) has summarized all the different academic discussions up to the year 2005. He rightly rejects unprofessional etymological explanations that make use of Low German Ihne ‘bee’ (Goldmann & Wermusch 2004), and he mentions the explanations proposed by Wolfgang P. Schmid and Jürgen Udolph. Laur also considers a Baltic interpretation of Junne which was already suggested by Labuda. This approach assumes Latvian joma meaning ‘bdden, bay’ or ‘Lachenzurückgebliebenen Wassers am Strande [a pool or puddle of remaining water at the bank]’ or in the meaning of ‘sandbank, shallow water’. Laur points to the problem of Wollin not actually being situated within the Baltic language area, but nevertheless assumes Baltic influence in the regions along the lower Oder.

Latvian joma was even borrowed into the German dialects of East Prussia. It is found in the usage of fishermen as Jome (fem.) and refers to a ‘sumpftige Schlucht zwischen zwei Sanddünen [marshy gorge between two dunes]’ (Polanska 2002: 179). However, this form represents an early borrowing from Livonian juonis ‘Meerestiefe zwischen zwei Sandbüchen [depth between two sand banks]’ (Polanska 2002: 213; she also assumes another origin; compare already existing earlier investigations by Vasmer 1958: 489). The East Prussian Jome can therefore not be looked for in the forms Wollin or Junne.

3. Jumnetta

The variant Jumnetta apparently only occurs in the chronicles of Helmold: “In the Latin tradition, the form Jumne was transformed into Jum(ne)ta and Vimnetta in Helmold” (Petrulevich 2009: 68). The origin of Jumnetta is
uncertain. It is uncertain whether the form represents a younger variant, which is based on Vineta, Uineta. In a footnote, Petrulevich (2009: 68 n. 3) remarks: “According to R. Schmidt (2000: 121), the oldest manuscript suggests the reading uineta, which was changed by a copyist into iuneta = iunenta or iunneta” and “Vinneta auf einer falschen Lesung oder einem Schreibfehler für Junneta beruht [Vinnetà is based on a misreading or a scribal error for Junnetà]” (Bach 1953: 26).

The statement made by Laur (2005: 15) about the problematic connection between Vin(n)eta and Iunneta seems to be the most probable explanation:

Diese Namenform begegnet uns in der Slawenchronik des Helmold von Bosau aus der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts als Vinnetà, aber auch als Iunnetà. Seine Ausführungen stützen sich deutlich auf Adam von Bremen, wobei die Form auf -etu bei ihm eine Latinisierung darstellt. [We encounter this name form in Helmold of Bosau’s Chronicle of the Slavs from the second half of the twelfth century as Vinnetà, but also as Iunnetà. His comments are strongly based on Adam of Bremen, and here the form in -etu represents a Latinization to him.]

When discussing the form Junneta, it can therefore be noted that we are dealing with a younger variant, which was most likely derived from the forms Iunne, Junne. This also applies for Vineta, see below (paragraph 7).

4. Liulni

The variant Liulni only occurs in the tradition of Thietmar of Merseburg. Petrulevich (2009: 91) associates Livilni with Wulinensis civitas, Willin, Julin, Wolyn, Wolin, Volin. However, this is most questionable since the forms Wolyn, Wolin, and Volin represent considerably younger forms and Julin is not relevant for the investigation. I will refer to Willin and Wulín in the next paragraph. For the forms Livilni, Liulni, I am of the opinion that they are more likely to be due to an incorrect division and reading of the minims. Besides the initial letter L, the name form Liulni consists of eight (!) adjoining minims, which results in something like this: LLLLLLL. One has to be brave when trying to present a definite reading of it. From my point of view, Liulni represents a single reading which therefore must be disregarded as a relevant variant in the etymological discussion. This is also supported by the fact that it represents the only example with initial L-.
5. Velin, Wilin

The spelling variants Wilin and Velin cause particular difficulties (Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma 1991: 88–89). Due to their spelling, these recorded forms can hardly be used to explain the place name Jamne. Petrulevich (2009: 75–76) comes to a similar conclusion: “I would rather agree with Lehr-Spławński […] that Julin is most likely a spelling variant (compare the variants of the place name Wolin from the decree of Pope Calixtus II, cited by Ekkhard of Aura: Velin, Wilin, Ulin) […] which became widespread owing to popular etymology”.

Subsequently, the forms Wilin and Velin represent only occasional examples which should hardly be considered in this investigation.

6. Vinne, Uimne

Spelling variants such as Uimne, Uimnem are only recorded in the tradition of Adam of Bremen; see Tab. 1. When discussing these records, one has to bear in mind that the original text of Adam of Bremen is unknown and only available in copies. Anyone familiar with these texts knows how difficult it is to read them without mistakes. This is exemplified by the following excerpt (Fig. 1).

It is obviously very difficult to separate the letters i, n, u, m, t and even l from each other in the words magnitudine (second line, antepenultimate word), lignum (last word of the fifth line) or diligentia (last line, penultimate word).
In my opinion, this difficulty causes the diverse spellings such as *Jumne*, *vinne* with alternative forms: *lunne, wimne*. This variation is most likely explained by the fact that the handwritten manuscripts showed several minims side by side, which may have represented the letters *u, i, m* or *n*. It appears that the reading of these letters must have led to different results. Therefore, I think the readings for *Uimne* must be variants of *Jumne*, this being the only form — and I will explain this later — for which a reliable etymology can be established.

7. *Vin(n)eta*

In the German-speaking countries, the most popular form of the currently disputed place name is *Vineta*, which has become a synonym for a lost city engulfed by the sea. Nowadays, the name is mainly apparent in northern Germany, for example as part of the name of the Vineta Festival, in names of discos, transport companies, and hotels, and even a student corporation ("Burschenschaft") in Heidelberg bears this name. However, as Laur (2005: 15) rightly points out, the famous place name being used in connection with the legend of the sunken city neither originates in Helmold nor in any work by Kantzow, the German historian and annalist; it is only the form of the name *Vin(n)eta*, and not the legend, that can be found in these authors' works.

However, this form represents a younger formation and is almost certainly without significance for the etymology of the place name in question. Bach (1953: 26) commented briefly that the spelling *Vineta* "beruht auf einer falschen Lesung oder einem Schreibfehler für *Jumneta* [is based on a misreading or scribal error for *Jumneta]*".

The variant *Vineta* can only be encountered in the manuscripts of Helmold of Bosau. However, it is advisable to examine all the different spellings found in the edition (Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, Vol 32, Hannover 1937: 8): *Jumneta, iuneta (iiunenta, iinetta, iinuet, iimuet, iimneta, Vinneta*.

Laur (2005: 15) commented on this:

[Helmold stützt] sich deutlich auf Adam von Bremen, wobei die Form auf -*eta* bei ihm eine Latinisierung darstellt, *Vineta* statt *Jumneta* fasst man meist als eine Verlesung oder Verschreibung auf [Helmold is strongly based on Adam of
Bremen, and here the form in -eta is a Latinization to him, Vinnetta instead of Jumnetta is mainly considered a misreading or a slip of the pen.

Moreover, Laur tried to find a reason for the initial letter V-:

Wir können uns aber auch fragen, ob das V als Anfangsbuchstabe in Helmolds Original, das wir ja nicht kennen, oder der späteren Handschrift, auf die wir uns stützen, nicht nur eine Verlesung oder Verschreibung darstellt, sondern aus der hier gebrauchten Form des Volksnamens Winitthi, d.h. ‘Wenden’, stammt, in deren Bereich die Stadt ja lag. [But we can also ask ourselves whether the V as an initial letter in Helmold’s original, which we of course do not have, or in the younger manuscript, which we are relying on, does not just represent a misreading or a slip of the pen, but rather derives from the form of the tribal name Winitthi, i.e. the ‘Wends’, which is also used in the manuscript and in whose territory the city was after all located.]

It will not be possible to find a final answer to this problem. For the current investigation, it is important that the variants Vinnetta, Vin(n)eta and others are not relevant for the etymological analysis of this difficult name.

8. Wollin, Wolin

Petrulevich (2009: 94) provides a comprehensive and detailed list of the forms of Wollin, Wolin. See her for the full references. The variation may be listed in the following manner according to year of sources:

1175 Wolyn
1184 Wolin
1188 Wolyn
before 1223 Velen (Weylen, Wyelen, Welen, Velyen, Vyelun)
1195 Wolyn
1195 Wolin
1216 Wolin
1217 Wolin
1232 Wolin
1240 Woldin
1243 Wolyn
1243 Woldin
1260 Wolin
1263 Wolin
1263 Wolin
It is not definite whether the Welen, Welyn- forms should be included here. Wolin is not only the name that has been used for the town until today, it also represents the oldest surviving form handed down to us. It was mentioned as Vuloini (habitant name) by Widukind of Corvey back in c. 970.

According to the majority of scholars, Wolin is seen as a Slavic name. Considering the Slavic settlements on the islands Wollin, Usedom, and Rügen, and also on the mainland at the mouth of the Oder estuary, this is hardly a surprising assumption. Therefore, the repeated occurrence of forms such as Wolin in texts or manuscripts written by German annalists is also not surprising.

Ever since the earliest discussions, the place name Wolin. Wollin has been connected with Volyn, Wolhynien [Volhynia] (Buttmann 1856: 122). However, the etymology of the name has long been disputed:

a) A connection with the Slavic word wol with the meaning ‘Ochse [ox]’ was suggested by Buttmann (1856: 122).

b) According to Rospond (1965: 35; and similarly in Rospond 1979: 305–07 and Rospond 1984: 435), it is most likely that Wolin derives from *Ol-unio with a root ol-., Indo-European *el-l-*ol- ‘water, damp’, but in the current case with a prothetic w- to a root *vol-, vel-, vol- ‘dampness, wetness, liquidity, water’. However, since from an Indo-European perspective it is not possible to combine *ul-, *uel-, *wol-in any ablaut (gradational form), this explanation is not convincing.

c) A different suggestion was made by Rudnicki (1961: 230). He proposes an old ablaut in the forms Wolin – (J)ulin and refers to analogue examples such as Wonieść : *Unieść, Ulin(ia) : Wolin(ia),
Wolica: Ulica (Rudnicki 1936: 67–73). Yet, it is again impossible to unite this approach with the Indo-European ablaut system and its development in the Slavic languages.

d) Another approach was used by Lehr-Splawiński (1933–34) and again by Rudnicki (1936: 67–73). They assume a relationship between the name and the shape of the island and suggest Slavic *ovel- ‘oval, egg-shaped’. However, this view is not convincing at all.

e) The comparison of a place name with parallel name variants, which represents a basic principle in the field of onomastics, supports the idea of a derivation from a Slavic personal name. A base form *Volynjo, composed of a personal name Volynjo and a possessive adjective ending, has long been considered. This approach corresponds with the Slavic form vol- ‘wollen [want]’ (Lorentz 1964: 139). The proposal made by Trautmann (1948: 95) is even more convincing. He suggests a derivation with -in- from a name Wola, which represents a short form of the Slavic personal name Wolimir (or similar). This view has generally been accepted by different scholars (see Laur 2005: 14).

A comparison with parallel name variants supports this interpretation:

1. The Polish place name Wólyń has been analysed in the same way, namely from an old form *Wolin as a short form of a dithematic such as Wolimir (Trautmann 1948: 95; Jeżowa 1961: 43; also approvingly Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma 1991: 88–89)
2. Wollin near Prenzlau, recorded in 1321 Wollin, 1354 Wolyn, 1472 Wallin etc. (Wauer 1996: 261–62)
3. Another place name Wollin (district of Uecker-Randow), recorded by Trautmann (1948: 95) as 1354 Wolyn, must rather be disregarded here, because since 1240 several records show the form Woldin (Niemeyer 2003: 82–83).
5. Further name examples are given by Niemeyer (2003: 83).

Due to the numerous different records with -i- and -y- (Wolin, Wolyn), it remains debatable whether it is possible to come to the same conclusion as Petrulevich (2009: 74): “It is also suggested that two different forms can be distinguished, one for the island and one for the town of Wolin: *Vol-yn and *Vol-in, respectively (Rudnicki 1936, pp. 70 f.)”.
I am afraid I cannot agree with Rudnicki here: The forms Wolin and Wolyn are solely different graphic versions of the same place name, the old *Wolin, as opposed to Volyn/Volhynia which denotes the name of a region. Moreover, the latter contains the suffix -yn which is generally used to form appellatives and names (Dickenmann 1978 and its review by Udolph 1979), and consequently, is not analogous with the name of the island, Wol(fl)in.

9. Jóm, Jómsborg

At this point, we have almost finished the analysis of all the different place name forms. The last variant to discuss, Jómsborg, is mainly apparent in Scandinavian sources. Petrulevich (2009: 91–96) provides an excellent summary of the relevant records with full references. They may be listed as follows:

1043 at Jómi
1190 Jómsborg
1190 Jómsborg
1200 at Jómi
1200 at Jome, Jomshorgh
1200 Jómsborg, at Jómi
13th cent. Jómsborg
1230 Jómsborg, at Jómi
1260–70 Jómsborg
1270–1300 at Jómi, Jómsborg
14th cent. a Jome, af Jomwilath Jonune, Jomshborg

Traditionally, these variants are viewed as Old Norse name formations. Laur (2005: 14) states:

Die nordgerm. Form Jomsborg ist entsprechend dem Ortsnamenpaar slav. Kanunin (slav. kamen „Stein“) – nordgerm. Steinborg gebildet. Die Form mit dem Grundwort borg = „Burg, Stadt“ stellt dabei eine altgermanische Namenbildung für städtische und stadtähnliche Siedlungen dar, wie etwa Burstawborg für Stettin mit der Übersetzung hier auch des Bestimmungswortes oder Aldeigisborg für Alt-Ludoga [The North Germanic form Jomsborg is constructed in accordance with the place name pair Slavic Kanunin (Slavic kamen ‘stone’) – North Germanic Steinborg. The form of the base word borg = ‘castle, town’ represents an Old Norse name formation for urban and
town-like settlements, like, for example, Burstaborg for Szczecin/Stettin (here with a translation of the determiner) or Aldeigjuborg for Staraya Ladoga/Alt-Ladoga. (Slavic szceć means ‘bristly reed’ and Scandinavian burst means ‘bristle, stiff hair; roof ridge’ (Petrulevic 2013: 168.).)


In my opinion, Laur is absolutely right when referring to the interrelationship of the languages that are responsible for the existence of these name variants. Thus, at this point, it seems necessary to quote Laur (2005: 22) once again:

Ein Beispiel dafür in unserem Zusammenhang stellen Jóm und Jónsborg mit der Hinzufügung des eigensprachlichen Grundwortes borg = „Burg“ im Altwestnordischen oder Junne im Altindischen zu wohl *Jum(in)a für Wollin dar. Ein weiteres wäre in ähnlicher Weise Aldeigja beziehungsweise Aldeigjuborg für finn. *Alodejoki oder Aaloo-kas für Alt-Ladoga. Bei Übernahmen solcher Art können wir ferner volkstymologische Umdeutungen beobachten, die den ursprünglich fremdsprachlichen Ortsnamen das Aussehen von eigen- sprachlichen verleihen. [In this context, Jón and Jónsberg provide an example of the addition of the native base word borg = ‘castle’ in Old West Norse or Junne in Old Danish to a probable *Jum(in)a for Wollin. Another similar case would be Aldeigja or Aldeigjuborg for Finnish *Alodejoki or Aaloo-kas for Staraya Ladoga/Alt-Ladoga. With acquisitions of this kind we can also observe folk-etymological interpretations that give the originally foreign-language place names the appearance of being native.]

The addition of the North Germanic element -borg is not only apparent in Jónsberg, Steinborg (for Kammin), Burstaborg (for Szczecin/Stettin) and Aldeigjuborg (for Staraya Ladoga/Alt-Ladoga), but also in Russian place names such as Izaborsk and Alaborg (Schramm 2002: 263, 316) as well as in Jórsalaborg (for Jerusalem) (Petrulevic 2009: 67). In the discussion of the forms Aldeigja and Aldeigjuborg for Alt-Ladoga, Schramm’s position (2002: 263) has to be mentioned. He considers it a mistake that researchers prefer the Scandinavian compound in contrast to the earlier testified simplex.

As mentioned earlier, the traditional view used to be to regard the form Jónsborg as a “Scandinavization” of the continental form Junne or the
like. This view has now been criticized by Petrulevich (2009) who also provides a new approach to this problem. She attaches more importance to the forms including the vowel –o– such as Jómi and Jómsborg as opposed to the –u– forms such as Jumne, Jumine etc. She points out: “Naturally, the form Jómsborg is much more frequent than at Jómi” (Petrulevich 2009: 68).

In the following passage, I will try to give an account of her ideas.

Petrulevich (2009: 71) explains: “If it were accepted that Jumne was the base form, it would not be possible to derive the form Jómsborg from it without forcing the linguistic evidence [...] I would like to add that a derivation in the other direction, i.e. of Jumne from the forms at Jómi, Jóinsborg, is also rather problematic, since there is no plausible explanation for where an extra nasal -n- comes from. Third, I cannot agree that the original root vowel of the forms at Jómi and Jumne was u”.

Several pages later, Petrulevich (2009: 80) complements her opinion by saying: “In my view, the forms at Jómi and Jumne share the same root: at Jómi is primary, and Jumne, which has a suffix -u-, secondary”.

For the etymological analysis, she assumes the place name to be Slavic in origin and agrees with both Hennig (1935: 92–94) and Rudnicki (1936: 90) “that the toponym at Jómi might be derived from the Slavic jama f., ‘pitch; ditch’” (Petrulevich 2009: 82). In the first instance, there is nothing to be said against this theory.

The appellative is certainly well-attested in the Slavic toponymy. It is found throughout the territories settled by Slavs, for example Jama, Janka, Jamna, Jamno, Jamy etc. (Petrulevich 2009: 82–83).

However, how should one explain the vowel –o– in the Scandinavian forms? Petrulevich (2009: 83) refers to the Pomeranian language in which we encounter the forms jama as well as jona. With this approach, she relies on Lorentz who is an excellent scholar in this field of language. Consequently, Petrulevich considers the Scandinavian records with the vowel –o– as the reflex of the Polabian equivalent to Slavic jama.

Concerning the change between Jum- and Jom- in the names such as Jumne, Wolin and others, Petrulevich (2009: 83) mentions the variants of the place name Rome attested in northern sources where we can find Róm and Róma as well as Róm.

Petrulevich (2009: 83) provides a straightforward conclusion: “It seems possible that the Slavic toponym *Joma f. was borrowed into Old Norse as *Jóm (and, possibly, *Júmi) neut., according to the pattern Róma f. > Róm, Róm neut.”
On the basis of this assumption, the following conclusion for Junne can be drawn: The place name is based on a typical Slavic formation with the suffix *-un- as in Brzeţno, Gōrke, Chłodne and others (discussed in detail by Borek (1968)), thus, finally, Slavic *Jamo, *Jamne (Petrulevich 2009: 84).

In the following paragraph, I will present my personal opinion about this theory. I have analysed the issue concerning Slavic jama and Polabian jōna very carefully, and unfortunately, from a Slavic point of view, I have to remark that it is not possible to explain a formation of Jōmsborg and Jōm from Polabian. I would like to give reasons for this:

When considering Pomeranian and Polish place names which are based on Slavic jama, it can be observed that older records — and this is important here (I will refer to younger records later) — show no -o- vowel at all.

Trautmann (1950: 69) gives the following examples of place names which he traces back to *Jamno:

1) Jamene, as mentioned in 1292, 1406 Jamen, now deserted site near Federow (Mecklenburg)
2) Jahnem near Güstrow, 1235 Jamin, 1314 Jamene
3) Jamund near Köslin/Koszalin, until 1945 the German name of today’s Polish site Jamno, old records supplied by Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma (1985: 199) 1227 Jamre (!; most likely a misprinting or scribal error) 1278 Jamene, 1279 Jamene, 1300 Jamen, Gamen, 1313 Jamele, 1507 Yament, 1780 Iarmund. The evidence and analyses in the collective work NMP (Nazwy miejscowe Polski) 5. (2003: 49) should also be compared.

Further examples that belong to Slavic jama can be found in NMP 5, p. 50:

5) Jamno near Łowicz, 1297 Jamno, 1375 (copy 1511–12) Jamno etc.

From these examples it is evident that the development of Slavic -o- into -o- cannot be observed in Polabian place names. There is a simple reason for this. The change into -o- is a rather young development, which has
been discussed in detail by Lorentz (1925: 36). From Lorentz’s description of the phenomenon, we can conclude that in the Pomeranian language a widespread transformation from older -ą- into -o- has indeed occurred. Yet, how old is this sound change? Since when can we observe this development? Lorentz (1925: 36) discusses the dating and makes it clear,

1) that -ą- was still used in the fourteenth century in the Pomeranian dialect as well as in the rest of the West Slavic territories;
2) that the change into -o- can only have happened after this, at the earliest from 1500 onwards;
3) that it is impossible to assume Pomeranian influence for the much earlier recorded place names Jómsborg, Jóm etc.

This view is supported by the study of Vondrák (1924: 21) in which he states: “Der Übergang des ā in ō (geschrieben meist ď, es ist eine Verengung) … trat jedoch im Polabischen spät ein: zobo, sjot (vor dem XVII. Jhd. existierte das o noch nicht in historischen Dokumenten) [However, the transition of ā to ō (mainly written as ď; it is a narrowing) … occurred later in Polabian: zobo, sjot (before the seventeenth century the o did not yet exist in historical documents)]”.

My conclusion: I cannot agree with the theory that the Scandinavian forms Jómsborg and Jóm owe their -o- to a Polabian predecessor.

10. Reflections about the forms Jumne, Jumme etc.

To conclude, I will now — as mentioned earlier — get back to the name variants Jumne, Jumme, Juninne etc. To the very good and detailed summary of the records found in the manuscripts of Adam of Bremen provided by Labuda (see Tab. 1) should the following be added:

1152–1264 Jumne (Historia Norvegiae, see Petruševič 2009: 91)
C. 1160 Junume (Annalista Saxo, see Lau 2005: 14)
fourteenth century Jumpe (Annales Ludenses, see Petruševič 2009: 93)

In a brief remark (Udolph 2005: 219), I suggested an etymology for this name group. Based on the supposition of a base form *Jumina, I considered dividing the name into *Ju-mina. The first syllable may be associated with an Indo-European base *jew-*jou-/*jur-, which according to Pokorny (1959: 507, 511) and others is attested in:
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Old Indic yāuti, yuvāti 'vermengt [blended, mixed]', ud-yīdhati 'walt auf (vom Wasser) [to foam, to bubble (of water)];
• Lithuanian judra 'Wirbelwind [whirlwind];
• Avestan yaozaithi 'regt sich auf (vom Wasser, von unruhigen Ländern) [to agitate (of water, of unpeaceful countries)].

Pokorny assumes an original meaning 'vermengen, bei der Speisezubereitung [to blend, mix, for food preparation]', initially perhaps in the meaning 'in Bewegung setzen [to set sth. in motion, to bestir, actuate sth.].'

He adds several appellatives which — in connection with different suffixes — may belong to the current analysis:

• Lithuanian jaunia, javiai, jauni 'heiße Wasser darüber gießen [to pour hot water over sth.]';
• Albanian (Gheg) gianë 'Schmutz, Teich, Schwemmne [dirt/mud, pond/pool, watering place].

Furthermore an extension *jeu-dh- 'in hefliger Bewegung sein, kämpfen [to be in vigorous motion, to fight]' can be found in:

• Old Indic ud-yīdhati 'walt auf (vom Wasser) [to foam, to bubble (of water)];
• as well as in Old Iranian *jeug- 'aufregen, unruhig [to ruffle, agitated]', to this Avestan yaozaithi 'regt sich auf (vom Wasser, von unruhigen Ländern) [to agitate (of water, of unpeaceful countries)].

In an article (Udolph 2002) about hydronyms of Europe and in a different context, I have mentioned another base form extended with -n- and suggested an approach with *jeu-n-/*jou-n-/*ju-n-. I added names such as Jonen, Jona, Jaunbach/La Jogne, La Jouanne, La Joigne, La Jougnenaz/La Jogne, Junica, Jiindze and Jauntall/Juinfeld, Jaunstein-Podjuna to this.

It is now possible to associate the -n- in such formations with the Indo-European participle system. This was done for the first time by Schmid (1994), who also frequently emphasized it. It can be illustrated as in Tab. 2.

With this it is now possible to regard such -n- formations as in Jonen, Jona, Jaun originally as participle constructions from a root *jeu. We can thus connect the approach *Ju-mina to this.

Schmid (1994, 167–74) has treated corresponding formations at length
Tab. 2. The Indo-European Participle System according to Schmid 1994: 131.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktiv</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Präs. -nt-</td>
<td>-menal-mono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bariand-ferent-)</td>
<td>(alumnus,femina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. -yes/-yos/-us-</td>
<td>-to/-no-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ber-us-jös „Eltern“</td>
<td>sta-t-s, salb-h-s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in a different context, but his thoughts have hardly been picked up on. On the basis of river names such as Limona, Limene, and Lac Léman (Lake Geneva), numerous names can be added. Here is a small number of selected examples:

Akmena in Lithuania (Schmid 1994: 167); Almana, tributary to the river Lippe (North Rhine-Westphalia), 1075 Almana (Schmid 1994: 131; Schmidt 1967: 2, 11–13); Alme, tributary to the river Exter, 1359 Almina (Schmidt 1967: 12); Almana (city along the river Axios); Almenas district Utena in Lithuania; Aunonce in France, < Almanzia (Schmid 1994: 167); Almstedt, place name near Hildesheim, 1151 in Almenstad; Almenstede etc., located along the river Alme, probably developed from *Almana (Keitner 1972: 13); Blume, place name near Hann. Münden, 1329 Blomena, 1333 Blomena etc. (for details refer to the NOB 4: 55); place name Salzeln, 1124 Elmen, 1221 in villa Elmene, appears to contain a hydronym, tributary to the river Elbe (Bily 1996: 160); Falmana; Fulmana; *Galmina; Germania, place name in Thrace, derived from a hydronym *Germana(s) (Duridanov 1969: 23); Germuna, hydronym in Lithuania (Duridanov 1969: 23; Vanagas 1981: 113); Glimina; *Helmana in Helme, left tributary to the river Unstrut, with Helnegau, 749 Helmana and so on (Walther 1971: 237); Ilm, left tributary to the river Saale, with place names Ilmenau, Dorfheim, Stadtlin, 1114 in villa ... Ilmine, 1341 Ylmena (Walther 1971: 237); Ilmenau, feeder river of the Elbe, \* < *Elmanal-ina; Ilse, right tributary to the river Oker, with place name Ilsenburg, 995 Elsina, 1003 Ilsina (Walther 1971: 237); \*Imina > Ilmhe (in Hanover) (more detailed NOB 1: 231); Limene, Limonia, Lac Léman, and further names (Schmid 1994: 167); Swalmana; Swulmana; Warmana > Warmenau; Wermana; Wulmana.
For further information on these names, historical evidence, the discussion about their origin, and other additional details compare the contributions of Greule (2004) (though he did not consider the possibility of a participle construction), Krahe (1957), Schmidt (1970: 11–13), and UdoIph (2004: 146–52).

These numerous name examples, which are clearly derived from a formation with an ablaut suffix -meno-I-mono-, open up the already mentioned possibility to add Junme, Junme, *Jumna as a corresponding formation to this and to assume an original form *Jumina or *Jumava.

The basic meaning of the root *jou- can be considered as ‘fließen, in Bewegung setzen [to flow, to set in motion]’ or the like. Due to this and in reference to the island as being surrounded by waterways, a basic meaning for Junme = Wol(t)in as ‘umflossen, umspült [washed by, surrounded]’ might be proposed.

In order to verify this view, another hyronym, which has not been discussed in this context yet, can be consulted, namely Jümme, a river in Eastern Friesland and nowadays also a name of a borough, which is recorded in a map from 1806 (Fig. 2).

Although being sceptical, Remmers (2004: 118) connected this river
name with Old High German *gumpito* `Pfuhl, Teich [pool, pond]`, but his suggestion remains very uncertain. It is far more convincing to connect the river name with *Jumne/Wollin* and to assume the word *Jumina* in the East Frisian *Jümme*. This would also serve as an explanation for the umlaut. Upon my suggestion, this view was also included in the internet article by Norbert Fiks “Wie die Jümme zu ihrem Namen kam” (2010). However, this article points to the considerable problem that the river only appears for the first time on the map shown above, namely at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Can we then venture to suppose an old approach with an Indo-European suffix? I shall leave this question unanswered. However, due to the resemblance to the forms of *Jumne/Wollin*, it is very tempting to explain the two names together. At any rate, we can certainly not just omit the East Frisian name.

I will now come to the last point of this article. Which root vowel should be assumed for the analysis of the etymology of the name variants *Jumne*, *Jumme*, *Jôm*, *Jômsborg*, and so on? Traditionally, the -au- forms were preferred, and I agree with this choice. Another theory was presented by Petrulevich (2009: 71): “If it were accepted that *Jumne* was the base form, it would not be possible to derive the form *Jômsborg* from it without forcing the linguistic evidence […] I would like to add that a derivation in the other direction, i.e. of *Jumne* from the forms at *Jômi/Jômsborg*, is also rather problematic, since there is no plausible explanation for where an extra nasal -n- comes from. Third, I cannot agree that the original root vowel of the forms at *Jômi* and *Jumne* was *u*.” And she concludes: “In my view, the forms at *Jômi* and *Jumne* share the same root: at *Jômi* is primary, and *Jumne*, which has a suffix -n-, secondary.” (Petrulevich 2009: 80)

I have traced this approach once again, and I think to have found arguments for the assumption that the Scandinavian -o- forms may possibly go back to old Slavonic contacts. Equivalent examples can be found in the loanwords between Slavic and Germanic languages.

One of the most important cases is the generally acknowledged borrowing of Slavic *duma* `Rat, Gedanke, Absicht; episches Volkslied [advice, thought/idea, aim/intention; epic folk song]` from Gothic *dôms* `Urteil [verdict]` or from Proto-Germanic *dônaz* (Kiparsky 1934: 171–73). Concerning the discussion of this borrowing, Kiparsky (1934: 172) states:

Got. *ô* und urgerm. *ô* haben stets slawisch *ô* ... gegeben, weil das heutige slav. *ô* noch in uurruss. Zeit (etwa um 900) denselben Lautwert wie das germ. *ô* gehabt hatte (die Ostseefinnen, die sowohl *ô* wie *ô* hatten, wählten zur Wiedergabe des
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Regarding the change between Jumne, Wolin and others, Petruievich (2009: 83) refers to the name variants Róm, Róma and as Romans of the place name Rome, which can be found in Nordic sources. For this, the following remarks by Stender-Petersen (1927: 484) are important: Borrowings such as Gothic Rûmônis for Latin Rómâni support the idea that

der urgerm. Vokal ð [...] so offen gewesen sein wird (etwa ð), dass der Römer es mit seinem ð, der Germanen dieses röm. a mit seinem o = ð identifizieren konnte. Andererseits finden wir eine Bestätigung für diese Annahme in der Tatsache, dass dem Germanen das lat. ú so geschlossen erschien, dass er es mit seinem ú (vgl. lat. Róma > germ. Rîma) wiedergeben konnte [the Proto-Germanic vowel ð [...] had become so close (approximately ð), that the Romans could identify it as their a, the Germans could identify this Romance a as their o = ð. On the other hand, we find confirmation of this assumption in the fact that the Latin 3 seemed so close to the Germans that they could reproduce it using their ú (cf. Latin Róma > Germanic Rûma)].

Stender-Petersen says further: "Im Gotischen ist das urgerm. o kein offener Laut mehr, sondern ein geschlossener, dem ð nahestehender Laut, der oft mit diesem verwechselt wurde [In Gothic, the Proto-Germanic o is not an open sound any longer, but rather a closed one, similar to the ð sound, with which it was often confused]."

The mutual mixing of Germanic ð and û is also evident in another passage by Stender-Petersen (1927: 485) when he mentions that the equivalent for Gothic ð, û, is not anymore (in an earlier period), but later rather u: Gothic bóks, bóka > Slavic bûk, buk; Gothic *plôgs > Slavic plugî; Gothic Rûma, rûmîskos > Slavic Rumû, rumûskû.

From these observations I think we can conclude that, for the Nordic variants Jómsborg, Jóm, the same linguistic phenomenon has occurred in the reverse direction that is to say the Slavic -u- in Jumne, *Jumina, *Jumma was perceived as the vowel -o- by the North Germanic peoples.

For this reason — and with this I want to finish — this approach also
supports the supposition that the difficult name *Jumne, *Jumina, *Junna consists of a *u- vowel in the root syllable. This theory can also be verified by the etymology, which in the approach *Ju-mina, *Ju-mana considers a suffix that is attested in the Indo-European participle system. In my opinion, this idea represents a not entirely convincing base form, yet still an acceptable one. After all, the explanation of the place name still remains just as difficult as the quest for the original great city or even greatest city, as some chroniclers thought.
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Summary

The place name Jōmsborg including its variants appears exclusively in Norse, i.e. Old North Germanic sources. On the contrary, on the Continent the variants Vineta, Jumne, Julin, Janeta, Vinne, Uimne, Juminem, Juliaun, Uineta, at Jōni and Vinmeta are to be found. It is generally understood that these place names denote the island Wollin, Polish Wolin. The basic problem of onomastics is to ascribe these very diverse forms to one basic form. One has to conclude that this is not possible. Partially, the forms derive from spelling and reading variants. Also, Jumne, Julin etc. cannot be combined with the apparently Slavic place name Wollin.

In my opinion, the only possibility for a reasonable explanation of the most probable form Jumne is a comparison to the East Frisian river name Jimme. Both forms can most likely be ascribed to an Indo-European basic form *Jumina or *Jumana. In this case, an archaic participial construction with the suffix *-meno.-mono- is present. The basis can be seen in the Indo-European root *
jeu- with the basic meaning "to flow, to set in motion". If the old evidence refers to Wol(1)in — and this is not certain — one could assume a basis "flowed around, bathed by water".

Still, one has to stress that this interpretation is not definite.
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The etymology of Jómsborg is a difficult and intricate issue due to above all the heterogeneity of the available place-name evidence. A lot of effort has been made to suggest a well-argued, convincing etymology of the place-name in question and to clarify the links between the different place-name forms attested in the sources, although there is still no consensus on the matter. The conference has provided a chance to discuss the general difficulties in dealing with Jómsborg and its etymology as well as two possible hypotheses regarding the place-name’s origin, i.e. the etymologies suggested by Prof. Jürgen Udolph and me. Due to the limitations of the present format I will only summarize the discussion of the main linguistic issues of the etymological suggestions in question.

In short, Prof. Udolph’s idea is that the place-name form Junne is the key form among the diversity of the attested relevant place-name material. This form is to be derived from *Ju-mina, a participial form from the Indo-European root *ieu-*jou-/*ju-, see Prof. Udolph’s paper in this volume p. 200ff. for details.

Two weak points of this hypothesis were discussed at the conference. The first one concerns the evidence that Prof. Udolph’s etymological suggestion is based on. The prioritization of the form Junne which represents the core of this etymology, needs an explanation taking into consideration the first attestation of this place-name, at Jómi, from 1043. It is difficult to postulate a uniform etymology for both Junne and at Jómi/Jómsborg without explaining the absence of a nasal -n- in Scandinavian forms. The second issue concerns vowel length. The participle form *Junina contains a short root vowel and is contradicted by the forms at Jómi and Jómsborg containing long root vowels.

My etymological suggestion can in short be summarized in the following way. The place-name Jómsborg is to be derived from the Slavic jana ‘pit; ditch’. The place-names at Jómi and Junne were formed from two

corresponding Slavic forms, *Jama and *Jame. The existence of such parallel forms in Slavic onomastic material is well attested; see Petrulevich 2009 p. 82 ff. for more details.

The weak spot of the hypothesis turned out to be the explanation of the development which led to a change of a root vowel a in the Slavic place-names to a root vowel o in the corresponding Scandinavian forms. In my paper from 2009 I have suggested that the Scandinavian o-forms are based on the corresponding o-forms in Pomeranian, i.e. the development of a to o in Pomeranian was placed before the year 1043. As Prof. Udolph has pointed out the development in question is of a much later date and cannot be used to account for the change of the root vowel from a to o in this case.

My response to Prof. Udolph’s criticism is a modification of the etymological suggestion from 2009. The change of the root vowel is explained by phonological adaptation which in most cases accompanies place-name replication or loan. In this case the root vowel a is adapted as an o in the same way as e.g. Basel, cf. the form Basula from 870, which is attested as Boslaraborg in Leidarvisir og borgarskipan by the Icelandic abbot Nikulas of Munkaþverá from the 1150s. I am thus still of the opinion that the jama-etymology is the most convincing one, since it allows us to account for several issues including the relation between the Scandinavian forms at Jõmil/Jõmsborg and the German form Jomue. I hope to be able to present the final variant of the etymological suggestion in my doctoral thesis.

The general conclusion of the conference discussion is that there is still further work to be done on the subject.
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