

The island is but twelve miles by four, but in that small area history seethes, a history moulded by the geographical position of a group of islands torn between ecclesiastical and historical links with Normandy, and a deep and abiding loyalty to the English Crown, a loyalty which began with John's loss of Normandy in 1204, an historical fact which put the islands, and Jersey most of all, in the forefront of battle.

And so, with my friend I continue the work, since my husband's very sudden death in 1979. Every name or fact, new to us, which comes our way, is recorded, and we hope to incorporate this material in an appendix to his work if and when it is published. It has been a most interesting project, sometimes really exciting, sometimes disappointing, but in the long run deeply rewarding.

## NOTE

\*This is a shortened version of a paper given at the Twelfth Conference of the Council for Name Studies at Keele, March 23rd 1980.

JOAN STEVENS

St. Mary, Jersey

## THE SURVIVAL OF ROMANO-BRITISH TOPONYMY\*

Nothing ambitious is offered here, simply a series of comments which may shed a little oblique light. They arise in part from the work of Professor Rivet and myself on The Place-names of Roman Britain (PNRB), although within that book it was no part of our purpose to deal systematically with post-Roman survival of names.

The problem of the survival or extinction of Romano-British toponymy is much less than a purely philological one. In considering the linguistic situation of south and east Britain in the 5th and 6th centuries, the period after Roman authority was withdrawn and during which Germanic invaders and settlers displaced speakers of Latin and British over large areas, the philological fact is seen to be utterly dependent upon changes which only the historian and the archaeologist can explain. The historian depends for possibly historical data on a few brief references in chronicles, and must make what he can of the literary-pious text of Gildas and of the part-legendary materials in the early sections of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the pedigrees and regnal lists, etc. He further depends upon Bede who wrestled, honourably but not always successfully, with the same intractable materials and perhaps others not now extant. What is the poor philologist to do when he finds such serious works as Leslie Alcock's Arthur's Britain (1971) and John Morris's The Age of Arthur (1973) brought under devastating attack by David Dumville for their incomprehension or misuse of sources?<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it seems that archaeological techniques have made great progress in recent years in recognizing both late Romano-British and early Germanic presences, either by identifying habitations or in the typology and dating of pottery and other artefacts. We can hope to learn much more in the near future about e.g. late Romano-British Christianity, the state of some towns in the 5th century, perhaps about the dating of early Germanic settlement, and so on. Place-name studies will benefit accordingly, and it is a pleasure to pay tribute to Mrs Gelling's work on, for example, wīc-hām names, in which so many strands both philological and archaeological are drawn together.<sup>2</sup> There is an admirable running commentary on these matters, with much reference to the work of Continental scholars and to Continental sites, by Mrs Hawkes in her section 'Post-Roman and Pagan Anglo-Saxon' of the survey 'British Antiquity', annually in the Archaeological Journal.

The scope of 'Romano-British toponymy' goes far beyond what is directly recorded for us. From all sources up to 410, including late texts such as the Ravenna Cosmography (early 8th century), Professor Rivet and I collected some 460 names, including not only habitation-names but also regional and ethnic names, river-names, etc., which of course have to be considered together in a mutually informative system. Some names are still missing for relatively important places, such as Lancaster fort and vicus, many among minor towns, and a few of major rivers such as the Medway. To this total of about 460, covering most of the 'major' toponymy, one must add notionally thousands of names unrecorded in any ancient text or inscription. Every river, every lake and forest and hill, had its name, surely 100% Celtic. Some of these we can deduce confidently, e.g. \*Brigantia (strictly, perhaps, a divine name) > R. Brent of Middlesex (compare R. Braint of Anglesey). Every small settlement had its name, perhaps 95% Celtic, allowing a few named in Latin along the roads (like the recorded Ad Ansam). Every villa had a name, usually that of the owner or of an early owner, and of the 600 villas it is likely that most would have been named in Latin because they belonged to romanized gentry, in line with the four villa-names we do know (\*Albiniano, Anicetis, Sulloniacis, Villa Faustini).

While one's principal interest remains in the 'major' toponymy, and in what happened to it in the Germanic settlement, the 'minor' must not be relegated, for it is important still in the north and west, and not negligible in the south and east. We can often guess at elements in the original British names through early A-S forms and by analogy with better-known names, with names in Welsh, and so on. Thus Micheldever, Andover, and Candover (all Hants), and Dovercourt (Essex), all contain British \*dūbro- 'water, stream', as does the recorded Dubris > Dover, and this has long been recognized. Sometimes one can guess the complete ancient name, e.g. Wendover (Bucks) < \*uindo-dūbra 'bright stream' (or possibly 'clear, i.e. chalky, stream'). Kentford (Suffolk) is on the River Kent, whose British name is not recorded, but which was plainly another Romano-British Cunetio river exactly comparable to recorded Cunetione (a habitation-name), Mildenhall on the R. Kennet in Wiltshire. We can also accept with assurance some names recorded by Bede and others. Bede's Domnoc or Domnoc (Dunwich, Suffolk) is clearly based on British \*dubno- \*dumno- 'deep'; and Tunnacaestir, which Bede explains eponymously as named after an abbot 'Tunna', includes the British river-name Ituna as in the Eden rivers of Cumbria and Fife, the name then being that of a Roman fort or Romano-British settlement on one of these Eden rivers.

Here I become more controversial, and venture some mildly partisan observations about both linguistic and scholarly processes, because they affect our view of the nature and extent of the notional Romano-British 'minor' toponymy, and its survival. Students of the place-names of England have often been rather exclusively Anglicists, Anglo-Saxonists, Germanists. Of course the great proportion of the modern toponymy of English is Germanic, not only in present nature but in origin too. But I think there has been a lack of open-mindedness about possible Romano-British survivals in ways that may be, for one reason or another, concealed.

Myres remarked long ago that "It is, of course, highly probable ... that many place-names now to all appearances thoroughly Teutonic are in reality basically Celtic, and owe their present form to popular substitution of a Germanic for a similar-sounding Celtic word. Thus, if we did not know that the Celtic Eburācum [more precisely, Celtic \*Eburācon, R-B Eburācum - C.S.] lay behind such early forms of 'York' as Eoforwic, the name would almost certainly have been derived by students of place-names from the Saxon word for a 'boar', and its Celtic origin would have been very naturally denied."<sup>3</sup> Alcock in 1971 has much the same argument, using as his example Rochester (R-B Durobrivae), the Hrofaescaestrae of the 8th century being explained by Bede as named after one 'Hrof', leader of the Germanic settlers there. Alcock concludes: "Very many English place-names have the form 'personal or kin name + village, town, or settlement'. It is then very tempting to believe that the person or the kindred founded the settlement, and since the personal or kin name is English, so must the settlement be. The example of Hrof and his fort or walled town warns us that this need not be so. It may well be that apparent absence of settlement-names derived from Primitive Welsh is proof only that the Englishman's traditional inability to pronounce a foreign language correctly is a trait of very long standing" (194-95). We need not go so far as Alcock's parting joke, for these processes are common, perhaps universal, wherever languages are in contact. In PNRB we identified several folk-etymologies or assimilations of British names to Latin elements by speakers of Latin in Britain, notably Cataractonium (in which Latin cataracta is secondary) and Cambodunum (recorded once, probably twice, as Campos-, with assimilation to campus). Certainly the possibility should be recognized that such folk-etymologies and assimilations may lie concealed in many seemingly English names. We know about the process in the cases of York and Rochester, and others such as Salisbury (Sorvio-, of unknown meaning in British, taken into A-S with

assimilation to searu 'armour'), but we have no means of knowing in perhaps hundreds of other instances. Where we do have a record that a British element was used in ancient toponymy, or was so used in older Welsh or even in modern Welsh, the possibility that it lies concealed should be borne in mind. I take two examples for detailed mention, confessing that although I am sure the general argument of Myres and Alcock is sound, the demonstration in particular cases involves special pleading.

Chetwode (Berks) is Cétwuda in 949, and is agreed by Ekwall and others to derive from British \*cēto- 'wood'; so do Chatham and Chattenden in Kent, and Cheadle in Cheshire. In ancient toponymy we have Letocetum (> Lichfield) 'grey wood', and of course coed commonly in Welsh toponymy. This word must have been used all over England for many kinds of wood and for some settlements. Hence it is at least possible that when we find in Shropshire (Shropshire, well to the west) Chetwynd and Chetton, these too have a concealed British \*cēto- rather than the A-S personal name Ceatta or Cetta as the standard authorities say. Early forms help, and may give counter-indications, but when records begin with DB, as in these two instances, that is already several centuries too late to hint at the process of folk-etymology and substitution. Even when the earliest recorded form, that of DB, hints at the personal name Ceatta, as it does for Chetwynd, this may be an illusion. One recalls the A-S mania for eponymous solutions, as when Bede explains Hrofaescaestrae as derived from the hero Hrof, or when the ASC entry for 501 offers us Portsmouth as a foundation owed to that splendid leader 'Port'. If writers of scholarly intelligence offer such things, we can hardly guess at how widespread the practice must have been among ordinary illiterate folk devoid of linguistic awareness.

A similar case is offered by British \*crōco- 'mound, tumulus, hill', well-documented in ancient toponymy here and abroad. It seems to be recognized in Crich (Derbys.), Crichel (Dorset), Cricklade (Wilts.), Cricklewood (Midx.), Crook (Devon), and others. It could be - Ekwall agrees that "it is just possible" - that some of the numerous Churchill names contain this British \*crōco- element, early assimilated (with metathesis) to A-S cyrice 'church' and with unconscious tautology as often (\*crūc-hyll; compare Penhill, and the triple Pendle Hill). This idea is supported, with topographical detail in particular cases, by Mrs Gelling (Signposts, 138-40). Some quantitative survey of common elements in recorded Romano-British, and also early Welsh, Cornish and Breton toponymy,<sup>4</sup> might have a certain predictive value for further conjectures of this kind.

When this paper was given in an early version, exception was very properly taken to this line of argument by a noted authority who observed that, from the Germanist's point of view, one can study only the evidence actually available, that is the forms of names recorded as A-S items by Anglo-Saxons in charters, histories, etc., or by Norman scribes in DB. One concedes the point, and expects A-S specialists to assign A-S roots when there is no firm evidence against them. Yet it may not suffice, in linguistic studies, to be too rigorously scientific and insufficiently humane, by which I mean that a place has to be left for human error, foible, and misunderstanding. We leave such a place within one language (notably for processes of analogy), and with greater cause must leave one too when languages are in contact. My plea is simply for recognition of possibilities, no more; for recognition that a portion of R-B 'minor' toponymy, apparently lost, may lie concealed and transformed. The likelihood of this is enhanced when, with disconcerting frequency, the A-S element perceived by the specialists is a personal name not actually documented as having existed. They should remember that great hero 'Port', and tremble.

It must be made clear that there is nothing necessarily wilful or specially ignorant about folk-etymology and substitution; nor is it likely that sophisticated humour was involved in our cases as it is in 'trick-cyclist' for psychiatrist or 'sparrow grass' for asparagus. At the moment of contact between Germanic settlers and Romano-Britons we have to envisage a purely oral, not written contact, and a fleeting one at that, which gave no scope for inquiry about meanings in most instances. An element of an unknown language is assimilated to the nearest sound-equivalent in the language of the incomers, and this is all that is needed for minimal identification of a place. It matters not a jot to the incomers that none of their number is actually called Ceatta (at Chetwynd) or that there is no church visible at some of the places now called Churchill.

At times there was not folk-etymology or substitution, a process of unconscious error, but accurate translation, though this must have been relatively rare and although, again, we usually lack the materials to document it. A clear case is Bannovalium, the small R-B town at Horncastle in Lincolnshire. In British \*banno- was 'horn, spur (of land)', in this case where two rivers join, and A-S Hornecastre (DB) translates the first element. It would be too much to suppose a merely coincidental reference to the same topographical feature. If there was translation, there are presumably implications of friendly contact between Romano-Britons and Germanic speakers, perhaps at the very early stage when such towns received small garrisons of Germanic mercenary troops in the later 4th century. Somewhat more to be expected is that Bovium should eventually be translated 'Cowbridge' (Glam.), not directly, but via medieval Welsh Pont y fon (later reinterpreted Pontfaen 'stone bridge', the modern name); it was in English Covbrug from the 13th century.

A few names which are anciently recorded may survive in forms not hitherto recognized. There are several in the north, where with Celtic continuity and some Latin memories preserved by the Church, survival is natural enough.

To the south of Carlisle lies Brocavum, now Brougham [bru:m]. This was a fort with a substantial civil vicus, in lands - Cumbria - with a continuing R-B culture; being close to Carlisle, the community was possibly Christian by 400, and later the place had a small Celtic monastic community. When newly recorded the place was Bruham, 1130, Broham, 1176, explained by Ekwall as Burg-ham, the burg in question being the Roman fort. At some stage, certainly, there was assimilation to burh, but it might have been quite a late one. However, as A.H. Smith remarks in EPNS Westmorland (1967), "A-S burh is not as a rule found in this metathesized form [i.e., bru-] so regularly or so early". If Brocavum (British \*Brocaŷon) did continue, we need no metathesis. Smith adds: "The first element of Brougham cannot be derived from Brocavum, as with lenition that would have given Brog- for which Old English would have substituted Broc-". Certainly; but what if lenited Brog- was understood as Burh- by Anglo-Saxons? Or what if a Christian community near Carlisle, and then the monks, had preserved a memory of the R-B name as Latin? We cannot trace the stages in detail, and any normal process has certainly been disturbed; but it seems perverse to deny the possibility that Brocavum (first syllable only? Or does -ham represent -um, -on?) survives as Brougham. The possibility is supported by Mr Hogg (1964)<sup>5</sup> and, by implication, by Dr Higham in 1978;<sup>6</sup> also, though without commitment to it, it is discussed by Mrs Gelling (Signposts, 55-56). A second case in the same region is that of Bravoniacum, the fort at Kirkby Thore, whose actual site is called 'The Burwens' in a first record of 1777. A.H. Smith derives this, naturally, from A-S burgaesn 'burial-place', found commonly as Borwains, Burrow, Borrans, etc. There has admittedly been assimilation to this A-S word, but to my ear at least Bravon-

> Burwen(s) does not tax credulity.

A third northern case gives virtual certainty of continuity. In Northumberland is the R. Coquet and several related names. It was Cocwud(a) about 1050, and Ekwall explains that this 'cock-wood' was originally the name of a forest, that of the river being by back-formation. However, on a new reading of the Ravenna Cosmography, we are given Coccuveda as a Northumbrian river-name, with a sense 'red appearance, red-seeming'; indeed, the river is "filled with red porphyritic detritus from the Cheviot". This R-B name, with perfect Celtic etyma, continues as modern Coquet, without need to bring in any back-formation. The 1050 and other records of Coc-wuda are simply A-S folk-etymologies, and not ones that became wholly established, since the river is not now called 'Cockwood River'.

A fourth case, in the south, is more dubious. Ekwall derives Silchester from A-S \*siele, \*sele 'sallow-copse'. Mrs Gelling puts it differently (EPNS Berkshire, III): "Sil- may be from the substitution of OE sele 'hall' or \*siele 'willow-copse' for Calleva, and this is perhaps not out of the question, though it did not seem sufficiently convincing to justify the inclusion of Silchester on Map II" [of R-B names surviving in the county]. However, -chester is nowhere else compounded with sele or with a botanical term, but it is frequently attached to the first syllable of a R-B name. Moreover, although the site was long abandoned and was virgin for the excavators of the 19th century, it did have some continued occupation from R-B times into the 6th century, and as an important road-junction could be expected to have some use for surviving Romano-Britons and incoming Saxons. If modern Sil- does represent part of Calleva (British \*calli- 'wood'), it is hard to explain phonologically; in DB the place is Silcestre, but as Crawford pointed out in 1949, other medieval records have Cil-.

The temptation to perceive possible continuity wherever there is a remote resemblance between ancient and modern forms must be resisted, of course. Mr Norman Scarfe in his excellent book The Suffolk Landscape (1972) hankers, without argument, after the continuity of R-B Combretovium as Coddenham (it is agreed that the places are the same), and of Camboricum - properly Camboritum - as Cavenham (in PNRB we identify Camboritum as Lackford, not far away). But early forms give not the slightest support for this, being respectively Codenham and Canauatham (for Cauanatham), in DB.

Sometimes irregular phonetic processes, rarely admitted in the thinking of the authorities, should be taken into account. Binchester, a fort with vicus in Co. Durham, was R-B Vinovia or Vinovium, of uncertain meaning in British. Ekwall says that Binchester perhaps has as its first element A-S binn 'manger', later also 'stall', adding that "The old fort may have been used as a shelter for cattle." However, it seems natural to think that Bin- could represent the first syllable of Vinovia. It is certain that b and v were distinct in British, and also in the Latin of Britain on the whole. Initial Celto-Latin v (y) was taken into A-S as W-, so that Vinovia should > \*Winchester. Professor Jackson allows that "At most, influence of A-S binn on \*Win-ceaster might be postulated". To show how continuity could have happened one has to note that inscriptions show the fort to have been garrisoned at one time by Frisians, presumably Germanic, but also by Vettones, cavalry from a Celtic tribe who lived between the Tagus and Duero in Lusitania. In the Latin of Hispania, confusion of b/v was early and constant (Felix gens, cuius vivere bibere est ...). It happens that we have a precise proof of this in the case of the Vettones: Pliny says (NH XXV.46) that they discovered the medicinal and magical properties of a plant and gave their name to it, vettonica, now betonica, betony, with b-. Pliny names the tribe with their correct v-, and their plant also, but evidently their spoken Latin had b-, and

with this b- the plant-name passed into general Latin usage. At the Durham fort the three inscriptions left by the unit also have v- in correct classical form; but one distinguished member of the tribe, Flavius Vetto, centurion of the 20th Legion and in acting command of the 6th Cohort of Nervians, left his name on an altar to Victoria at Rough Castle, on the Antonine Wall, spelling it Betto (RIB 2144). There is thus reason to think that the garrison in Durham pronounced R-B Vinovia as \*Binovia (or \*Binobia), and that this is what passed to later settlers in the area as Bin(chester). Association of the first syllable with -chester surely increases the likelihood of such continuity. The next station up the road is Lanchester, Langcestr' in 1196, i.e. 'long ...' Possibly the settlement attached to the fort was 'long', that is, strung out in a ribbon development, but the fort itself must have been square or rectangular. Its R-B name was Longovicium, probably built on British \*longo- 'ship', perhaps in some emblematic sense. One may suggest that this, misinterpreted by Latin speakers as though it were the Latin adjective longus, was passed in translation to Germanic speakers for their Langcestr'. Here again we have continuity involving an error, but error of the kind that abounds in the history of languages.

Further disturbance to strict phonological processes may come from learned intrusion. The name \*Coriosopitum (as tentatively restored in PNRB) is represented by both Corchester (site of the fort) and Corbridge (the town). It has been pointed out that in popular development this first syllable should > \*Cher-. Learned influence, that is an accurate oral or written memory of the ancient name, has retarded or reversed popular development (the most spectacular instance I know is in Spain: Emerita (Augusta) > Mérida, still half-learned, for the good reason that if popular it would > \*Mierda). In Northumbria the learned influence would be that of the Church, perhaps specifically from nearby Hexham Abbey (founded 673). Another important case is that of the R. Severn, Sabrina. This has S- in Anglo-Saxon, though if borrowed from early Welsh it should have been \*Hafren, for the s>h process in British was completed by the late 6th century. Professor Jackson's explanation of the anomaly is naturally to be respected (LHEB, 516 ff.), but it is simpler to suppose that the name of this important river was known in Latin ecclesiastical tradition, both British and eventually Saxon, and that initial S- was maintained for this reason; the name is after all present in Gildas, Sabrina, and Bede followed him, using the river to state the limits of an episcopal see.

There is finally one purely linguistic aspect on which there seems to have been little comment (but see Signposts, 54-55). Although one does find a few cases of R-B names still represented some centuries later in reasonably complete form,<sup>7</sup> in many instances in which a name was taken into A-S usage, and survives, only a first syllable was retained. In part the reason is presumably a mechanical one: if -ceaster or -wic or -burh were added to the full R-B name the stress stayed on, or moved to, the first syllable of the old name, and the intervening syllable(s) would be lost naturally. Thus R-B Mamucium (British \*Mammūcīon) was recorded as Mameceaster in 923, and erosion of the unstressed syllable had already taken place. So too with Brancaster, Mancetter, Richborough, Wroxeter, and others. Moreover, since we find R-B Durovernum (Canterbury) represented as early as 604 as Dor-wic-caestre, we can see that erosion of the four-syllable original had taken place in quite a short time, under pressure of added -wic-caestre. It is true, of course, that it is not enough to look at the official (near-classical) Latin forms in which R-B names are recorded for us; in spoken Latin, some erosion of unstressed and final syllables had taken place, probably, before the end of Imperial rule, in British rather later. But it can still be suggested that the process was one which stepped outside phonological rules: the Anglo-Saxons found the compounded and polysyllabic R-B names 'too much of a mouthful', and by

convention took the first syllable only, all that was necessary for identification. The process is then akin to such shortenings as colloquial Brom for Birmingham, Chi for Chichester, or services' usage Alex for Alexandria, Gib for Gibraltar. Although I have said that in a few instances learned influences should be borne in mind, these could not apply until after the spread of Christianity and literacy in the 7th century, and most transfers of names must have occurred orally, to Anglo-Saxons in their illiterate and pagan phase when no considerations of 'correctness' can have come into the matter.

Having pleaded for a certain open-mindedness which will take account of foibles and variability in linguistic processes, I think it important to recognize that in name-survival, no general pattern is discernible with regard to type of place or to geographical area (though naturally chances of survival increase as one goes west and north, and river-names are in a special category).<sup>8</sup> Each case depends upon circumstances, and usually we do not know these in detail. To observe that the civitas-capitals Noviomagus and Ratae did not hand on their names, but that the minor road-station Spinæ (not so very far west) did, is to illustrate the problem; for to suppose desertion of the sites of what became Chichester and Leicester, and a contrasting continuity of population at Speen, is obviously unwarranted. The Germanic invaders and settlers, illiterate and pagan, were not only relatively unconcerned about taking over names in any 'correct' form once minimal identification had been achieved, but were unconcerned too in another way. They, after all, were not going to learn Latin or British, and were not proposing to take over in running order the full administration of a province with continuing romanitas, all of which is in notable contrast to the attitude of, for example, the Visigoths in Spain, allies of the Imperium, Christians already - even if of a heretical sort - and apparently already Latin-speaking to some extent. In England, even the settlers' perception of categories of places seems to have been hazy in the extreme, as can be seen from their usage of generic terms.

Anglo-Saxon ceaster was borrowed from Latin castra at an early stage, and from Latin speakers in Britain. It was not borrowed across the Rhine at a pre-migration stage, since it does not appear as a loanword in any other Germanic language. Already, in later Latin, the semantic range of the word was considerable, since one finds castrum applied in Gaul to military and civil sites, also ecclesiastical centres,<sup>9</sup> and in north and north-west Spain castro is applied to villages and even to long-abandoned hill-forts (though probably only by learned revival). In Britain the Anglo-Saxons seem to have applied ceaster to almost any Roman remains of an inhabited or habitable kind, even using the word alone if such remains were 'par excellence a ceaster' or 'the only such remains in the neighbourhood', as when designating the Caisters of Norfolk, Lincolnshire, and Northamptonshire, Rochester for a time in the 7th century, and eventually the Chester of Cheshire. Apart from military applications (both on the Saxon Shore - Brancaster, Portchester - and on Hadrian's Wall), the term takes in everything from coloniae (Gloucester, Colchester) and civitas-capitals (Chichester, Leicester, etc.) down to small settlements whose R-B name we do not even know, such as Casterton (Rutland) and Alcester (Warwicks.), and even a villa such as Woodchester (Gloucs.). Mrs Gelling analyses senses and applications (Signposts, 151-53). Alcock suggested that because R-B towns in the 4th century were often powerfully defended by massive walls with ballista platforms, they were in this respect indistinguishable from Saxon Shore forts, both being doubtless castra in common usage;<sup>10</sup> and since Germanic mercenaries helped to garrison both types of habitation, town and fort, they would have learned an already confusing usage.



Latin vicus was also borrowed from Latin speech in Britain, and applied as wīc to a wide range of habitations (as also in Latin abroad: Vich, Vigo, etc.). Wīc compounded is often applied to places which are sure to be new Germanic settlements, but the wīc-hām compound studied by Mrs Gelling is shown to have been applied to surviving settlements of Romano-Britons, for in late Latin usage vicus could, both administratively and colloquially, apply to these small rural settlements as well as to the civilian settlements at the forts, and to towns up to the not inconsiderable importance of Water Newton (Durobrivae<sup>2</sup> in PNRB) and Catterick (Bede appears to continue Roman administrative parlance in writing of vicum Cataractam).<sup>11</sup> In all this a further fact is to be noted. The numerous wīc-hām names, without further compounding or particularizing elements, are simply generic. This evidently sufficed for the purposes of the new settlers, who did not trouble to echo, or incorporate any part of, the distinctive name borne by each R-B habitation, such as (hypothetically) 'big granary' or 'dark-stream place' or 'Boudicca's valley'.<sup>12</sup> In the same way, the numerous wale-tūn names (now studied anew by Professor Cameron) simply designate 'settlement of Britons', without particularization or effort to take over any part of the original R-B name. This widespread nonchalance is further shown when, in later A-S usage, we find -wīc applied to a range of wholly disparate places which include York (Eoforwic), no less. There is further compounding with ceaster too: Canterbury in 604 was Dor-wic-caestre, and York in 644 (ASC) was Eofor-wic-ceaster. Moreover, -wīc was interchangeable with -ceaster: Dunwich was Domoc in 636 (ASC) and in Bede, Dommoceaster about 890 (OE Bede), and finally Dunewic in DB (with assimilation to dūn). Usage of purely Germanic burh was just as variable and uncertain. It is true, of course, that we are dealing with a time-span of centuries, during which usage doubtless evolved. It is also true that, when the invaders and settlers from N. Germany entered Britain, they found a different world in which their native terminology did not properly apply; hence their borrowing of Latin terms, with the semantic instability which often accompanies loanwords. However, I think it can be said that if there was so much vagueness and diversity in the application of generic terms, and if so many places were perceived generically rather than individually, and if even the scholarly Bede causes Mr Campbell the problems that he does with his usage, it is not logical to expect in the Anglo-Saxons, in the earliest phase of their take-over of R-B names, the slightest degree of care and accuracy. Fragmentary, haphazard survivals, and much transformation by misunderstanding, folk-etymology and substitution, are the best that one can expect.

Is there, finally, anything that can usefully be said about the relative survival-rates of categories of R-B names? Two contrasting groups of military establishments allow something to be said. There is a high rate of survival in the names of the nine Saxon Shore forts. Walton Castle (Suffolk), whose R-B name we do not know because it does not figure in the Notitia Dignitatum, was presumably already unusable as a fort because suffering encroachment by the sea, but it is noteworthy that this is a Waletūn name, indicating continuing habitation by Britons in it or nearby. It is a reasonable assumption that the names of these forts became known to the Germanic auxiliaries who helped to garrison them in the later 4th century (names of some units being recorded in the Notitia). Even if these early immigrants did not long survive (being absorbed into the R-B population or taken to the Continent by the imperial claimants), the same assumption can be made about the auxiliaries who came to Kent at Vortigern's invitation, continuation of fort-names from that time being more or less assured. In contrast, the great chain of forts of Hadrian's Wall and its associated systems down the Cumbrian coast evidently ceased in the early 5th century to have any military function, and it is not certain that any Germanic auxiliaries were at that time placed in them; the inhabitants of the once-substantial civilian vici attached

to them must have drifted away as military occupation ceased, and as one would expect, not a single name of any of these forts and vici now survives, though two may have done so for a time (see Aesica and Camboglanna in PNRB).

Among names of cities, coloniae, and of London, the survival-rate is quite good, but the forms of survival differ widely for reasons adumbrated above. It is plain that name-survival cannot be used to show any kind of continuity in urban life at least as this was understood in R-B times. In the 5th century the withdrawal of Roman control, military forces, and political organization, and the rapid decline of the economy, would have ensured the decline of the cities even if there had been no Germanic invasion. But even a deserted city, or one with few inhabitants, still had a name, and even if it contained nothing worth looting, and Anglo-Saxons had no intention of settling inside it, the city represented a landmark, a geographical fixed point, and the pivot of a still usable road-system. A few contrasting cases illustrate the impossibility of making general statements about city-names.

Canterbury, R-B Durovernum, probably received Germanic settlers in peaceful circumstances in Vortigern's day. The city had at least one church, and its Christian community would not have been disturbed violently. Eventually, as a unique case, the city became the capital of the thriving kingdom of Kent in which Aethelbert, married to a Christian Frankish princess, received Augustine on friendly terms in 597, and he was soon converted with his subjects. Here, if anywhere, we would expect the R-B name to survive; it should be another \*Dorchester. But this is not so. Certainly in ASC 604 the place was Dor-wic-ceaster, with Dor- continuing the first syllable of the R-B name; but that is all. We know from Bede that a knowledge of the R-B name was current in his day, for he refers to Doruverni and has further adjectival forms of this, and it established itself in the standard usage of the Church. I think it can be shown that this name, with those of Richborough, Rochester, London, and perhaps Thanet, was almost certainly brought by Augustine and his mission in 597; they had been provided with the names, from an itinerary source, in Rome before they set out.<sup>13</sup> But this Doruverni remained Church Latin; it did not spread to the Germanic masters and inhabitants of Canterbury and its region, and they were not interested in learned restoration even when they became Christian. The Dor- of Dor-wic-ceaster had proceeded from the R-B name, from the lips of Latin or British speakers into the ears of the first Germanic settlers, in a pattern typical of such transfers elsewhere. But it had only a tenuous existence. From the start, the Germanic settlers had not thought of themselves as in any way city-based; to themselves they were Cantware 'men of Kent', and their town was Cantwaraburg (first recorded, 754). The name of Kent was borrowed, of course, from R-B Cantium,<sup>14</sup> but that is natural enough; the use to which it was put, in Cantware, was entirely Germanic, in line with other ethnic groupings such as Limeneware, Chesterware, Boroware, in other parts of the region. The point I wish to make is that surviving R-B Christianity, and new Christianity from Rome (Augustine), and peaceful take-over by Germanic settlers, and the establishment of a Germanic court in a city, all seem to have had no power, ultimately, to ensure the survival of a name; the naming process in this important place is entirely Germanic, and although there is a borrowing - Cantium - this is in a way misapplied.

The next civitas-capitals along the S. coast provide contrasts. Noviomagus must have been lost early, being known only as the possession of a Saxon, Cisseceaster (Chichester). Venta Belgarum, much the more important, survived as Uintancaestir, Winchester, its name subsisting perhaps because of its strong ecclesiastical tradition, possibly indigenous, certainly renewed from Rome in the 7th century.

As for that other Venta, of the Iceni, now Caistor St Edmund (Norfolk), it is a chester name but that is all. That it did not survive is surprising, for the city is flanked by two large and very early Germanic cemeteries, denoting peaceful coexistence of Germanic settlers and R-B city-dwellers for a not inconsiderable time. But did the name after all survive, oddly metamorphosed? In perusing the pedigrees of the E. Anglian kings and, in part, those of Lindsey (for they have a confused section in common), I noted that in both there is given as an immediate descendant of Woden - that is, in the early and fictional part of the pedigrees - one Uinta, Winta. One can believe almost anything of Germanic anthroponymy, but this one looks suspiciously like the name of the R-B civitas-capital erroneously placed, I imagine more readily in a written rather than an oral tradition: what had originally been an adjunct, a note of the place where an early ruler resided, has become a regal name. What more natural than that the first Germanic chieftain in Norfolk should establish himself in the political and strategic centre of the region, just as his colleague did in Kent? Now I find to my pleasure that the same idea had occurred to John Morris in 1973 (p.298), and is, with much else of concern, present in a Suffolk publication of 1976 by Mr Scarfe and Mr Martin.<sup>15</sup> Clearly, if this is right, it does not involve survival of the kind which interests us here, as a continuing habitation-name, but a memory even if metamorphosed in this curious way is significant.

Among the four coloniae, the R-B names survive, allowing that of Colchester to derive from the late R-B usage of Colonia (Antonine Itinerary: see PNRB) in a way that Ekwall, Reaney, and others would not accept (they insist that Colchester is 'place on the R. Colne'). More about the historical and archaeological background seems to be known for Lincoln than is usually the case, and it provides strong reasons why the R-B name should survive, not only Lindum but the once-proud title Colonia.<sup>16</sup> Our surprise then is reserved for the fact that Bede was not fully aware of the import of the latter, for he indulges in fanciful relatinization of the vernacular name.<sup>17</sup> The name of London continues the R-B name, although the process is not wholly clear.<sup>18</sup>

The same kinds of contrasts are found among the smaller towns. In some cases a slight difference in the siting of a settlement explains why a name was not continued. The R-B name of Cambridge was Duroliponte, probably 'fort by the river-liable-to-flood'. The R-B town was gathered round the former fort at the top of Castle Hill and extended down to the river at Chesterton, significantly named. Its name must have been lost early, and Bede did not know it although in a way he needed it: recording that in 695 the monks of Ely sought a stone coffin for the body of St Etheldreda, he says they went to Grantacaestir, then a civitatula quondam desolata (IV,19) and found what they wanted, presumably in the old R-B cemetery area along the road to Godmanchester. But this Grantacaestir, later Grontabricc (c. 745), was really a different place, for the Anglo-Saxons settled eventually east of the river on the flat gravels (and very heavily in nearby areas, for their early cemeteries are found in several directions). Now Granta is a British river-name; presumably in R-B times, \*Granta had always been the name of the river along its full length, and Duroliponte referred only to the part of it near the original fort, that part specially liable to flood. We have, then, a surviving R-B river-name, as often; total oblivion of the R-B town name, with a record of the abandonment of the site; and a new name of a new settlement, still with -chester indicating proximity to a R-B walled town. (The modern village of Grantchester does not continue this; it was in DB Granteseta 'dwellers on the Granta', with later assimilation to -chester). The contrast is provided by the name of Lichfield, R-B Letocetum, originally that of the settlement of Wall on a major road, preserved (presumably) by a surviving R-B population and transferred to a new settlement two miles away at modern Lichfield;

however, since this early became an important ecclesiastical centre, some revival of Letocetum from a Latin tradition is perhaps not wholly to be discounted.

As for the villas, in Britain no villa-name survived to become the name of a village on or near the same site, as they so often did in Gaul. Recent studies in continuity of estate-boundaries and settlement-patterns receive no support from toponymy. But we know the reason, too: the villa-owning class, British in origin but strongly romanized, had simply disintegrated with the collapse of the villa-economy in the early 5th century, and their names went with them.

The relatively high rate of survival of river-names of Celtic origin, even in south and east England, has long been noted.<sup>19</sup> The reason can hardly be that water, since it contained divinities, was especially sacred to the Britons and that names were tenaciously preserved; in any case, by 400, many of them were Christian. The reason must in some way be connected with Germanic penetration and settlement. Rivers are in one sense natural boundaries, and could often have formed frontiers as fixed lines over which there could be no dispute - not necessarily between peoples, but simply between land-holdings and communities. The name was then important to know. Further, the major rivers, and many lesser ones now artificially canalized, were thoroughfares for traffic and, indeed, for the first penetration by Germanic groups in the south and east, so that their names were early learned and well preserved. When we find, well inland, names of Celtic origin preserved for even very modest streams, the first of the two reasons stated may have applied. Not all names of Celtic origin, however, are necessarily the primary 'proper' names of the rivers. As we suggested in PNRB, we have almost too many names derived from British \*abona (Avon), \*isca (Exe, Axe, Usk, etc), and similar; it may be that Germanic inquiries were simply met with Welsh responses that gave general words for 'water, stream', these being adopted as though they were true 'proper' names; or perhaps particularizing adjuncts (as in modern Water of Luce, Water of Fleet) were not transferred. Most such names occur well to the west and north, where contacts of new settlers with retreating Welsh and others may have been brief in a generally hostile atmosphere.

In conclusion, Bede has something to tell us on these matters. He knew a goodly range of R-B names, some accurately, others in garbled or partial form, and they came to him from a variety of sources: classical authorities, ecclesiastical tradition within Britain (Gildas, some saints' lives) and as renewed from Rome, and probably accurate local traditions such as a Latin one of the kingdom of Elmet.<sup>20</sup> Sometimes Bede collects up to three forms and remarks or implies that one is more correct, that is more ancient and primary, than the others: ciuitas quae dicitur Rutubi portus, a gente Anglorum nunc corrupte Reptacaestir uocata (HE I, 1); ad Ciuitatem Legionum, quae a gente Anglorum Legacaestir, a Brettonibus autem rectius Carlegion appellatur (HE II, 2); Uenit ad Lugubaliam ciuitatem quae a populis Anglorum corrupte Luel uocatur (Life of St Cuthbert). The English have some names corrupte, the Britons rectius. Yet we know of no attempt to restore ancient and 'more correct' names in A-S speech and records, even though in the Latin of the Church, of course, forms of Bede and others had been, or were to be, adopted. Bede's work was immediately copied and diffused, and was very influential. Moreover, I mentioned above the possibility that, in a few names, learned influence has played a part. But clearly, even when the Anglo-Saxons were fully Christian and when there was a certain amount of respect for the Roman past,<sup>21</sup> learned influence in the interest of Roman or Celtic priority and 'correctness' was not going to have any effect. With the confidence of conquerors, the Anglo-Saxons had largely completed their naming processes, and these were either fully Germanic or Germanic by transformation (of names such as

Eoformic). It would be foolish to expect anything else; yet at all points the contrasts with the toponymy and the processes of the other western provinces of the old Empire were very great.

These modest suggestions about some types of name and some scholarly attitudes do not go much beyond the linguistic or philological and are thus, as emphasized in the introductory remarks, limited in scope. The contrasts and oddities at all points remind us of the perils of generalizations, and of the fact that the survival or extinction of a name tells us nothing about survival or extinction of population, nor about institutions, political systems, tolerance or enmity. The point is well illustrated by one of the oldest names in the west. Gadir, perhaps founded about 1100 B.C., was 'walled place' in Punic. It was subject later to Greek influence and to Roman rule as Gades, then to Gothic rule, then to Moslem rule (as Arabic Qadis) from 711 to 1265, then was Christian again and romance-speaking until the present day, as Cadiz. It is well-recorded history which tells us about rule, population, and institutions; the name itself has shown an astonishing capacity for survival, but - except for a whisper of phonological change - it is silent.

## NOTES

\*A revised version of a paper given at the Twelfth Conference of the Council for Name Studies at Keele, 23 March 1980.

Abbreviations:	A-S	Anglo-Saxon
	ASC	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle
	DB	Domesday Book
	LHEB	K. Jackson, <u>Language and History in Early Britain</u> (Edinburgh, 1953)
	PNRB	A.L.F. Rivet & Colin Smith, <u>Place-names of Roman Britain</u> (London, 1979)
	R-B	Romano-British

1. David N. Dumville, 'Sub-Roman Britain: History and Legend', History, 62 (1977), 173-92.
2. Margaret Gelling, 'English place-names derived from the compound wīchām', Medieval Archaeology, 11 (1967), 87-104; 'Latin loan-words in Old English place-names', Anglo-Saxon England, 6 (1977), 1-13; and her book, Signposts to the Past (London, 1978), 67-74. In this paper I have not included comments on such Latin elements as camp, funta, port, and ecles in Anglo-Saxon formations, having nothing to add to Mrs Gelling's admirable work, but all, of course, are relevant to the theme of this paper.
3. Note to p. 427 of R.G. Collingwood & J.N.L. Myres, Roman Britain and the English Settlements (2nd ed., Oxford, 1937).
4. Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones kindly drew my attention to a paper by Melville Richards, 'Early Welsh Territorial Suffixes', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 95 (1965), 205-12, in which are listed regional names and toponyms of the 5th to 10th century formed by personal name + suffix. Examples include names in -iog -iawg, a suffix which is a development from British \*-āco- (Latin -acum) 'estate of, property of'. Although it was no part of Richards's intention, one may suppose without difficulty that such formations of early Welsh continued an older British practice. In R-B records we have Bravoniacum, Ep(p)iacum, possibly Eburacum, and several others; one can conjecture that there were hundreds of places so named in what is now England, and that since most of them

would have been small (i.e., not forts or road-stations) they went unrecorded in our sources; also that what is observable as a gap - the seeming lack of Celtic place-names in England formed from personal and kin names - is hypothetically filled in this way.

5. A.H.A. Hogg, 'The Survival of Romano-British Place-names in S. Britain', Antiquity, 38 (1964), 296-99.
6. N.J. Higham, 'Continuity Studies in the First Millenium A.D. in North Cumbria', Northern History, 14 (1978), 1-18 (at 13).
7. For example, Dorchester (Dorset) was Dornwaraceaster in 864. The R-B name was Durnovaria; in the 864 form, presumably -wara- represents an assimilation of -varia to A-S, as in Cantwara, etc. It is, of course, hard to say whether a name in south and east Britain was taken by Germanic speakers from Latin or British, and this would affect what follows. My impression is that scholars are now more prepared to accept that a good deal of Latin speech endured in the 5th century in the cities of the south and east, perhaps also in parts of the countryside, and that the Anglo-Saxons took names from this Latin speech, just as earlier, in the 4th century, Germanic mercenaries had done. Mrs Gelling's 1977 paper provides support, as does PNRB (14-15). The whole question is the theme of Chapter VI of LHEB; Professor Jackson prefers to explain most transfers in terms of A-S contacts with British, but does not wholly rule out Latin as a medium in particular instances (e.g. 252 note). It seems to me simpler to assume that ecclesia, for example, was taken into A-S speech straight from Latin, even in rural areas (for if a Christian community was basically British-speaking, its language of religion was Latin); and I think that no phonological objection can be raised to this. The transfer of the name of London makes an important example, discussed below.
8. Hogg (1964) plots survivals on the map of Britain up to Hadrian's Wall, and attempts to draw conclusions. Jackson, LHEB 220, distinguishes four zones with differing densities of survival of river-names. Both maps are reproduced in Signposts, 61, 89.
9. A.L.F. Rivet, 'The Notitia Galliarum: Some Questions', in R. Goodburn & P. Bartholomew (eds.), Aspects of the 'Notitia Dignitatum' (Oxford, 1976; = BAR Supplementary Series, 15), 119-35.
10. L. Alcock, 'Roman Britons and Pagan Saxons. An Archaeological Appraisal', Welsh History Review, 3 (1966-67), 229-50 (at 231-32).
11. On vicus in general, see Signposts, 67, with mention of work of Johnson (1975). Bede's use of Latin and Germanic terms is explored by J. Campbell, 'Bede's Words for Places', in P.H. Sawyer (ed.), Names, Words, and Graves: Early Medieval Settlement (Leeds, 1979), 35-54.
12. The analysis of types of British names recorded in R-B sources by Mrs Gelling in Signposts, Chapter 2, gives a good idea of their nature; one could notionally add to it the corpus of toponyms formed from personal names, alluded to in Note 4.
13. See Colin Smith, 'Romano-British place-names in Bede', Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History, 1 (1979), 1-19 (= BAR British Series, 72).
14. P. Quentel, 'Le Nom celtique du canton en Gaule et en Grande-Bretagne', Revue Internationale d'Onomastique, 25 (1973), 197-223 (at 220), would

derive Cantware from the R-B ethnicon Cantiaci: "Cantiaci est la forme adjectivale correspondant à Parisiaci, etc. En anglo-saxon Cantiaci sera traduit Cantware 'les hommes du Kent'. Voilà qui est, dans ce domaine, un autre indice de continuité, à remarquer d'autant plus que les noms celtiques qui ont subsisté dans ce comté sont par ailleurs peu nombreux." Such is also the view of Myres (1937: p. 428) and perhaps of others. This seems doubtful, however, since in south and east Britain we know of no other survival of a R-B civitas-name, the only survivals being in the extreme west, and there in the form of area-names not tribal names (Dumnonia > Devon, Demetia > Dyfed, etc.).

15. Norman Scarfe, 'The place-name Icklingham: A preliminary re-examination', with an Appendix on the Iclingas, by Edward A. Martin, East Anglian Archaeology, Report No. 3: Suffolk (Suffolk County Council, 1976), 127-34. A parallelis provided by a pedigree of the rulers of Dyfed, in which the son of the founder Magnus Maximus is one Dimet, an eponymous regression to Demetia or Demetae.
16. On the background, Myres (1937), 414-15.
17. Smith (1979), 9.
18. The view of Jackson is that a form \*Lundonion was heard from speakers of British, giving A-S Lundēne (LHEB 258-61, 308 note, etc.); Jackson argues this in terms of British and A-S phonology, and his view has been widely accepted. However, R.E. Zachrisson in Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain (Uppsala & Leipzig, 1927), 80, argued - as he had for certain other names - that the name was transferred from Latin speech to A-S. He could, in my view, well be right. Against standard Londinio (-ium) in most R-B sources, we have late R-B forms Lundinio in Iter VII of the Antonine Itinerary (3 times), Lundinium 3 times in Ammianus Marcellinus, and Lundonia in Bede (probably from a tradition maintained in Rome). This seems ample evidence of a late R-B (Latin) u as the first vowel. As for the stressed vowel, in Vulgar Latin ī > ē (ī > ē) in most parts of the Empire by the 3rd century, British examples including felicessemus (RIB 988), baselicam (RIB 978), demediam (RIB 306), etc.; so there is no problem in postulating a late Latin spoken form \*Lundeniu and its transfer to the Germanic settlers.
19. E. Ekwall, English River-Names (Oxford, 1928). Professor Jackson's map is mentioned in Note 8 above.
20. Smith (1979), 4-6.
21. Michael Hunter, 'Germanic and Roman antiquity and the sense of the past in Anglo-Saxon England', Anglo-Saxon England, 3 (1974), 29-50, especially 35-44.

COLIN SMITH

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge

PLACE-NAMES IN EARLY IRISH DOCUMENTATION:  
STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION\*

The primary consideration of this paper was to establish from observation of place-name documentation in a number of selected texts the commonest structural patterns in earlier place-name formation. A secondary consideration was the observation of the commonest generic elements in the place-names of the sources examined. Place-names that are known to be transferred population-/sept-names have been omitted from the assessment.

1. A preliminary to the main exercise was the consideration of what is probably the commonest structure in the place-name coverage of today, viz. 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun', e.g. Lag an Aoil ('hollow of the lime'), Loch an Iúir ('lake of the yew'). The texts examined towards this end were AI (Annals of Inisfallen, ed. S. Mac Airt), AU (Annals of Ulster, ed. W.M. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy), Loch Cé (The Annals of Loch Cé, ed. W.M. Hennessy), the Patrician biographical material in the Book of Armagh (ed. W. Stokes, The Tripartite Life of Patrick, II, pp. 269-351), Bethu Phátraic, I (ed. K. Mulchrone).

For each set of annals the proportional occurrence per century of the place-name structure 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' was presented in a series of histograms. (Proportions were based on the total count of place-names within the century, with the omission of repeats and known transferred population-/sept-names.) Excepting one 6th century entry, Ráith in Druad, instances of the place-name structure in AI begin in the 11th and 12th centuries, both with ca 2%, with a marked increase in the 13th century to ca 11%. In AU the structure is not documented with any degree of certainty until the 9th century (ca 1%) but the incidence is not markedly significant until the 12th and 13th centuries. Loch Cé covers the century-span that appears most significant in this study, the 11th - 16th centuries. Here we have a fairly steady increase in the incidence of the structure from ca 2% in the 11th century to 22% in the 16th century. The statistical tendency, on the combined evidence of the three sets of annals, would indicate that while names of the structure 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' are instanced as early as the 9th century, it is from the 11th century onwards that there is a noticeable increase in the frequency of usage.

These findings were upheld by the narrative texts examined: the non-occurrence of this place-name structure in the Book of Armagh material (7th - early 9th century)<sup>1</sup> and the markedly low incidence of the structure in Bethu Phátraic<sup>2</sup> (original compilation ca 900 A.D.).

Also considered briefly at this stage was the incidence of the place-name structure 'Noun with article' which, according to the findings of the main exercise (discussed below in 4), is not significantly represented in early documentation. The proportional occurrence per century of this structure in the annals was presented alongside the corresponding 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' histogram. The correspondence was sufficiently marked in all three sets of annals to indicate that the increase in frequency of the name-structure 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' was related to the increase in frequency of the 'Noun with article' name-structure.<sup>3</sup> It was also noted that in Bethu Phátraic the