On the etymology of *at Jómi, Jumne* and *Jómsborg*

By Alexandra Petrulevich

1. General introduction

The situation regarding the toponyms under study here (*at Jómi, Jumne* and *Jómsborg*) is extremely complex, since there are more than 10 place-name forms (to mention just a few: *at Jómi, Jumne, Julin, Wolin*) recorded in Scandinavian, German and Slavic primary sources which, according to the majority of scholars,\(^1\) denote one and the same place – identified, as a rule, as the town of Wolin, situated on the southern tip of Wolin island in Polish Pomerania.

1.1. Objectives and points of departure

The abundance of the place-name forms suggests that, apart from considering the etymology of *at Jómi, Jómsborg* and *Jumne*, I will have to try to answer the following questions:

1. whether the forms mentioned in the primary sources are in any way related;
2. if so, what their relationships may have been; and
3. what could possibly have led to this sort of diversity.

The answer to the first question is the most crucial, as it affects the points of departure of the present research. Having examined most of the primary and secondary sources, I am convinced that all the toponym forms denoting Wolin are in some way connected (of course, not all the name forms in question share the same etymology).

It is natural to assume that there are a few groups of place-name forms, related in different ways, within the ‘Wolin group’ as a whole, given the linguistic and historical evidence (e.g. the forms themselves, the correlation between the names used and the events described, suggesting the way the place-names were transmitted, the author’s competence etc.). More-

\(^1\) See Lexicon 1, p. 328; *Saga of the Jomsvikings*, p. vii; Labuda 1964, p. 184; Schmidt 2000, pp. 120 ff.; Słupecki 2000 and references there.
over, this is the only way the problem of the various Wolin names can be solved.

Owing to the limitations of this article, I will not be able to deal with all the toponym forms at length. I have therefore picked out the names recorded in Scandinavian sources (skaldic poetry, sagas, chronicles written in Latin): *at Jómi, Jomne, Hynnisburg, Jómsborg, Jumne, atb Jomune, af Jomni*, and forms from German sources that are related to them (*Jumne, Jum(ne)ta*), using an etymological criterion. I shall consider these toponym forms to be the subject of my investigation and shall examine them in the greatest possible detail.

*Saxonis Gesta danorum* is an exception among the Scandinavian sources. Saxo does not follow the common Scandinavian practice, but uses the forms *Julinum, Jumensis provincia*/*Julinensis provincia* to denote the town of Wolin and the ‘region of Wolin’, respectively. I shall analyse these variants with other place-name forms, which are not related to Scandinavian forms, explaining why Saxo used these toponyms, and how he came to have two forms for the region of Julin – *Jumensis provincia* and *Julinensis provincia*.

As for the place-names that are not related to Scandinavian forms (in Slavic chronicles and documents, as well as in related German chronicles), I shall limit myself to a concise summary of what has been done by other scholars, who have suggested different etymologies and hence ways in which the toponyms within the group are related.

To make the writing process easier, I am dividing the toponym forms denoting Wolin into two major groups: Group 1 or ‘Scandinavian place-names’, i.e. the place-names used in Scandinavian and related German sources, excluding *Saxonis Gesta danorum* (see Table 1), and Group 2 or ‘Slavic place-names’, i.e. the place-names used in Slavic and related German sources, including *Saxonis Gesta danorum* (see Table 3). I would like to emphasise that the names of these groups have nothing to do with etymology, but reflect the frequency of certain forms in written sources in particular territories.

2. The evidence of Scandinavian and related German sources

2.1. Base forms

There are two base forms of the place-names studied, recorded in the mid and late 11th century respectively: a form in the dative, *at Jómi*, which is used by
Arnórr jarlaskáld Póróarson (c. 1046), and *Jumne*, a form used by Adam of Bremen (c. 1072).

In *Hrynhenda* and *Magnúsdrápa*, devoted to Magnús góði, Arnórr depicts Magnús’s victory over the Wends, mentioning some sort of Wendish *‘habiH tat’* (see Table 1). The source used by the skald is unknown. However, it is likely that the toponym *at Jómi* was either taken from the oral tradition or borrowed by the author from one of the eyewitnesses of the events.

The magnificent Slavic town of *Jumne* appears in Adam of Bremen’s *Gesta Hammaburcensis Ecclesiae Pontificum* (see Table 1). It is primarily described as a commercial port, but the author gives accounts of Harald Bluetooth’s escape and of Magnús’s siege as well. Adam could have obtained the name of the town from two possible sources – German merchants (who described the town as a trading port) or Sven II Estridsson of Denmark (Adam’s main informant on Danish history).

2.2. The forms *at Jómi* and *Jumne* in later sources

The two base forms *at Jómi* and *Jumne* were borrowed into later sources, either changed or distorted to a varying degree. It is worthwhile to divide the primary sources mentioning these toponyms into two groups or traditions: Old Norse (skaldic poetry, *konunga sögur*, including *Ágrip af Nóregs konunga sogum* and *Ágrip af sogu danakonunga*) and Latin (chronicles). I am aware of the narrowness of this approach, which does not take into account the familiarity of authors with works written in both languages and, accordingly, the mutual influence of the traditions. Nevertheless, such a division will best enable me to trace the development of the base forms.

A compound *Jómsborg* and its derivatives appear in Old Norse sources by the end of the 12th century (see Table 1). The compound is formed in accordance with the standard model (dat. (*at* Jómi) > gen. *Jóms* + the generic -borg, cf. *Steinsborg* (Kamięń Pomorski), *Burstaborg* (*bursta* is a gen. pl. of *burst*) (Szczecin), *Jórsalaborg* (*sala* is a gen. pl. of *salar*) (Jerusalem)). It is interesting that the aforementioned declension of the toponym *at Jómi* is the only one found in primary sources. It is likely that the name was considered to be either masculine or neuter, which was enough to form a genitive, but not enough to determine a nominative, resulting in ‘fossilisation’: the form *at Jómi* was used only in combination with the preposition *at* (*ath, af*) and in

---

2 Apart from in the poetic works of Arnórr jarlaskáld, the form *at Jómi* is encountered once again in the *Jómsvíkingadrápa* (c. 1200) by Bjarni Kolbeinsson, the bishop of Orkney (see Table 1).
most cases functioned in parallel with the compound Jómsborg (JómS., p. 74, Fsk., pp. 80, 115, 208, Hkr. 3, p. 43), the declension of which did not cause any problems. Naturally, the form Jómsborg is much more frequent than at Jómi.

In the Latin tradition, the form Jumne was transformed into Iam(ne)ta and Vinneta in Helmold’s Chronica Slavorum (c. 1172); into Jomne in Historia Norvegiae (12th–13th centuries); into Hynnisburgh in Svenonis (1185–9); and into Iumpne in AL (14th century) (see Table 1).

I would like once again to emphasise the possible interrelationship between the two base forms. It is likely that Adam’s form Jumne alone is behind the variants from Helmold and AL, Jum(ne)ta and Iumpne, whereas the author of Historia Norvegiae was apparently familiar with both Latin (HN, p. XXI) – Adam’s Gesta is one of the sources used – and Old Norse names (cf. at Jómi), and his choice of the root vowel o (Jomne) in a Latin text can be seen as a correction of Adam’s form.

Wolfgang Laur (2005, pp. 14, 22) adduces two more forms, Junume and Julinum, which are said to be used in Annalista Saxo under the year 1160. First, Annalista Saxo incorporates the years 741–1139 and, second, the town of Wolin is not mentioned there (AnS, pp. 1–616). Perhaps Laur had Saxo Grammaticus in mind, who described events that happened in 1160 and used the toponyms Julinum and Jumensis provincia/Julinensis provincia in his work.

The form Jomne in Historia Norvegiae was corrected by Gustav Storm to Jome (HN, p. 113), which, to my mind, only obscures the situation. Apparently, dat. Jómi can denote a town only in combination with the preposition

\footnote{According to Roderich Schmidt (2000, p. 121), the oldest manuscript suggests the reading uineta, which was changed by a copyist into iumenta = iumenta or iumenta. Mikolaj Rudnicki (1936, p. 91) points out that the suffix -eta is not known in Polish or even Slavic toponymy, but in names like Leta < Log-eta from lekti (‘light’). He holds that *log-aks, a log-ak, etc. is the suffix -ota, which stands in an apophonic relationship to the probable -ota, cf. the male suffix kok-ot < kok-ot: kocz-ot (kok-ota); however, there are no such examples for the female suffix -ota. The form Vinneta beruht auf einer falschen Lesung oder einem Schreibfehler für Jumneta (Bach 1953, p. 26). For more information on Helmold’s forms, see Schmidt 2000, p. 121, and Rudnicki 1936, p. 91.}

\footnote{Inserting -p in the consonant cluster mn in Slavic -no-names was quite common in Latin documents, cf. Cerno: Cermule, Cermulepotsa (1269), terra Cernoma (1293), Cernina (1300), Cernomena, Chernenpa (1352), Czermno: Lomno; de Homno… Lomno (1440), Lomno (1480), Lomno (1578); Lomna: Lompa (1382), Lomupa (1390); Slohno: Loslo (1283), Slohno (1283), Slohno (1291, 1295), etc. (Borek 1968, pp. 41, 132, 221). According to Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen (1957, p. 275), inserting -p in the consonant clusters mn (md) and mp is characteristic of East Danish, Scanian in particular; -p is possibly an ‘ortografisk Udtryk for Ophevelsen af Læbelukket ved Artikulationsovergangen fra Labial til Dental’. The appearance of -p in Jumne in a text from Lund is not surprising; Jumne and Jumpne should be seen as equivalents.}
at (see 5.1). I see no possibility of using the form to name a town in the context (see Table 1), unless a further preposition is added (in civitate in/at Jome). Naturally, the author of Historia Norvegiæ copies Adam’s form, which in Gesta denotes both the town and, apparently, the island it is situated on (see 5.2).

The form Hynnisburgh is most likely a result of copyists’ mistakes. However, I do not accept the original form Hyumsburgh 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.

The scribal version Hynnisburgh was it seems a result of orthographical transformations. An h- before the initial vowel was quite common in Latin texts, cf. horebro, herjeo, Heaspyrd ~ espyrd; hesabro ~ Esbro (Nordberg 1926, pp. 165 f.). The letters nn appeared because of a miswriting of mn. However, the change of iu- into -y- can hardly be satisfactorily explained. According to Stig Olsson Nordberg (1926, pp. 141 f., 144 ff.), the letters u/ui could be substituted for y in Swedish Latin texts, e.g. Wicbu, wigbui, Walby; dalbui, dalby etc., but not the other way around. The German element -burg is natural for the Latin chronicles used by the author, cf. Hammaburg, Magdeburg, Mersiburg, Brandenburg, Altdinburg etc. (Adam).

The late compilation Flateyjarbók (14th century) uses variants of both base forms, Old Norse at Jómi > a Jome and Latin Jumne > af Jomni, ath Jomune, as well as the commonest form Jómsborg (see Table 1). Although the Old Norse and Latin forms appear in one work, they are mentioned in different sagas (a Jome in Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar and Jómsvíkinga saga, and af Jomni/ath Jomune in Magnús saga bins göði ok Haralds saga hóðlóð). If the saga contexts are compared with those of Adam’s Gesta (a short abstract of which is included in the manuscript), it is possible to explain the presence of Latin forms in the Old Norse text. Adam makes no mention of Jomsvikings and their connection with the Slavic town of Jumne, but the siege of Jumne by Magnús göði is briefly described (Adam, p. 137). Apparently, the Flateyjarbók authors used the forms ath Jomune and af Jomni to correspond to the

5 See Svenonis, p. 118, Labuda 1964, p. 184. Hyumsburgh is hardly possible at all from the point of view of the linguistic evidence. The only condition under which -n- ‘im liname’ can be dropped in Old Norse is in a combination of three consonants (Noreen 1923, p. 214). One cannot possibly get a form *Jumnsburg that would allow -n- to be eliminated from an ia-stem Jumne.

6 Mímer is the only exception known to me which ‘nicht ganz selten’ takes an a-stem gen. Mími (Noreen 1923, p. 258).
Latin source.

Clearly, *af Jomni* and *ath Jomune* are late orthographical variants of *Jumne*. If, as I believe, the two forms are related, it is not easy to determine which of them is the original one. The form *af Jomni* is used in skaldic poetry (Arn. Magndr., Flat. 3, see Table 1), which is believed to be a highly reliable source. However, if *af Jomni* is accepted as the genuine form, the epenthetic vowel in the prose form *ath Jomune* is difficult to explain. More likely, the original form *Jomune* is based on the spelling variants of *Jumne*, which contain an epenthetic vowel, cf. *Jumune, Iumime, Iuminem, Iumine* etc. (see Table 2). *Jomune* was then adjusted to suit the requirements of skaldic verse, i.e. shortened to the disyllabic *Jomni* by the loss of a short unstressed vowel in the penultinate syllable.

The Latin forms are combined with prepositions in the Old Norse text, which is natural in a place-name derived from the name of a landscape feature. The most plausible explanation for the different prepositions – *af* in the poetic text and *ath* in the prose – is a mistake (*f* was written instead of *t*), which is suggested by parallels with *Hulda-Hrokkinskinna*, cf. *af Jomni/ ath Jomune* (‘away from *Jómn*’) in Flateyjarbók and *at Jómi* (‘at *Jóm*’) in *Hulda-Hrokkinskinna* (Table 1). Otherwise the meaning of the skaldic verse is distorted. In the context, with no motion implied, the preposition *af* most likely denotes ‘direction from but at the same time continuous connection with an object from which an act or thing proceeds, *from*’ (e.g. ‘*gengr þar af Meðalfellsströnd*’) according to Cleasby (p. 4); ‘away from, off’ (e.g. ‘*iii. milur af Jerusalem*’) according to ONP (p. 55). Cf. Arn. Magndr. 8 in *Hulda-Hrokkinskinna*: ‘at *Jómi*’, and Flateyjarbók: ‘away from *Jómn*’.

2.3. Conclusions: the root vowel and the relationship between *at Jómi* and *Jumne*

Having examined the toponyms in question (*at Jómi*/Jómsborg and *Jumne*), the German researchers Wolfgang P. Schmid, Laur and Jürgen Udolph come to the conclusion that the vowel *u* in the root is authentic, and that the base form for these place-names is *Jum(i)na*. In his *RGA* article on *Jumne*, Roderich Schmidt (2000, p. 120) does not establish possible base forms or the etymology of the place-name, but he does comment on the relationship between *Jumne* and *Jómsborg*: ‘Man nimmt an, daß Adam diese singuläre Form [Jumne] einem dän. Gewährsmann verdankt, und hat gemeint, es sei eine Wiederlatinisierung des nord. Jomsborg.’
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Schmid (1979, p. 266) discusses the meaning of the IE root *jern-, which in his view is suitable for denoting river confluences, river forks and settlements in such places, e.g. ‘die nobilissima civitas Jumne, die Jomsburg an der Odermündung, zur Zeit Adams v. Bremen ein von Slaven besiedelter internationaler Handelsplatz. Dieser Name lässt sich auf ein *Jumina- zurückführen.’

Laur (2005, p. 22) is convinced that both Jumne (which he sees as an Old Danish form) and Jómsborg are derived from *Jum(i)na: ‘Ortsnamen aus einer anderen Sprache können wie Lehnwörter auf der lautlichen und der formalen Ebene in die eigene integriert, das heißt eingegliedert werden. Ein Beispiel dafür in unserem Zusammenhang stellen Jóm und Jómsborg mit der Hinzufügung des eigensprachlichen Grundwortes borg = «Burg» im Altwestnordischen oder Jumne im Altdänischen zu wohl *Jum(i)na für Wollin dar.’


First, I do not think that it is correct to consider the form Julin when dealing with the original root vowel of at Jómi and Jumne and their possible base form, as Udolph seems to do, since the former has no etymological connection with the latter two forms.

Second, the relationship between the forms Jumne and Jómsborg needs to be borne in mind. 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, as I have already pointed out (see footnote 5). I would like to add that a derivation in the other direction, i.e. of Jumne from the forms at Jómi/Jómsborg, 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. To examine this problem properly I will have to use the findings of the analysis carried out in detail in other parts of the article. References to the corresponding sections of the paper are given.

The place-name forms from Group 1 and Group 2 existed in parallel, as can be seen from the datings (see Tables 1 and 3). They were also used to denote the town of Wolin within parallel types of sources: Group 1 in Scandinavian, and Group 2 in Slavic (on the form Julin, see 4.1–4.3). Overlapping occurs in German chronicles, which were influenced by either a Scandinavian or a Slavic element.
Since the name of the town in question was always Wolin to Slavs, the place-name Jumne was obviously the name of something else used as a name for the Slavic town. In my view, both Jómi and Jumne were names of a waterway used as oikonyms, i.e. names for an inhabited place (for details, see 5.3–5.4).

The direct transmission of Jumne from Wolinians to Adam of Bremen seems very unlikely. The toponym was most probably obtained either through German merchants or through Sven Estridsson, the Danish king. Scandinavians were more likely to denote the town by the name of a nearby landscape feature. Thus, in all probability, Jumne was transmitted through Sven Estridsson.

Apparently, the forms at Jómi and Jumne shared the same root and were used in parallel, since it is not possible to derive one from the other, cf. the parallel usage a Jome and ath Jomune/af Jomne in Flateyjarbók.

In the manuscripts of Adam’s Gesta, only the forms with a root vowel u can be found (Labuda 1964, p. 187 – see Table 2 – and Udolph 2007, p. 219). Danish authors retained the Latin tradition of a u. However, in West Scandinavian sources (both Latin and Old Norse), Jumne was corrected to Jomne and Jomune in accordance with the form at Jómi preserved in skaldic poetry.

The preserved forms at Jómi and Jumne are authentic. Taking into account the adoption of the Latin name Rōma > Old Norse Róm, Rúm, one can assume that the root vowel was most likely -o-, and there could be two variants of each name form in Scandinavia, i.e. at Jómi, *Júmi and *Jómne, *Júmne (the ending is of minor importance), but only two were preserved in written sources.

3. The evidence of Slavic and related German and Scandinavian sources

3.1. Various Wolin forms and their interpretation

The first toponym from Group 2 that appears in a primary source is Livilni, used by Thietmar of Merseburg in his account from 1007: ‘Sed quia raro illucescit serenitas, quam non sequatur caliginosae nubis obscuratis, regi pascha Ratisbone celebrati de Liuticus et ab hiis, qui a civitate magna Livilni dicta missi fuerant et a Iaremiro duce, Bolizlavum multa sibi contraria molyri cupiditem asserebant sequae ad haec perficienda verbis ac pecunia ab eodem
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introduci affirmabant' (Thietmari, p. 153). A generally accepted identification of Thietmar’s Livilni with Wolin is based, first, on the phonetic similarity (Li-vilni), the relativity of which is explained by the inaccuracy of German adaptation; and second, on the political situation mentioned, i.e. the confrontation between the Polish king and the ‘anti-Polish coalition’, since Wolin could belong to the latter, being an active participant in a constant struggle for the independence of Pomerania.

The names Julin and Wolin (in different spelling variants) are consistently used to denote the town of Wolin in Latin works from the early 12th century onwards. Julin is first mentioned in Vita Ottonis episcopi Bambergensis (Vita Ottonis, pp. 788, 841) by Ebbo (1153) and Herboldus (1158), and, in all probability, is borrowed from there by Saxo Grammaticus (Saxonis, p. 480). Wolin is first mentioned in a Latin document from 1140 as civitas Wulinensis and Willin (PU 1, p. 33).

Rudnicki (1936, pp. 70, 73) drew attention to the peculiar distribution of the forms Wolin and Julin in primary sources: Julin is mostly used in Latin chronicles, Wolin (Volyn, Wolyn etc.) in acts and other documents. The possible reason for the frequency of Julin in chronicles is popular etymology, which connected the form with the name of Julius Caesar and was first mentioned in Vita Ottonis by Ebbo (Lehr-Spławinski 1935, p. 42, Rudnicki 1936, p. 73).

The relationship between the forms Livilni, Julin and Wolin has been interpreted in different ways. Udolph (2007, p. 219) refuses to acknowledge any possible etymological connection between the forms: ‘Die unterschiedlichen Schreibungen Livilni, Julin, Willin, Vełin, Vulin, Wolin lassen sich nicht vereinen.’ Polish scholars are inclined to believe that the forms are connected, although there is no consensus on how.

Tadeusz Lehr-Spławinski (1935, p. 40) examined different forms of the place-name in question, as well as the name variants of the tribe associated with the town, and came to the conclusion that there were several parallel forms of the place-name: a primary name Wołyń and secondary forms based on the root Vel-: Wieleń, Wieluń, Wieluniec. The following parallels to the form Wołyń are given: a historical region of Wołyń (Volhynia) in Ukraine (Old Russian also Velynь and Velynjane), a town Volyně and a river Volynka in the Czech Republic, a village Wołyń, forest districts of Wołynie and Wołyny in Poland, and Wölön in German Pomerania.

7 ‘It is rare for the heavens to shine brightly without the shadows of dark clouds following. Thus, while the king [Henry II] was celebrating Easter at Regensburg, representatives of the Liutizi and the large city of Wolin, and also Duke Jaromir, informed him that Boleslav was trying to instigate a great conspiracy against him and employing both his words and riches to lure them into it’ (Chronicon, p. 259).
The forms Vuloini, Vulini and Wolin are said to be root equivalents, since using the letters o and u for the vowel o in Slavic names is very common in the German-Latin tradition. The forms Volin, Wolin and Julin are said to be graphic variants of the form v’olyn, since v could be written as V or W, I or J (to highlight its palatal quality), o as o or u, l as l, y as i, and n as n (Lehr-Splawiński 1935, pp. 39 ff.).

Rudnicki (1936, pp. 70 f.) suggests an early ablaut in the initial syllable of the root ovel/*eyel- from which, according to him, the name Wolin should be derived: vol- : vel- : ul- (jual-) (cf. von- : ven- : (j)un- from *eyen-). The pronunciation variants *vol- : *vel- : *ul- are seen as possible from an Indo-European perspective, cf. vod- : ud- : ved- (Old Indic udáñ-, Greek ὕδωρ, Umbrian utur, Latin unda, Old Prussian unds : Lithuanian vandû, Old Church Slavonic voda, Gothic watô, Old High German wazzar : Armenian get < *vedo-) (Rudnicki 1936, p. 72). Thus, there were three parallel primary forms, *Vol-ino/*Vol-yno, *Vel-ino and *Jul-ino/*Ul-ino, which explains the variety of the place-name forms recorded in Latin documents. However, Udolph (2007, p. 220) objects to the idea of an early ablaut and writes that such a view ‘ist mit dem idg. Ablautsystem und dessen Weiterentwicklung im Slaw. nicht zu vereinigen.’

It is also suggested that two different forms can be distinguished, one for the island and one for the town of Wolin: *Vol-yno and *Vol-ino, respectively (Rudnicki 1936, pp. 70 f.).

Stanisław Rospond (1984, p. 436) argues that the form Julin arose as the result of a transformation of Wo- into O-, due to the similarity of the pronunciation (cf. Wologoszcz – Ologoszcz).

Laur (2005, p. 22) considers the form Julin to be a contamination: ‘Wahrscheinlich liegt eine Kontamination vor, eine Vermengung der Namenform Wollin mit einer, die mit einem j beginnt wie Jumne und Jomsborg.’

3.2. The origins of Julin

The first author to use Julin, Ebbo, most probably acquired the form from one of the people directly involved in the conversion of Pomerania, e.g. from his informant Udalricus, who had been Otto’s close friend and companion (The Life of Otto, pp. 10 f.). Thus, the place-name was apparently not a contamination of Wolin and Jumne created by somebody who did not have access to authentic sources of information.

Rudnicki adduces the evidence of the only Pomeranian document, No. 74 from 1178, which mentions Julin (‘castellano Iuliensi’) (PU 1, p. 58). The
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The document is of major importance, since it seems to use the form independently, with no possible allusions to *Vita Ottonis*. It was composed in the presence of Pomeranian witnesses: Jakso, a prince (domino Iaczone), Boguslaw I, a prince (domino Bogozlauo), Kasimierz I, a prince (domino Cazimero), Warcislaw, a castellan of Szczecin (Warzizlauo castellano de Stetin), Zauist, a castellan of Kamień Pomorski (Zauist castellano Caminensi), Więceståw, a castellan of Wolin (Vienzelauo castellano Iulieni), Goćisław, a castellan of Usedom (Gustizlauo castellano Vznomiensi), Dzirżko, a castellan of Dyzmin (Dirskone castellano Diminemsi), and Budowoj, his relative (Budowoy cognate eius) (Rudnicki 1936, p. 73). Rudnicki is therefore convinced that the toponym *Julin*, used in the presence of Pomeranians and the castellan of the town in question, has to be authentic (Rudnicki 1936, p. 73). The form was seen as a rare one (cf. the name of the lake *Wonieść*, which was almost always recorded as *VonC* in 1258–1397, but once as *Uneszce* = “*Unieście* = Pom. *Uneste* (1397), and as *Onyeszcze* in the 15th century), which disappeared from the spoken language, but was preserved in written texts, partly thanks to the popularity acquired by its association with Julius Caesar (Rudnicki 1936, p. 73).

However, there are two more Pomeranian documents that mention *Więceståw*, a castellan of Wolin: No. 66 from 1175 and No. 97 from 1184 (see Table 3), the evidence of which does not seem to be taken into account by Rudnicki. No. 66 is an act of Kasimierz I (*Kasimerus* Pomoranorum princeps), by which he presents a village of Schlatkow to the Grobe monastery. Among the witnesses we find: Zauist castellanus de Camyn (*Zauist castellano Caminensi* from No. 74), Vencezlaws castellanus de Wolyn (*Venzelzlauo castellano Iulieni* from No. 74), Dyrsk castellanus de Dymyn (*Dirskone castellano Diminemsi*), and Buduwyn (most likely corresponds to *Budowoy* from No. 74). No. 97 is an act of Bogusław I (*Boguzlauus* princeps Pomoranorum), by which he presents another village to the Grobe monastery. The document is witnessed by *Wenzelslaus* castellanus de Wolin.

Thus, *Więceståw*, a castellan of Wolin, appears in three documents: as a castellan of Wolin in 1175, of *Julin* in 1178, and of *Wolin* in 1184. Moreover, the documents Nos. 66 and 74 were composed in the presence of almost the same witnesses.

In the circumstances, and taking into account the different spellings of the same names in the documents cited above (cf. *Vencezlaws – Venzelzlauo – Wenzelslaus, Buduwyn – Budowoy*), I doubt that *Julin* could be a rare form of the place-name *Wolin*. I would rather agree with Lehr-Splawiński (1935, pp. 41 f.) that *Julin* is most likely a spelling variant (cf. the variants of the
place-name Wolin from the decree of Pope Calixtus II, cited by Ekkehard of Aura: *Vulin, Wilin, Ulin; Ekkehardi*, p. 264), which became widespread owing to popular etymology.

### 3.3. Julin and Jumne in *Gesta danorum*

The original manuscript and early copies of *Gesta danorum* are lost, except for a few pages. The earliest edition was published by Jodocus Badius Ascensius in 1514. Doubts were cast upon the authenticity of the form Julin, which was believed by Richard Hennig (1935, p. 50), for example, to be a later correction from Jumne to Julin. Hennig (pp. 51 f.) also accused Petrus Erasmus Müller of inventing the form *Julinensis provincia* and using it instead of *Jumensis provincia*.

First of all, a change of the form from whatever it might have been to Julin can hardly be proved, since Julin is used in a later summary of Saxo’s *Gesta danorum*, the *Compendium Saxonis* (13th century), the earliest copy of which is dated to the 15th century. Second, Jumensis provincia and Julinensis provincia are two separate forms, the first used in Book 8, the second in Books 14 and 16 (*Saxonis*, pp. 379, 859). I assume that if Müller had wanted to correct the name, he would have been consistent in his ‘Berichtigungs-Wut’ and used the form *Julinensis provincia* in all cases. I therefore consider the forms Julin, Julinensis and Jumensis provinciae to be authentic.

Jumensis and Julinensis provinciae are used in different contexts: ‘Post quos Toki Jumensi provincia ortus cum Otrito, cui agnomen Juvenis erat, illustris agnoscitur’ (*Saxonis*, p. 379), which refers to Pálna-Tóki, one of the Jomsvikings; and ‘Cumque rex eodem die Julinensis provinciae denuo invadenda consilium agitasset, Absalon concubia nocte opportuna ascensus loca scrutatus’ (*Saxonis*, p. 859), which refers to the campaign of Absalon and Valdemar I against Wolin. It is not clear whether Saxo was in any way equating the toponyms. He was aware of the pirates of Danish origin (whose names suggest they were Jomsvikings) living in Wolin: ‘Post hec Haraldus, armis Sclauia potitus, apud Iulinum, ... Sturbirn duce, competencia militum presidia collocauit. Quorum piratica, egregio animorum robore celebrata ac finitimus paulatim tropheis alita, eo demum ferocitatis excessit, ut continuis nautarum cladibus septentrionalis replet Oceanum. ... Inter quos fuere

---

8 ‘After these, Toki, born in the province of Jomsborg, is known to fame together with Othrik, called the Young’ (*Saxo Grammaticus*, p. 238).
9 ‘As the king had formed the plan of invading the district round Wolin once more, on that same day, Absalon had reconnoitred the best ways of gaining access on a night watch’ (*Saxo 2*, p. 521).
Bo, Ulff, Karlshefni, Siualdus ...' (SaxonisG., p. 325).

It can therefore be assumed that he considered Julin and Jómsborg to be the same town, and, since Pálna-Tóki was the leader of the Jomsvikings, *Jumensis provincia*\(^{11}\) and the earldom at Jómi shared their denotation as well. It is not clear, then, why two different names are used to denote the area around Wolin. I assume that, although Saxo obviously associated both *Jumensis* and *Julinensis provinciae* with the same town, he did not know whether (or believe that) their borders were identical.

The use of both *Jumensis* and *Julinensis provinciae* can be seen as a linking of two independent traditions: a Scandinavian tradition, which is based on the name of a landscape feature used as the name of the town and the area around it (see 5.1–5.2), and a Slavic tradition, which later took over, based on the name of the town used as the name of the area (see 5.2). Thus, the form *Jumensis provincia* is a ‘Scandinavian relic’ in Saxo’s work.

4. The denotations of *at Jómi, Jumne* and *provincia Wolin*

4.1. The denotation of *at Jómi*

The toponym *at Jómi* is used either on its own (*at Jómi*, e.g. Arn. Hryn., see Table 1) or in combination with the verb *heita* (*hæitir at Jómi*, e.g. Fsk., see Table 1).

According to Cleasby (p. 26), the preposition *at*, used in combination with a proper name in the dative in contexts in which no motion is implied, has the following meanings: (a) it denotes ‘the kingdom or residence of a king or princely person’, e.g. ‘konungr, jarl, att öllum Nóregi, king, earl over all N.’, konungr at Dyflinni ... but í or yfir Englandi; ‘cp. the phrase, sitja at landi, to reside, of a king when at home’, e.g. ‘at Jómi’; ‘used of a bishop’, e.g. ‘biskup at Hólum’, but ‘biskup í Skálaholti ... : at Rómi’; (b) in denoting a man’s abode the preposition “at” is used where the local name implies the notion of *by the*

---

10 ‘After which, as Haraldus was master of Sclevia he put Stubbiornus in charge of a formidable garrison at Wolin ... The piracies of these men made their bravery notorious, and were encouraged by victories over their neighbours, until at last they grew so bold that they covered the waters of the north with the continual destruction of seafarers. ... Among them were Bo, Ulff, Karlshefni, Siualdus ...’ (Saxo 1, p. 6).

11 The Jomsvikings are not mentioned in Adam’s *Gesta*, and it seems strange to use the name based on Adam’s *Jumne* to refer to the province owned by one of them. The usage of the *u*-form is, most likely, connected with the Danish tradition of following Adam even when relying on West Scandinavian sources. However, the form confirms that *Jumne, at Jómi and Jómsborg share (one of) their denotations*.\(^{1}\)
side of; and is therefore esp. applied to words denoting *a river, brook, rock, mountain, grove, or the like, and in some other instances*, e.g. *at Hofi (a temple) ... at Borg (a castle) ... at Helgafelli (a mountain) ... at Hálsi (a hill)* etc.

According to ONP (pp. 658 f.), *at* + proper names in the dative has the following semantics (excluding the indication of origin): (a) *‘at, in’; at kirkio, at scipe ... at Borg; (b) ‘(... as part of a place-name, usually in conn. with the vb. kalla, heita, nefna)’, e.g. ‘Kona hét Þorgerðr ... ok bjó i Fljótsdal, þar sem nú heitir at Þorgerðarstoðum’; ‘Hann ... setti þar þæ, ok kallaði at Borg, en fjórðinn Borgarfjörð’; (c) (denoting dominion) over, of, e.g. ‘hann setti Erленd jarl Haralldz son at Orknéyivm’, ‘hinn hælghi Petr at Rumi’.

Skaldic verses do not provide sufficient evidence to clearly determine the denotation of the toponym *at Jómi*. The lines of Magnúsdrápa are the most ambiguous (see Table 1), with *at Jómi* denoting either the Wendish area of *Jóm* wasted by Magnús góði, or his earldom *at Jómi*, or the Wendish town *at Jómi*. However, it seems that in the context of Hrynhenda we are dealing with an oikonym derived from a topographical feature, which can be literally translated as ‘a settlement at *Jóm’*. It is impossible to define with certainty the type of settlement involved. But taking into consideration the phrase ‘i virki breiðu’, as well as the meaning of the Old Norse word *virki* (*‘a work ... wall, stronghold, castle’*; Cleasby, p. 710), one can say that the Wendish settlement burnt by Magnús góði was at least ramparted with a wall.

Comparing the use of the formulae *heita* + preposition + toponym in the dative and *heita* + toponym in the nominative in Landnámabók and Ístdingasögur, Jan Nilsso came to the conclusion that the former was typical of oikonyms and the latter typical of names of topographical features. Cf. ‘Porbjorn hét maðr, er bjó á þeim þæ, er í Árskógi heitir’ (Reykdelaga saga); ‘hann bjó þar, sem heitir á Blámýri’ (Hávarðasaga) and ‘þat er suðr frá holti því, er Smiðjuholtt heitir’ (Fóstbræðra saga); ‘Er ekki sagt frá ferð þeira, fyrr en þeir kómu i ey þá, er Hoð heitir’ (Egils saga) (Nilsso 1986, pp. 14 ff., 33 f., 36 f.).

Thus, *at Jómi* is referred to as: (a) a stronghold *at Jómi* named after some area/landscape feature called *Jóm* (Fsk., p. 80); (b) the area called *Jóm*, an administrative district, an earldom according to Cleasby, or an area ‘dominated over’ according to ONP (Fsk., pp. 115, 208). In Jómsvíkingasaga, Búrisleifr/Búrisláfr, the king of the Wends, promises Pálna-Tóki a district of his land named *Jóm* (*‘heitir at Jómi’*) on condition that he will constantly live there and defend the country (JómS., p. 74). It seems that the use of the formula *heita* + preposition + toponym is a discrepancy in the context, since in the sentence the toponym *at Jómi* clearly refers to a certain piece of land.
(from which the name of the town could be formed: *at Jómi*), and thus the nominative is much more frequent. However, the context becomes logical if one assumes that both the name of the earldom and the name of the town *at Jómi* are derived from the name of a landscape feature *Jóm*.

4.2. The denotations of *Jumne* and *provincia Wolin*

Adam (pp. 79 f.) writes: 'Urbs illa mercibus omnium septentrionalium nationum locuples nihil non habet iocundi aut rari. ... Ibi cernitur Neptunus triplicis naturae: tribus enim fretis alluitur illa insula, quorum aiunt unum esse viridissimae speciei, alterum subalbidae, tertium motu furibundo perpetuis saeavit tempestatibus. Ab illa civitate brevi remigio traicitur hinc ad Dyminem urbem, quae sita est in hostio Peanis fluvii, ugi et Runi habitant.'

It seems that the author equated the Slavic town of *Jumne* with the island it was situated on. Thus, relying on the example, I assume that the town of the Wends and the island could have had the same name, *Jumne*.

Hennig (1935, p. 94) mentions that in the Sorøer Handschrift of Adam’s *Gesta*, which was lost in 1728, the town *Jumne* is once called *Jumnö*, ‘Jumn-Insel’. The manuscript was transmitted through the 1579 publication by A. S. Vedel (who, most likely, used several manuscripts [Adam, p. XXI]) and thus, as Hennig (1935, pp. 94 f.) admits, the evidence cannot be relied on.

Although in B2 (Vedel’s publication), *Jumne* is indeed twice named *Iumnoe*, I doubt that this form can be interpreted as ‘the island of *Jumne*’, since there are no parallels: the islands mentioned in *Gesta* are not usually given additional endings, but are indicated by the word *insula*, e.g. ‘insula Bant’ and ‘Ceterum insulae Funi adiacent aliae VII minores ab euro, quas supra diximus frugibus opulentas, hoc est Moyland, Imbra, Falstra, Laland, Langland ... ’ (Adam, pp. 239, 243). Moreover, the generic *ø* in the island names *Sprogø*, *Morse*, *Samsø* is transmitted via *a* or *e*, e.g. *Morse*, *Samse* (Adam, pp. 233, 242).

The name *provincia Wolin/provincia Volin* is used in two Latin documents (Nos. 127 and 171) from 1195 and 1216, which are almost identical in their enumeration of settlements (PU 1, pp. 169 ff., 212 ff.). Rudnicki (1936, p.

---

12 ‘Rich in the wares of all the northern nations, *that city* lacks nothing that is either pleasing or rare. ... There Neptune may be observed in a threefold mood: *that island* is washed by the waters of three straits, one of which they say is of a very green appearance; another, rather whitish; the third rages furiously in perpetual tempests. From *that city* it is a short passage in one direction to the city of Demmin, which is situated at the mouth of the Peene River, where the Rugiani also live’ (Adam of Bremen, p. 67, italics mine).
68) assumes that the toponym provincia Wolin denotes the island of Wolin in the context. However, the village of Dramino (villa Drammine; German Drammin), which is located in provincia Wolin (No. 127: in provincia Wolin villam Drammine; No. 171: in provincia Volin villam Drammine), is not situated on the island, but on the mainland. Thus, in my view, provincia Wolin denoted not the island, but the coastal area on either side of the river Dziwna.

4.3. Conclusions
The toponyms at Jómi and Jumne seem to have two denotations each, in contrast to the place-names from Group 2, Livilni, Julin, Wolin, which exclusively denote the town of Wolin.

In the 11th century, at Jómi most probably denoted a town, and Jumne both a town and the island it was situated on. In later Scandinavian sources (Fagrskinna, Jómsvíkinga saga), at Jómi came to denote an administrative region with unknown borders.

I do not have enough evidence to claim that the area denoted by at Jómi in sagas and poetry and Jumne in Adam’s Gesta is identical to that denoted by provincia Wolin in Latin documents (although Jómsvíkinga saga clearly states that Búrisleifr/Búrisláfr gave Pálna-Toki a fylki of his land). However, it is possible to claim a continuity of denotation, from provincia Wolin in the 12th century to the present gmina (district, commune) of Wolin, which still includes two coastal areas of land separated by the Dziwna and the town of Dramino.

The administrative boundaries of the earldom at Jómi could therefore have included the island (Adam), or the island and the immediate coastal area on the other side of the Dziwna.

5. The etymology of at Jómi and Jumne
In my view, the forms at Jómi and Jumne share the same root: at Jómi is primary, and Jumne, which has a suffix -n-, secondary. I will therefore begin with the etymology of at Jómi, and then show how Jumne could have been formed, and what relationship could have existed between the two in Slavic society.

13 An island having the same administrative and natural boundaries is not an exception: Gotland was considered to be an independent administrative unit under the nominal control of a jarl (Guta saga, p. 7).
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The ‘fossilisation’ of the form *at Jómi* suggests that it was, most likely, a ‘foreign’ toponym, i.e. not Scandinavian. It seems logical to look for the origins of *at Jómi* and *Jumne* in the region they come from – Polish Pomerania, which is part of the area earlier inhabited by Balts. It is known that hydronyms usually survive an ethnic shift, and Baltic hydronymy occurs widely in Slavic territories. However, I am convinced that the hydronym in question is of Slavic origin, as are the other hydronyms at the mouth of the Oder, e.g. Dziwna, Świna and Peene.

Gerard Labuda (1964, p. 188) questioned the possibility of deriving the toponyms under study from Slavic languages. He assumed that the place-names ‘Jóm : Jómsborg’ and Wolin denoted the same Slavic town, and claimed that the existence of two Slavic names for one and the same place was very unlikely.

The toponym *at Jómi*, which denotes both a town and an earldom, is derived from the name of a landscape feature that characterised the town, as well as a considerable area of land around it. I would therefore propose the hypothesis that the toponym in question was formed from one of the names of the waterways at the mouth of the Oder, cf. e.g. ‘at Á (river) ... at Bagisá, ... Giljá, ... Myrká, ... Vatnsá, ... Pverá, ... at Lækjamóti (waters-meeting)’ etc. (Cleasby, p. 26). Thus, the names *Jóm/*Jómr and Wolin could originate in Slavic languages, since they functioned in parallel in Wolinian society, as the names of the waterway and the town, respectively.

Indigenous local names could be treated in different ways by Scandinavians – the toponyms in question could either be borrowed into Old Norse or else be rejected and replaced with newly coined Scandinavian ones. To illustrate the first possibility: several settlements in Yorkshire, the names of which contain the Scandinavian element *-bý*, existed before the arrival of Scandinavians, who adopted the Old English elements: *Eppleby* (from OE *æppel*), *Huby* (from OE *hōh* ‘spur’), *Swainby* (from OE *swān* ‘young man’) in the East Riding, and *Wauldby* (from OE *wald* ‘wold’) in the West Riding (Fellows-Jensen 1995, p. 175). To this I can add the toponyms *jórsalir* and *Orkneyiar*, behind which there most probably lies a purely phonetic ‘Scandinavian modification’ of indigenous place-names: *jórsalir* from Jerusalem (phonological adaptation: *jóf* + *salir*, pl. of *salr*); cf. Cleasby, p. 468, Blöndal Magnússon, p. 693, on the toponym *Orkn-eyejar*.

Peder Gammeltoft draws an interesting conclusion about the possible origins of the names of the three Shetland Islands ‘in the extreme northeast of
Shetland, the area closest to Norway: Unst, Yell and Fetlar. He argues that these island names ‘appear to be pre-Norse in origin but have been given a thin layer of Scandinavian “varnish”. This layer of “varnish” has not been applied in order to conceal the fact that they are not Scandinavian – after all, a place-name only needs to function, not to mean anything – but rather to make them palatable to the Scandinavian tongue and morphology’ (Gammeltoft 2004, p. 93). Gammeltoft (op. cit., p. 94) states that there are no pre-Norse toponyms in Orkney and suggests that the type of contact is a major factor determining name borrowing by Scandinavians: ‘Only under these circumstances [a peaceful contact of a mercantile and exploratory nature], it seems, would it make sense to transfer place-names of a Pictish origin into Old Norse. When the Scandinavian settlement of the Northern Isles began, the Scandinavians assumed a much more active naming role and named places exclusively in Old Norse.’

It is quite problematic to determine how Scandinavians dealt with the Pomeranian place-names mentioned in sagas. Steinsborg (now Kamień Pomorski) and Burstaborg (bursta is a gen. pl. of burst) (now Szczecin), for example, appear to have sound Old Norse etymologies. However, it can still be argued, for instance, that they may represent originally West Slavic names adapted by speakers of Old Norse (in these two cases, the West Slavic components were translated and an Old Norse generic was then added).

It is plausible to assume that Magnús góði’s campaign against Wolin was preceded by a period of peaceful contact. Most probably, Scandinavians were often guests in Pomerania (taking into account that in 1043 they apparently punished the Wends for not paying tribute) and used the waterways to get into the bay to the island of Wolin and the town situated on it. Thus, they may have adopted the name of one of the waterways, which survived in written sources in the name of the town and the region around it – at Jómi.

5.2. The etymology of at Jómi

My etymological starting point is the suggestion presented in earlier works, e.g. by Hennig (1935, pp. 92 ff.) and Rudnicki (1936, pp. 90 ff.), that the toponym at Jómi might be derived from the Slavic jama ė., ‘pit; ditch’. The root jama is very productive toponymically on Polish territory, e.g. Jama (1), Jamka (1), Jamna (1), Jamno (6), Jamy (2), Jamieńskie Góry (Rospond 1951, p. 101) etc. The toponyms derived from jama are mostly oikonyms; however, there is also an oronym Jamieńskie Góry, and the hydronyms Jamno (a lake),
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Jamieńskie Bagno (a bog) and Jamieński Nurt (a stream) in West Pomerania, which is of special interest to me.

Friedrich Lorentz (1958, p. 298) adduces two forms of the word jama f. – jama and joma14 – in Pomeranian, a variant of which was spoken on the island of Wolin and in the nearby area. Taking into account the direct transmission of the place-name at Jómi from Wends to Scandinavians, I assume the toponym to be formed from the Pomeranian form joma, which corresponds well with the root vowel o attested in West Scandinavian sources.

However, the Scandinavian toponym at Jómi, formed, as I believe, from feminine joma, can be either neuter or masculine. As a rule, Slavic feminine words preserved their gender when borrowed into Old Norse, e.g. käza f. (ʼporridgeʼ) < Russian kaša f.; leďja f. ʼa type of boatʼ < Old Slavonic ladija f. (de Vries 1962, pp. 5, 304, 349); but cf. Latin Róma f., borrowed both as Róm, Rúm neut. and Róma- f.

I would like to point out that the difference in the borrowing pattern of feminine toponyms might be connected with the time of actual adoption, a possibility I can demonstrate with the example of Róm/Róma-. The toponyms Róm or Rúm neut. (Sivg. 13, 25; Mark. 1, 10, 12; Eil. 3; Ív. 2; Skapti), as well as a compound Rúmsborg (Pl. 15), are used in skaldic poetry of the 11th–12th centuries (Lexicon 2, pp. 472 f.). The element Róma- f. in the compound Rómoveldi is mentioned once in a poem from Ragnarsaga lodbrókar (Ragn. 8), 13th–14th centuries (Lexicon 2, p. 472). Compounds with the elements róma-/róma- or rómaborgar-/rómaborgar-, e.g. rómaborgarlýðr, rómaborgarmadr, rúmarveldi, appear in prose sources in the 13th–15th centuries (Rómv. 11732, Heilag. 2 23032 21514–15, DN 4 866 (1437), Lars. AM 645 6714–15 etc. (Fritzner 1972, pp. 292 f.)). Latin Róma f. was therefore apparently borrowed twice – first as Róm, Rúm neut., and then as Róma- f.

It seems possible that the Slavic toponym *Joma f. was borrowed into Old Norse as *Jóm (and, possibly, *Júm) neut., according to the pattern Róma f. > Róm, Rúm neut.

14 In Lorentz’s dictionary the letters o ø o ø o ø denote different ø-allophones (ʼo = gpom. o oder ø, ø = gpom. ø oder ø’. Lorentz 1958, p. XX). Lorentz (op. cit.) writes: ‘Ich ziehe es ... vor, einige Hilfzeichen einzuführen, die keine neuen Laute darstellen, sondern nur besagen sollen, daß für die gemeinsamoravische Form mehrere Lauten in Betracht kommen.’
5.3. The etymology of Jumne

Place-names with the suffix -on- occur widely in all Slavic territories and belong to the most ancient type of Slavic toponyms (Borek 1972, p. 90). The suffix -on- is still very productive and forms adjectives from nouns, adverbs, prepositional phrases and compounds.

The process of toponym formation can be illustrated thus: (1) An adjective is formed with one of the three variants of the suffix -on- (-on m., -ona f., -ono neut.), according to the gender of the head noun, e.g. *brezьno > *brezьno polje (‘a field’, neut.); (2) The head noun is dropped, and the adjective becomes a toponym, e.g. *brezьno polje (‘a field’, neut.) > Brezьno. Typical head nouns are *ezero (‘lake’, neut.), *gora (‘mountain’, f.), *polje (‘field’, neut.), *rěka (‘river’, f.), *sedlo (‘village’, neut.) etc. (Borek 1968, pp. 305 ff.).

The choice of the suffix may also be determined by analogy, depending on what suffix prevailed in a certain region, or even changed from the original to a commoner one: the suffix -no, for example, is common in West Slavic territory (in modern times also occurring as -nel/-né), thus Bielne, Górne, Chłodne (łąka ‘grassland’, although the head noun is feminine); Nadrożny > Nadrożno. The affix -on- could also be used to create secondary place-names from other toponyms, e.g. Kosobudno : Kosobudy, cf. primary toponyms like *brezьno : Brezьno. (Borek 1968, pp. 307 ff.)

The form Jumne apparently originates in either *Jołmna or *Jołmno. In the first variant, the suffix -na corresponds to the most likely head noun, Pom. zatoka f.15 (‘a bight; bay’, see below). In the second variant, the suffix -no is a result of analogy, since, as can be seen from Map 1, -no toponyms in fact prevailed in West Pomerania until the 14th century (and still do).

5.4. The denotation of and explanation for *Jomna and *Jomna/no

Rudnicki (1936, pp. 66, 90) raises the question whether Zalew Szczeciński (Szczecin Lagoon) ever had an early Slavic name16 before it became known by the name of the town Szczecin, and considers it possible that the Scandinavian toponym *jóm, from Slavic jama, could have been this name. I second

---


16 Szczecin Bay is first mentioned in 1244 as ‘in ... aqua meatum habente aqua dicta Kele usque Stetyn, de Stetyn usque Ueckermünde et ab Ueckermünde usque ad aquam, que vulgariter Pene’ or ‘water between Kehle, Szczecin, Ueckermünde and Peene’ (PU 1, No. 428, p. 507).
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the proposal that the toponym *Jóm/*Jómr could be a Scandinavian variant of an early Slavic name for the Szczecin Lagoon (or, more likely, the Wielki Zalew (Great Lagoon), one of the two parts of Szczecin Lagoon, closest to the island of Wolin), as it fits perfectly into the overall picture of at Jómi – Jumne – Wolin relations.

The relationship between the forms *Jóma* and *Jómn/no* could be different. If the toponyms in question shared their denotation, *Jómn/no* could be either a later variant of *Jóma*, cf. Chelmno, a village, Szamotuly – Chelm (1396), Chelmno (1478); Borówna, a lake, Złotów – lacus duo, unus Borowo (1583–4), inter la. Borówna (1766–7) (Borek 1968, pp. 29, 83); or a parallel variant of *Jóma*, cf. Bělno (German Biehlen), a town, Hoyerswerda – Bylen, Byla (1529); Čermná, Klatovy – na vsi Čermné (1444), ves Czerma (1630) (Borek 1968, pp.

Map 1. Poland. The distribution of *-no* place-names before the 14th century. The map is taken from Rospond 1976, Map 6.

* = *-no* place-names – × = *-ne* place-names
It is possible that *Joma and *Jomna/no had different denotations and indicated a bay and an island/a piece of land, respectively. However, there is insufficient evidence either to support or to reject this proposal.

The explanation for *Joma, as well as for Jamno, the name of a lake in the gmina (district, commune) of Koszalin, could be connected with one of the meanings of the word *jama = *zatoka ‘bay, gulf’, suggested by Rudnicki (1936, p. 90).

The lake and the village of Jamno were first mentioned in 1278 (Jamno: German Jumund, a village and a lake, Powiat Koszaliński: Jamene 1278, in stagnum Jamene 1289 (Borek 1968, p. 88)). Today the lake is separated from the Baltic by a narrow sandbar approx. 600 m wide, but up to the 17th century it was navigable and served as a harbour for the town of Koszalin, as there was a passage through the bar (Jamieniński Nurt, which still exists, although sand periodically blocks the outflow). I believe that the lake could have been seen as a bay by early inhabitants and named ‘Jama. The name of the village, Jamno, was thus formed from that of the bay and later replaced it. In the same way, the toponym *Jomna/no could have been formed from the name of the bay *Joma, and denote the island of Wolin or part of it.

However, I have not been able to find any confirmation that in Polish or Pomeranian jama, like zatoka, means ‘bay’ (jama and zatoka ‘sinus’ are synonyms in the anatomical sense in Polish; Słownik, p. 132). In spite of this, I consider it quite possible that the toponym *Joma means – perhaps metaphorically – the ‘bay’, but more likely the toponyms *Joma and *Jomna have a semantic explanation connected with the meaning of Pom. *joma ‘a pit’.

‘The major parts of the two main sections of the [Szczecin] Lagoon are formed by a relatively flat and poorly differentiated bottom’; however, ‘diverse bottom topography is found in the northern part of the Great Lagoon where extensive sand banks ..., stretching for a few km into the lagoon (Wysok Krzecki, Mielizna Woliniska), are dissected by a trough-like depression 4–6.5 m deep’ (Osadczuk, Musielak & Bórowka 2007, pp. 90 ff.). In my view, the abrupt depression in the bottom of the Great Lagoon just a few kilometres off the southern tip of the island of Wolin could be the reason for naming the bay *Joma ‘the pit’.

5.5. Conclusions

All the place-name forms denoting Wolin in primary sources can undoubtedly be divided into two main groups: (1) at Jomi, Jumne, Jomne, Hynnisburg, Jomsborg, Jumpe, ath Jomune, af Jomni, Jomneta and (2) Livilni, Wulinensis civitas, Willin, Julin, Wolin, Wolin, Volin etc.
The coexistence of these two groups is explained by a difference in origin. The toponym Wolin was the original name of (and served exclusively to denote) the town. The forms at Jómi and Jumne are derived from *Jóma and *Jómma/no, which most likely go back to the appellative jóma and denoted the Great Lagoon, a part of Szczecin Lagoon. These toponyms were used by Scandinavians to name both the town of Wolin and the land around it. The authentic names of the Great Lagoon (*Jóma and *Jómma/no), which were preserved thanks to Arnórr jarlaskáld and Adam, disappeared from the Slavic onomasticon.

There are two base forms in Group 1, at Jómi and Jumne, which were most likely used in parallel by Scandinavians to refer to the town and the region of Wolin; all other forms are either spelling variations or compounds based on them. I have not carried out a detailed study of the Group 2 toponyms, but it seems that most of the forms are spelling variants of the base form Wolin (the form Willin 1140 still needs to be clarified, as does the question whether the author of Chronica Poloniae Maioris may have confused Wieleń with Wolin; see Table 3 and commentary there).

The names attested in primary sources suggest the following scenario for the development of the Group 1 base forms. (1) In the period when they were establishing trade with Wolin (10th–11th centuries), Scandinavians adopted the Slavic names for the Great Lagoon, *Jóma and *Jómma/no, which became a part of oral tradition. The declension of the names did not cause any difficulties; *Jóma is preserved in the dative in Arnórr jarlaskáld’s poetry (at Jómi), *Jómma/no in Adam’s Gesta (Jumne). (2) By the time the sagas were created (end of the 12th century), the genuine name of the bay had already been forgotten, and Wolin lost its status as a prosperous trading port owing to devastating Danish campaigns. As a result, saga authors had at their disposal only Arnórr jarlaskáld’s at Jómi in the dative (and, most likely, could not identify the nominative), and chroniclers Adam’s Jumne. (3) The late variants, Jomne, Hynnisburg, Jómsborg, Jumpne, atb Jomune, af Jomni, Jumneta, appeared for various reasons (spelling mistakes, the need for clearer denotation etc.).
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### Table 1. The transmission of the Group 1 place-names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place-name</th>
<th>Primary source</th>
<th>Text and reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | 1043    | *at Jómi* | Hrynhenda and Magnúsdrápa by Arnórr Borðarson jarlaskáld | Arn. Hryn. 12: ‘hæstan kynduð, hlenna þrystir, hjærta hjárnsaður at Jómi; hverg þorði hallir varða heiðr folk i víkri breiðu; búllungur, unnuð borgar-monnum hjortum eldi stalldræp hjortu’ (Skj B 1, p. 309)\(^7\)
|     |         |            |                | Arn. Magndr. 8: ‘Vann, þás Vinðr of minnir vápnhríð konungur, síðan; sveið ofám at Jómi illvirkja hræ stillir; búk dró bráðla steikðan blóðugr vargr af glóðum; rann á öskrið enn alfrekr bani hållar’ (Skj B 1, p. 313)\(^9\) |
| 2.  | 1072    | *Jumne*   | Magistri Adam Bremensis Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae pontificum II, XXII: ‘In cuius ostio, qua Scythicas alluit paludes, nobilissima civitas Jumne celeberrimam prestat stationem Barbaris et Grecis, qui sunt in circuitu. … Est sane maxima omnium, quas Europa claudit, civitaturn, quam incolunt Sclavi cum alis gentibus, Grecis et Barbaris’ (Adam, p. 79) |
| 3.  | earliest 1152, latest 1264 | *Jumne*   | Historia Norvegiae | De ortu regum: ‘Augmentabant enim ejus classem Norwegenses ac Dani, Gautones et Sclavi, qui cum illo in\(^10\) civitaturn Jumne, qua est firmissima inter Sclaviar urbes’ (HN, p. 113) |
| 4.  | c.1172  | *Jum(ne)ta, Vinnetta* | Helmoldi Presbyteri Bozoviensis Chronica Slavorum I, II: ‘De civitate Vinnetta’, ‘In cuius ostio, qua Balticum alluit pelagus, quondam fuit nobilissima civitas Jumnetta, prestans celeberrimam stacionem barbaris et Grecis, qui sunt in circuitu.’ (Helmold, pp. 7 f.) |
| 5.  | 1185–1189 | *Hynnisburgh* | Svenonis Aggonis Filii Brevis historia regum Dacie | VIII: ‘primus urbem fundasse dicitur, que Hynnisburg nuncupatur.’ (Svenonis, p. 119) |

---

\(^7\) ‘crasher of thieves, you kindled a towering blaze of fire south at Jóm. No wise dared they halls defend, the heathen host in the broad stronghold; royal one, you wrought in the townsmen, by bright flame, terror-struck hearts’. Transl. by Diana Whaley (1998, p. 116).

\(^9\) ‘the ruler singed not a few wrong-doers’ corpses at Jóm. A body swift-roasted the bloody wolf dragged from the embers; darted on unbaptised brows the most ravenous death of the hall’. Transl. by Whaley (1998, p. 120).

\(^10\) ‘At its [Oder] mouth, where it feeds the Scythian marshes, Jumne, a most noble city, affords a very widely known trading center for the barbarians and Greeks who live round about. … It is truly the largest of all the cities in Europe, and there live in it Slavs and many other peoples, Greeks and barbarians’ (Adam of Bremen, pp. 66 f.).

\(^11\) Lars Boje Mortensen, in the commentary to his edition of *Historia Norvegiae*, states: ‘There is no reason to insert in, as Storm does. The author of *HN* often makes use of a pure ablative without in’ (Historia Norvegiae, p. 145).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>c.1190</td>
<td>Ágríp af Nóregs konunga sogum</td>
<td>XIX, 1: ‘Hann [Óláfr Tryggvason] drygði víþa herskap baþi á Vendlandi ok á Flæmingialandi, á Englandi ok á Scotlandi, á Írlandi ok á morgom sjórom lýðom. Haþfi íþjuliga vetrseto sina á Vendlandi í borg þeirri, er hét Iómsborg.’ (Ágríp, pp. 20 f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>c.1190</td>
<td>Saga Olaf's konungar Tryggvasonar by Oddr Snorrason</td>
<td>11: ‘Oc með þessum sigir fæt Olaf aptr oc förði drotríngu gull oc silfr oc ægta gripi þat hava menn firir satt at þessi hafi verit Iomsborg er Olaf sat um oc menn villdu suktia hann oc var hann þyrgr íb. með lx manna.’ (Oddr, p. 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>Jómsvíkinga-drápa by Bjarni Kolbeinsson</td>
<td>Bbp. Jóms. 6: ‘Suðr frógum vérit sitja (seína gáðr) at Jómi (fogi ramir mik flaumi) þímm höfðinga snemna’ (Skj B 2, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>Fagrskinna</td>
<td>17: ‘(H)araldr konungr Gorms sunr haríade a Vinlannd. oc le þar gera borg mikla er hastir at Iome. oc er sub org calað söðan Iomsborg.’ 22: ‘Olaf konungr fær mik stóri af þessum þingi fe. oc allt eignabek hann þat er han villdi. oc olle þjói mest líðavíða Astríðr dottor Bírizzlafrs konungs er ate Sigvalde iarll at Iome.’ 41: ‘vinna aftar iarls riki þat er Dana konungr hafð at Iome.’ (Fsk. 1902–03, pp. 80, 115, 208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>Jómsborg, at Jómi</td>
<td>Jómsvíkinga saga 23: ‘Pat let hann [Bírizzlafr] ok fylgja þessu heimboð, at hann bauð at gefa honum to Pálnaþóki eitt fylki eða riki af landi sino, þat er heitir at Jóme.’ (Knyt., p. 179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13th c.</td>
<td>Ægríp af sogu danakonunga</td>
<td>‘varð Harald konungr sár ok féði at Jómsborgar í Vinland.’ (ÁgrípSDan., p. 328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>c.1230</td>
<td>Heimskringla by Snorri Sturluson</td>
<td>Magn., 24: ‘En er hann kom þar, spreði hann þar þin endi at Vendlandi, at Vinþr höfðu hörfit undan lýðin við hann í Jómsborg; þar höfðu Dana-konungar haft iarls-ríki mikit, höfu þeir Jómsborg at uphaði, ok var þat orðit allstyrkt vigi.’ (Hkr. 3, p. 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>c.1260–70</td>
<td>Knýtlinga saga</td>
<td>1: ‘Harald Gormsson var tekinn til konungs í Danmark eptir frøður sinn. … haði hann mikst iarlsríki í Vinlandi. Hann le þar gera Jómsborg’ (Knyt., p. 179)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.

| Table 2. Jumne in Adam’s Gesta\(^{21}\) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| II, 22 (79) | Uimne | Jumne, Jumne, Uimne | Jumne, Julinum |
| II, 22 (80) | Uimne | Jummem, Uimme, Jumnoe | Jummem, Uimmem |
| II, 22 (81) | Uimmem | Jummem, Jummem | Jummem |
| II, 27 (87) | Jumne (Uimne?) | Jumme, Jumnoe | Julinum |
| schol. 56 (137) | Jummem | Jummem | Jummem |
| schol. 121 (245) | Jummem, Jumme | Jumme | Jumme |
| IV, 20 (249) | Jummem, Jummen | Jummem | Jummem |

\(^{21}\) This table is taken from Labuda 1964, p. 187. The signs A, A1 etc. refer to different text versions.
Table 3. The transmission of the Group 2 place-names in the 11th–14th centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place-name</th>
<th>Primary source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1012–1018</td>
<td>Livilni</td>
<td>Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi chronicon</td>
<td>Thietmari, p. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>in civitate Wulinensi, Wullen</td>
<td>Rom; Innocentius episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 30, pp. 32 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>Venceslaus castellanus de Wulyn</td>
<td>Treptow; Kasimirus Pomorarum princeps</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 66, pp. 84 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>Venceslaus castellano Iulieni</td>
<td>Ueckermünde; Condradus episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 74 (see 51a), p. 97 (56 f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>Wenceslaus castellanus de Wulyn</td>
<td>Boguszlaus princesc Pomeranorum</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 97, pp. 156 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>Wulyn cum foro, Wulyn dictur</td>
<td>Rom; Clemens episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 111, pp. 145 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>before 1223</td>
<td>circa Velen (Welen, Wylen, Veylen, Vyelen)²³</td>
<td>Magistri Vincentii Chronica Polonorum</td>
<td>MPH 2, p. 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Sulistrig et Dobeslau de Wulyn</td>
<td>A. Pomeranie ducissa</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 126, pp. 167 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>item in provincia Wulyn²⁴ villam Drammine</td>
<td>Rom; Celestinus episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 127, pp. 169 ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²² Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma (1991, p. 88) have 1088 for Ebbo’s and 1124 for Herbord’s Vita Ottonis (the years when the events are believed to have taken place; however, the chronicle was written after Otto’s death). Udolph (2007, p. 218) follows them, as does Laut (2005, p. 22), who ascribes Herbord’s work to Heribert von Fritzlar, a German poet (c.1180–after 1217).

²³ In 1108, while at war with Gnyewomir, Boleslav captured Widen, a town on the river Notec, not Wolyn (VCh, p. 216). In my view, Wincenz Kadlubek’s Velen clearly denotes Widen, while the author of Chronica Maioris seems to confuse Welen with Wolyn (op. cit., p. 216). The authors who considered Velen to be a form of the name Wolyn (to mention just a few: Lehr-Spławski 1935, Rzetelska-Feleszko & Duma 1991 etc.) were misled by the references in MPH 2 (p. 994). Velen in Chronica Polonorum by Wincenc Kadlubek cannot be seen as a form of the name Wolyn; the Wol-variants found in some copies of Chronica Maioris in accounts of the siege of Wielen (MPH 2, p. 501) are the result of the author’s mistake.

²⁴ Rudnicki (1936, p. 68) assumes the toponym provincia Wolyn to denote the island of Wolin. However, although the village of Drammin (Polish Dramino) belongs to the gmina (district, commune) of Wolin, it is situated on the mainland, some 17 km south-west of Kamień Pomorski. See 4.2 on the denotation of provincia Wolin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Province/Region</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1190–1208</td>
<td>Julinum, Julinensis provincia, Juemensis provincia</td>
<td>Saxonis Grammatici Historia Danica</td>
<td>Saxonis</td>
<td>pp. 379 (Jumensis), 859 (Julinensis), 480, 490, 491 ff. (Julinum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>in provincia Volin villam</td>
<td>Grobe: Sigunius episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 171, pp. 212 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>Wolin cum foro, que Wolin dicitur</td>
<td>Rom: Seguino episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 177 (see 178a), p. 222 (223 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>Wolin</td>
<td>Wollin; Condradus episcopus</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 283, pp. 345 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Wolyn</td>
<td>Wollin; Barnen et Wartilas dux Slavorum duces</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 412, p. 490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Gherardus de Woldin</td>
<td>Stettin; Marianna ducissa</td>
<td>PU 1, No. 414, p. 492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>in villa Wolin</td>
<td>Hermannus Cominensis episc.</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>in Wolin</td>
<td>Wartilas d. Diminensis</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Wolin</td>
<td>Barnim d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>in Wolin</td>
<td>Zwerin</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>opidum nostrum Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>Barnim d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>in civitate Wolyn</td>
<td>Buggeslaus d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>Wolyn</td>
<td>Buggeslaus d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>in civitate Wolin</td>
<td>Zarnowe; Buggeslaus d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>civitatem Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>Stetin; Buggeslaus d. Slavorum</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>burgensibus in Wolin</td>
<td>Nientrebetow; Buggeslaus d. Slavorum et Cassubie</td>
<td>PU 2, No. 1397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>in civitate nostra Wolin (5 times)</td>
<td>Vikrundt; Buggeslaus d. Slavorum et Cassubie</td>
<td>PU 3, No. 1453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>opidi Wolin (3 times), Wolyn (twice)</td>
<td>Wollin</td>
<td>PU 3, No. 1478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>castrum Wolin</td>
<td>(PU 3, No. 1667)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>civitate Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>Barnyn et Otto duces Slavorum et Cassubie</td>
<td>PU 3, No. 1680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>civitatem Wolin cum terra adiacente</td>
<td>Stetin; Buggeslaus d. Slavorum et Cassubie</td>
<td>PU 3, No. 1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>villa Darjbebanz, sitam in terra Wolin</td>
<td>Buguzlaus (PU 3, No. 1806)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>monasterii in Wolin (3 times)</td>
<td>Camyn; Petrus epics. Camyn. (PU 3, No. 1812)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>in Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>Camyn; Bugzlaus (PU 3, No. 1871)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>consules civitatis Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>(PU 3, No. 1903)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>in Wolin (twice)</td>
<td>Wollin; Bugeslaus (PU 3, No. 1904)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Wolin (3 times)</td>
<td>Wollin; Bugeslaus (PU 3, No. 1904)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>Wolin</td>
<td>Wollin; Bugeslaus (PU 3, No. 1905)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>Wolin (4 times)</td>
<td>Wollin; Bugeslaus (PU 3, No. 1907)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Wolin (3 times)</td>
<td>Bugeslaus d. Slauorum et Cassubie (PU 3, No. 1953)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>nec portum Wolin</td>
<td>Otto et Wartislaus Slavie, Cassubie, Pomeranie duces (PU 6, No. 3530)</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Anno d, MCLXX obiit Bugiczlaus Lenticie, Pomeranie, Stetinensis d... quem beatissimus presul Otto personaliter baptisavit; Julin sedem episcopalem</td>
<td>Kronika p. t. Genealogia de 1347</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>1464–1472</td>
<td>a.d. millesimo centicimo XLV obit ... Julin sedem episcopalem</td>
<td>Cronica de ducatu Stetinensi</td>
<td>Rudnicki 1936, p. 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>13th–14th c. (VCh, pp. 12 ff.)</td>
<td>aliud vero Julin quod nunc Wolin dicitur (Julin q. n. Welen dicitur); Weluucez (Welmicz, Welmiesz, Waluucez), quod alias Julin dicebatur; in castro Wolinensi (Welinensi, Weluuncz), Wolin (Welin, Welon).</td>
<td>Chronica Poloniae Maioris (Chronicon Boguphali Episcopi)</td>
<td>MPH 2, pp. 476, 481, 499, 501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>13th c.</td>
<td>apud Iulovum</td>
<td>Compendium Saxonis</td>
<td>Compendium Saxonis, pp. 353, 387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 The dating and authorship of the *Chronica Poloniae Maioris* are still disputed. Since the edition of Sommersberg (Boguphali Episcopi), the chronicle has been ascribed to Boguchwał, an archbishop of Poznań, and Godysław Pasko, a *kustosz* of Poznań, who continued Boguchwał's work; *Chronica Maioris* was dated to their lifetime, the 13th c. Since the second half of the 19th c. the chronicle has been dated to the 13th–14th c., on the basis of the text structure, sources analysis etc.: Jan of Czarnkow (Jancone de Czarnekow) is one of the proposed authors (VCh, pp. 12 ff.).

26 See note 23.
On the etymology of at Jómi, Jumne and Jómsborg

Abbreviations

Arn. Hryn. = Hrynhenda by Arnórr Þórðarson jarlaskáld
Arn. Magndr. = Magnúsrápa by Arnórr Þórðarson jarlaskáld
Bjbp. Jóms. = Jómsvíkingadrápa by Bjarni Kolbeinsson
cp. = compare
Eil. = Eilífr Goðrúnarson
g = gotisch
Gesta = Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum
gpom. = gemeinpomoranisch
Heilag. = Heilagra manna sögur
Iv. = Ívarr Ingimundarson
Kash. = Kashubian
Lars. AM 645 = Isländska handskriften No 645

Arn. Hryn. = Hrynhenda by Arnórr Þórðarson jarlaskáld
Arn. Magndr. = Magnúsrápa by Arnórr Þórðarson jarlaskáld
Bjbp. Jóms. = Jómsvíkingadrápa by Bjarni Kolbeinsson
cp. = compare
Eil. = Eilífr Goðrúnarson
g = gotisch
Gesta = Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum
gpom. = gemeinpomoranisch
Heilag. = Heilagra manna sögur
Iv. = Ívarr Ingimundarson
Kash. = Kashubian
Lars. AM 645 = Isländska handskriften No 645

lib. = liber
Magn. = Magnúss saga göða
Magn.o.Har. = Magnúss saga hins göða ok Haralds Saga harðraða
Mark. = Markús Skeggjason
OTryg = Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar
Pl. = Plácitússrápa
Pom. = Pomeranian
PU = Pommersches Urkundenbuch
Ragn. = Ragnarssaga (verse af)
Rómv. = Rómverisasaga
s. = saga
schol. = scholium
Sigv. = Sigvatr Þórðarson
Skapti = Skapti Þóroddson
Slaw. = slawisch
SMagn. = Saga Magnusar konungs ens göda