

devising of a less equivocal new name, and from the many witty inventions did choose The Sussex Coaster. Alas, this too (so our more worldly correspondent doth assure your scribe) beareth canting connotations . . . A propos, an odd itinerary was recalled as published, according to the then custom, by a noble aesthete rumoured to be entangled with Vita Sackville-West's friend, Violet Trefusis (née Keppel): 'Lord Berners has left London for the Isle of Man' ['Albany', Sunday Telegraph, 11.ix.83, p.2].

SOURIS

Institute of Onomastics,
University College of Muritania.

VERONICA SMART, Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles: 28: Cumulative Index of Volumes 1 - 20, published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press and Spink and Son, Ltd.: London, 1981, xl + 118 pp., £24.00.

This Index shows at a glance the range of material available in the first twenty volumes of SCBI: they contain catalogues and photographs of coins from the earliest British examples up to the beginning of the eighteenth century, and include the following series: Ancient British, Anglo-Saxon (including Vikings of Northumbria), Norman, Plantagenet, Hiberno-Norse, Anglo-Irish, and later issues from Edward IV to William III, as well as miscellaneous associated Continental, Kufic and Roman coins. Although these volumes do not include material from the Stockholm Systematic Collection or the British Museum Collection, they constitute a corpus which, as Smart claims (p. ix), 'must easily exceed in quantity any individual collection published elsewhere'.

That this corpus is made so accessible by the layout and contents of the Index will be of immediate value to the student of numismatics and of British history. Simply from the Index itself, without recourse to the several volumes of SCBI, one can see, for instance, what mints operated under what kings, what moneyers operated at what mint, and even whether the same moneyer may have operated at more than one mint (although, given the currency of some OE names, especially in the later period, such an observation must be made with circumspection: for instance, the Godwine whose name appears on coins from Colchester in the reign of Edward the Confessor may, or may not, be the same Godwine who appears for Maldon in the same period). But the Index is also crucial to the student of philology, for it gives ready access to a body of material, viz. personal- and place-names on coins, which has long been recognised as vital to the study of language variation in the history of English, but which up till now has not been available in such complete form.

The present review concentrates on the significance of the Index for the student of philology: primarily, of onomastics and phonology; and confines itself to assessing briefly the value of the material, and of its treatment in the Index, for the study of the Anglo-Saxon (AS) series and the evidence for OE offered by this series.

The data recorded on coins is obviously limited: viz., spellings of personal- and place-names; but the philological value of the names derives from their formation from lexical items whose etymologies can (on the whole) be traced: e.g. the elements of the dithematic OE personal-name Leofwine are seen to be related to OE leof, 'dear beloved' and wine, 'friend'.

The value of the AS coin-evidence for the study of OE lies mainly in the following:

- a. The very quantity of different OE personal-names (of the moneyers) represented on the coins far outnumbers that found in any single document. It therefore gives ample material for the study of, for instance,
- (i) principles of OE name-formation: for example, hypocoristic formations, such as Dodda; compounding, as in e.g. Leof + wine; formative suffixes, e.g. -ing in Lifing;
 - (ii) influx of non-native names, especially Continental Germanic (CG) and Scandinavian (Scand.), and the introduction of bynames;
 - (iii) possible variation in (i) and (ii) according to period and region.

b. The coins can be placed in relative chronology within a fairly limited period: even for the early AS period, the coins are dated at least within the reign of the king whose name they bear, but from the reign of Aethelred II onwards, coins can be assigned a date within a margin of only a few years. Such comparatively precise dating cannot be claimed for (non-diplomatic) manuscript material from the same period. Variations in types of name-formation and in use of non-native names, as well as in spelling (and therefore presumably phonology) of a particular name, can thus be examined in respect of a fairly well-delimited chronology.

The mint-name on an AS coin may represent data for the study of regional variation: in the use or not of non-native names, and in the spellings (and phonology) of the names represented. However, for the later AS period, after centralisation of die-manufacture, mint-names cannot be taken as indicating regional provenance of a particular spelling (and perhaps phonological) form: for example, the Mercian form HEAÐEPULF on a coin from Droitwich, for Edward the Confessor, may conform to the regional variety associated with the area; but both West-Saxon EALH- and Anglian ALC- occur as forms of the same name-element at Chester, for the same reign (see further Smart: xvi).

c. Forgeries of AS coins, whether contemporary or more recent, are relatively rare: in this respect an AS coin has the advantage over many OE MSS (e.g. 11th cent. copies of earlier compositions, such as versions of the AS Chronicle), in being, most likely, an original contemporary document of OE (see Colman, 1983: 2.1.c).

d. One of the problems involved in OE name-studies is whether or not various spelling forms may represent the same name: e.g. whether LEOFPINE and LIFPINE both represent Lēofwine (see above); the philologist must then justify the decision by an explanation, both epigraphic (or orthographic, for MSS) and phonological, of the differences in spelling. The coin-evidence can be invaluable here, given the frequent recurrence of the same name, presumably identifying the same moneyer, at a particular mint for a particular period. For instance, the occurrence of both the forms cited above on coins from the Thetford mint, for the reign of Edward the Confessor, would support a decision to treat both as representing the same name.

Of course, even the evidence of mint and chronology is not always helpful, especially given various phonological developments (mainly evidenced in the late OE period) which reduced the distinction between some name-forms (see Smart: x-xi): e.g. the form ÆLPINE, on coins from Oxford, for Edward the Confessor, occurs as well as both ÆDEL- and ÆLF-, and there is no way of determining which of the two elements is represented by the form ÆL-.

e. Related to (d), above, is the problem of identifying errors. Certain principles may be invoked here:

- (i) there may be an epigraphic basis for suggesting that an odd spelling-form on an AS coin is an error, given the possibility of substitution of one punch for another, or omission of a punch-stroke, in the process of die-cutting (see Colman, 1983: 4.2.c). For example, in the form BURHREI, for Burhred (London, Edward the Confessor), I for D may be dismissed as an error involving no more than the omission of the semi-circular stroke ∩ from final D.
- (ii) the evidence of die-links may support classification of a spelling as an error. If an odd spelling occurs on more than one coin, then, on the face of it, it would appear to have been repeated, and is therefore not to be dismissed. But if the coins in question are seen to be from the same die, then the spelling is indeed unique, and

may, in the light of (i), above, be dismissed as phonologically insignificant. For example, the form GUOLCPINE, on two coins of Gloucester for Edward the Confessor, would appear, bafflingly, to represent a dithematic name with unetymologisable *guolc as its first element. But the two coins, one in the British Museum, the other recorded in SCBI: 19, are seen to be from the same die, and the form may be assumed to be an erroneous spelling of the name Selcwine, recorded on coins from the same mint and period.

All aspects of coin-evidence for philology outlined above are to be readily researched, given the contents and arrangement of the Index.

The Index of Personal Names consists of a list of moneyers' names arranged under head-forms (with a list of reigns and, where relevant, mints for which the moneyer appears) and presents immediate information about numbers of names (and types of names) for any period (and, where possible, region). One can only agree wholeheartedly with Smart's opting for this arrangement, rather than alternatives discussed in the introduction (p. ix). It has the further advantage of grouping together spelling variants of the same name. Such an etymological grouping is not, of course, without problems. These are exemplified by the forms SILACPINE, SILÆCPINE, SILEACPINE on coins from the same mint (Gloucester) as coins with the names Seolcwine and Silac (Sigelac); the difficulty here is handled reasonably by citation of the three forms under both head-forms, with a foot-note. Given the difficulties involved in such decisions, one values in particular the indexing of references to any philological note in the relevant SCBI volume.

The arrangement of the personal-names bears in mind the variety of interests that may have recourse to coin-evidence: 'ideally, one would wish to produce a kind of three-dimensional model for the pattern of moneyers in their time and place, to satisfy the numismatist who wants to know who was striking where and when, and the philologist who wants to trace how the same name is influenced by both historical development and dialectal variety' (p. x). Though such a model is physically impossible, its structure is inherent in the arrangement of the Index, from which, by cross-referring, the student can build up a fuller picture of a particular aspect of research.

The Index of Mints lists all forms (many abbreviated) of mint-names on the coins, of value for the etymological study of place-names (as well as, of course, for the information as to mints operating for any given reign).

The arrangement of the Index of Personal Names, described above, allows easy cross-reference with the Table of Reigns and Types, to discover:

- a. the earliest or latest instance (at least in this corpus) of a particular name (for instance, the name Boga on coins of Edward the Confessor is readily discounted as a possible eleventh-century CG import, by reference to its occurrence on coins from much earlier reigns);
- b. changes in spelling-forms of the same name-element over time, reflecting changes in phonology (for instance the pre-Conquest development of Æðel- to Ægel-, Æiel- to Æl- and Al-).

Apropos the chronology of AS coins, the Index of Finds is (indirectly) relevant to the philologist, since hoard-evidence has been crucial in the establishment of the commonly accepted ordering of types in the later AS series.

In the Table of Reigns and Types, identified forgeries are listed at the end of the entry for each series, and thus may be discounted from philological consideration.

The decision to transcribe the names in upper-case type (p. xi) may seem a minor one; but the use of lower-case would not only 'make even slightly erroneous forms quite unrecognisable', as Smart points out, but it would obscure the recognition of a possible epigraphic basis for a suspected error; for example, i in Burhrei would hardly appear as a plausible error for d, whereas I in BURHREI is more readily explicable (see above).

This review has aimed at illustrating only one area of the utility of Smart's Index; and has hoped by this not to suggest a limitation of its value, but to hint at the much broader significance of the work for various fields of study. The Index represents a remarkable feat of taxonomy, presenting a significant corpus in a treatment at once comprehensive and concise.

FRAN COLMAN

REFERENCE

Colman, Fran. 1983 (forthcoming). 'Anglo-Saxon coins and Old English phonology', Folia Linguistica Historica.

R. W. MORRIS, Yorkshire through Place Names, David & Charles: Newton Abbot, London and North Pomfret (Vermont), 1982, 224 pp., 27 Maps and Figs., £10.95.

It must be assumed that the intended audience for this book is the general public of Yorkshire who are interested in its landscape and history. It is therefore not surprising for onomasts to find no new insights here, but it is a serious criticism that, for those unacquainted with the techniques of place-name study, it is a most misleading piece of work.

The book deals with the place-names of Yorkshire in chronological order, including chapters on the street-names of York and on Domesday Book names. It begins with a general introduction, which appears to draw heavily on the principles of place-name study enunciated by Kenneth Cameron in English Place-Names, although this fact is not acknowledged. This is but the first example of a disturbing feature of the book - i.e. that while there is a short bibliography at the end, remarkably few references are made in the text to show when the author is drawing on a particular publication. In a popular book there may be a desire not to clutter the page with footnote numbers, but a reasonable compromise would have been to group detailed notes at the end of the book. The bibliography itself is very limited, with references to Northern History, but not to JEPNS or to Nomina. One looks in vain for reference to David Palliser in the chapter on the street-names of York or to Rivet and Smith in the discussion of Roman place-names, which would have enabled Dr Morris to have avoided, for example, the identification of Cambodunum with Cleckheaton.¹

A synthesis of the views of others has the responsibility of being up-to-date, especially when aimed at a general audience. Unfortunately many of the views stated repeat seriously outdated concepts, which should not appear in a summary published in 1982. The great majority of these outdated ideas relate to the historical background, but this has serious consequences for the interpretation of place-names in Yorkshire. For example, the entire view put forward of the nature of the Anglo-Saxon, Viking, and Norman settlements is gravely out of date. We have Anglo-Saxons moving along the 'relatively easy routes' of the valleys (p. 52) and following the rivers (p. 29), as if the Britain which they entered was virgin territory rather than a fully organised landscape. The Viking newcomers occupy farms 'probably carved out of the uncultivated wastelands that separated the villages' (p. 130), with no idea of the modern view of the Anglo-Saxon landscape as an entity fully divided between communities exploiting their resources, with no 'free' and unallocated land.² This misconception is repeated in the section on medieval assarting (p. 201), where there is a tacit assumption that the waste, 'expanses of uncultivated land, forest, scrubland or heath that lay between the villages', was worthless and not part of the general agricultural economy. Similarly the picture given of the Norman Conquest involves the total displacement of the Anglo-Saxon nobility by the new Norman elite, not only at the level of the tenants-in-chief, but also with the lower tiers (p. 151). David Michelmore has shown that at the level of the mesne lords in West Yorkshire the old aristocracy often remained in possession,³ so that it was actually even less the case that 'the coming of the Normans meant little more than a new landlord in the old village' (p. 152). Another major misconception (pp. 132, 171-2), which historians have been trying to kill for many years, is that Domesday Book refers to villages. Indeed it is even assumed that, if the name of a place is not recorded in Domesday Book, then it could not have been in existence in 1086 (p. 177) and that the names of the vills

recorded in Domesday Book must necessarily also refer to the present-day villages bearing those names (p.132), with no indication of the complexity of the relationship between vill names and settlement names nor of the concept of settlement mobility within a vill.

Some of the outdated concepts would have done justice in a Victorian work on the subject. Thus we have the Roman authorities intent on 'their civilising mission to Britain' and seeking to introduce the British 'to the polish of civilisation' (p.37); and Norman aristocrats, probably as hard-headed men as England was ever likely to encounter, portrayed as susceptible to the 'blandishments of the speculative builders of their day, who spoke in beguiling terms of the splendid manor houses they could build for them' (p.158). Perhaps the most delightful is the picture presented of the Domesday Book clerks assiduously recording woodland 'not unmindful of their royal master's love of hunting' (p.199).

Equally serious is the misunderstanding of published ideas. For example, it is stated (pp.70-1) that the idea that the -ing in Dicking and Cleaving indicates an early settlement is not now held and it is implied that this is the result of re-examination following Gelling's work on -ing names in the South. Yet the alternative interpretations given for these names were pointed out as the most likely ones as early as 1937,⁴ and the confusion results from a failure to distinguish between the significant -inga-/-ingas forms, as defined by Dodgson,⁵ and all other names which happen to end in -ing. Some confusion might also have been avoided had correct place-name forms been used in the citations of names.

The book reveals a lack of appreciation of how place-names develop and the complexities involved in their use as evidence. We are told that the Roman name for York, Eboracum, has vanished from the map as an explanation of why minor Roman place-names should not be expected to have survived (p.15). Yet the direct descent of the name York can be traced from the Roman form, whereas the other names do appear to have been totally replaced, a very different matter. Definite interpretations of place-names are often given in the book, as if there were no debate about their meanings. Thus we are told that Wakefield means 'the feld of Waca' (p.56), whereas the name is more likely to refer to the feld where the wake, or festival, was held.⁶ On occasion it is the more picturesque explanation which is selected, so that Halifax is the 'holy flax field' (p.208), whereas the elements concerned could as well be halh and feax.⁷ Again, another misunderstanding of the use of place-names is to treat all names of a type as if referring to one period; thus names relating to woodland and open country (pp.80, 81) are used to discuss the extent of Anglo-Saxon woodland, without any explanation that the names on which this is based are not usually recorded until 1086, and there could have been enormous changes in the extent of woodland over the 600-year period between the Anglo-Saxon arrival and the names being recorded.

There also appears to be a lack of appreciation of the basis on which the names used on distribution maps are chosen. A map showing the distribution of 'settlements' in 1086 (p.172; map 24) is said to repeat the same pattern as map 11 showing Anglian distributions and map 17 showing Scandinavian, without any realisation that the names involved on the last two maps are themselves restricted to names of those types recorded in Domesday Book, so that maps 11 and 17 are simply a breaking down of map 24 into its Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian components.

A misunderstanding of how place-names function leads the author into contradictions. On p.79 it is stated that the Anglo-Saxons had several synonyms for

woodland, despite the fact that the terms concerned probably refer to woodlands that were of different sizes or were managed in different ways, although on p.44 it is acknowledged that the various terms for dwellings were not synonyms, but must have applied to different types of dwellings. Yet then the name Bolton, from boðl-tūn, is described as a tautological formation. In fact the tūn of that name need not even have referred to a settlement, but could have been used in one of its other OE meanings of 'vill, township'. Similarly, it is acknowledged on p.131 that names may be coined by neighbours rather than by the owner or occupants of a place, but it is also assumed that places with names in hām (p.84) and tūn (p.96) were occupied by Anglo-Saxon settlers.

There are a number of outright mistakes, ranging from foederati being turned into the term for the local militia (p.40) and Sancti Martini Lending being translated as referring to the church of one St Martini (p.167), to the name Burley in Wharfedale being explained as a lēah belonging to a borough (p.85), with the astounding explanation that the clearing was established as a corporate enterprise because joint effort was required to clear the site. If the first element was referring to a borough this is the last way in which it would have been established, but the burh of the name must refer to a fortification of some sort, as the meaning of 'borough' for burh is a post-Conquest development and the name Burley is first recorded c.972.⁸ Again, we are informed in the discussion on Southowram and Northowram that at the time of Domesday Book there was only one 'village' called Oure or Overe (p.51), whereas Domesday Book in fact records two different vills, held by quite different people in 1066 - Northowram is Ufrun and Southowram is Oure/Overe.⁹

Many of the other assumptions made in the book are also seriously open to question. It is assumed, for example, that the only Celtic names which would have survived through the Roman period would have been those preserved in a Latin form (p.26); that the plotting of hām, tūn and -ing names will show the eventual distribution of Anglian settlement (p.92); that people bearing Viking personal names must necessarily be of Viking descent (p.163); and that the distribution of place-names can tell us something about racial feelings (p.148). One would also like to know what are the examples from Yorkshire of Anglo-Saxon respect for Celtic grammatical niceties, which are used to suggest that many of the incoming English could understand elements of Celtic speech (p.65).

It might have been hoped that someone well acquainted with the Yorkshire landscape would have brought a fresh eye to some of the interpretations of the names of the area. Unfortunately the few new suggestions which are made are often difficult to accept. For example, it is postulated that the absence of names in word in the North and East Ridings is not because no such names were formed there, but because the Scandinavians modified them, although it is not stated why they should have picked this particular element to do so, nor into what they would have modified it.

There is little new, original or illuminating in this book and much which is downright incorrect. Those who wish to learn about place-names would be better advised to go direct to the authorities such as Fellows Jensen or Cameron, rather than to encounter their ideas distilled in secondary form in this book. Those who are interested in the place-names of Yorkshire would be better advised to tackle the raw data available in the EPNS volumes on Yorkshire by A. H. Smith.

REFERENCES

1. D. M. Palliser, 'The medieval street-names of York', The York Historian, 2 (1978), pp.2-16; A. L. F. Rivet and C. Smith, The Place-Names of Roman Britain (London, 1979).
2. D. J. H. Michelmore, 'The reconstruction of the early tenurial and territorial divisions of the landscape of northern England', Landscape History, 1 (1979), pp.1-9.
3. Idem, 'Township and tenure', in West Yorkshire: an Archaeological Survey to A.D. 1500, eds. M. L. Faull and S. A. Moorhouse (West Yorks. C.C., Wakefield, 1981), pp.231-64, esp. pp.251-7.
4. A. H. Smith, PNERY, pp.84-5, 232.
5. J. McN. Dodgson, 'The significance of the distribution of the English place-name in -ingas, -inga- in South-East England', Medieval Archaeology, 10 (1966), pp.1-29.
6. A. H. Smith, PNWRY, II. 163-4.
7. Ibid. III. 104-6.
8. Ibid. IV. 196.
9. Ibid. III. 89,96.

BASIL COTTLE, Names, Thames and Hudson Ltd: London, 1983, 224 pp., £9.50.

Ostensibly a standard guide to British naming-practices, this book proves in fact sui generis, revelling in the idiosyncratic idiosyncratically perceived.

To begin, then, by characterizing Basil Cottle: a man, as earlier books have revealed, of bold opinions. His reiterated anathemata strike motor-cars, soccer and shinty, 'those carpet-bagging pirates called Normans', tobacco and alcohol (but he comments genially enough on pub-names), popery and heresy, 'Plebbly Starletries (like Sharon and Tracy)', the 'factitious counties' of 1974, pop-groups and their 'anti-hymnody', people who give Celtic an initial sibilant, and National Health numbers. His no less insistent enthusiasms embrace schoolboy mnemonics, heraldry, constellations (Orion above all), Paul Jennings, the telephone directory ('a static beauty and an inaction-packed restraint'), Ernest Weekley, runes, church-bells, rugby, puns, steam-engines ('the sad Evening Star 92220'), Welsh, Princess Diana, historic battles (naval ones especially), Scrabble, Chaucer, hymn-tunes (to whose names he devotes eight pages), Brittany, and Sir Walter Scott. He tells jokes; he reminisces about his dreams, his pupils, people he has met by the way, sweets he ate as a child, his namings of godsons (usually as Neil) and of a pair of fossils - all with a self-centredness so frank as to be disarming. If such a one would be your favourite guest, this book is for you.

The Cottelian aesthetic and moral imperatives cut across the conventional chapter-heads. To names exemplifying free choice his approach ranges from the sociological ('Battered girl babies . . . have in general . . . film-starlet and pop-singer names') through the censorious ('Stanley, devalued by bearers such as Laurel, Baldwin . . .'; 'the monosyllabic cacophony of Elm Grove Drive'; 'the coarse freakishness of Bible Belt onomastics'; 'names [for yachts] . . . like Vive la Différence are rather caddish and unseaworthy') to the prescriptive ('Not clipped down to Debra, please'; 'All I ask is that [a house-name] should not be strident or unneighbourly or pompous or vacuous'). With surnames, where advice can - except as a rider to Mr Punch's on matrimony - hardly be effective, Cottle nonetheless continues to evaluate (by his personal standards) rather than record, calling Philpot and Philpin 'bizarre' diminutives and speaking of 'the handsome Haythornthwaite . . . or the oafish Shufflebottom'. Place-names he assesses in aesthetic terms, invoking 'the plangent beauty of Nijniy Novgorod' and recalling how 'of the long-vanished stations of Jersey . . . the whole chaplet of names made music once'.

Where all is so personal, criticism - as distinct from dissent - finds limited purchase. Certainly it was naughty, after boasting of being no novel-reader, to risk a chapter on literary names. Inconsistency is perhaps Cottle's besetting sin. Straightway after, most properly, denying name-status to 'dictionary' words, he launches into lyrical catalogues of generic terms for flowers, herbs and trees, for butterflies (seldom promoted above the generic, but perhaps he would like to know that once I dubbed a domesticated autumn stray Vitalis Peacock, after a man in a twelfth-century rent-roll), and for birds. Despite Cottle's experience, the caprices of colloquial usage have betrayed him (said of a dog, 'What's his/her/its name?' requires the answer, 'Spot'; but, of a tree, 'It's an oak: Quercus robur'). The complexities here remain only half-acknowledged. Certain animal-, bird- and plant-'names' were deliberately invented, some being (as Cottle sporadically notes) based on the proper names of places or of people: Camberwell beauty, gardenia, timothy-grass. Some vernacular 'names' are personal ones turned generic: guillemot,

petrel, robin. Although noting these and also the fox's 'Christian names' Lawrence, Reynard and Russell, Cottle misses not only the vulpine Charlie (more formally, Charles James) but also billy and nanny as well as Dobbin and Neddy. On the whole, however, the generics here paraded seldom thus interlock with true names but include, for instance, ash and oak, which, although arguably names when given to runes, are surely when applied to trees mere dictionary words.

Enthusiasm may lead Cottle astray; but when it fails he loses his thread completely. After indulging an empathy with trees that includes them (perhaps scientifically) under 'Everything that hath breath', he treats under 'Inanimates' such 'automats' as racehorses, forgetting that their unreliability is what keeps racing going (this review was first drafted while contemplating some long-priced winners at Royal Ascot 1983). His ignorance of the Turf leaves him, he boasts, baffled by names like Arkle, Mill Reef and Red Rum: the first two, he may like to learn, were transferred respectively from a Scottish mountain and from a coastal site in Antigua (MR's dam, besides, being called Milan Mill), while, as for Rummy, his sire was called Quorum and his maternal grandsire Magie Red. The name Milton Keynes prompts an enquiry as to what has become of the Keynes family. For all his professed fondness for Scott, Cottle refers the name of Edinburgh's principal station directly to that of 'the first English abbey of the Cistercians' (cf., however, p.183). Commercial names catch him at his most obtuse, as when speaking of 'the opulent Snowcem' or failing to note that Camay is not 'presumably' but in fact an equivalent of a French soap-name Camée. 'The frankness is taken a little too far', he complains, 'in men's anti-stink devices, as in the savage promise of Brut': perhaps so, if he says [bru:t], but, if he would make it [bry:t], the promise could be all champagne (to a total abstainer, though, that might be worse). Again, Terry's Spartan Assortment, although containing nothing so nauseous as he supposes, is entirely hard-centred, justifying its name by the muscular strength that it gives to the jaws.

Even with verifiable etymologies, Cottle now and then nods. In interpreting Mangotsfield as 'open country belonging to an Anglo-Saxon called Mangod', he overlooks the suggestion in PNGloucs (following Forssner and PNDDB) that this personal name, although from the tenth century onwards found sporadically in English records, was of Continental-Germanic etymology.¹ As in his Penguin Dictionary of Surnames [PDS], he derives Hammond solely from 'the Norman name Hamon ("home" in Germanic)', ignoring - as also does Reaney's DBS - the parallel claims of Anglo-Scandinavian Hamund. The surname Cook(e) he repeatedly describes, in defiance not only of MED but equally of his own PDS, as 'French'. For Flower the only meaning he allows is 'arrowsmith', again forgetting that in PDS and DBS alike this is only one among four interpretations proposed. An anecdote leads to his explaining the rare surname Polyblank as French for 'white hair' (presumably *poil blanc, though neither here nor in PDS does he spell this out); but analogy with a Middle-English by-name Poligrand apparently explicable as a compound patronym from *Pol li grand [see above p.78] suggests as an apter etymon an analogous *Pol li blanc. As for Cottle's enthusiastic endorsement of a proposed derivation of America from the name of one Richard Amerik [cf. PDS s.n. Meyrick], it may not be irrelevant that the latter too was a Cambro-Bristolian.

Because I too combine philology with being laudator temporis acti (of Lost Causes, if you will), I can turn upon Cottle's idiosyncrasies an indulgent eye; any friend of Evening Star's can (sadly hippophobic though he may be) claim some fellowship from me. For all that and despite the book's fair factual reliability, I recommend it with reservations, because a seeker after plain information would be hard put to it

winnowing through the Basilisms and Cottleries. Like the after-dinner discourse of a moderately-travelled, passably literate, uninhibitedly self-opinionated guest, it belongs by the fireside, not in the study. When Cottle professed to see no reason, other than the alliterative, why 'a very paternalistic boar' should have been called Basil after him, his tongue ought to have been firmly in his cheek.

CECILY CLARK

NOTE

1. Contrary to some earlier assumptions, adequate records do survive of a probable CG etymon: apart from relevant forms to be found in M. -Th. Morlet, Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule, 2 vols. (Paris, 1968-1972), I.167 (noted already by O. von Feilitzen and C. Blunt, 'Personal names on the coinage of Edgar', in P. Clemons and K. Hughes, eds., England before the Conquest [Cambridge, 1971], 183-214, esp. 201) and also in E. Hlawitschka et alii, eds., Liber Memorialis von Remiremont, MGH: Libri Memoriales I, 2 vols. (Dublin and Zürich, 1970), 50 (fo.28v, LXIII), an occurrence of Manegaud was listed, under MANAG-, by E. Förstemann, Altdeutsches Namenbuch, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1900-1916), I - Personennamen, col. 1092.

See further the characteristically acrimonious interchange between Zachrisson and Björkman in Englische Studien 50 (1916), pp.341-58, 51 (1917-18), pp.161-79, and 52 (1918), pp.194-203, and, more recently, T. Kisbye, 'Osgod/Osgot on early Anglo-Danish coins', in M. Chesnutt et alii, eds., Essays presented to Knud Schibbye (Copenhagen, 1979), 12-26.

THORSTEN ANDERSSON and SÖLVE GÖRANSSON, eds, Äldre territoriell indelning i Sverige, *Bebyggelsehistorisk tidskrift* Nr 4, Stockholm, 1983, 158 pp., Swedish kronar 90, from Forskningsrådets förlagstjänst, Box 6710, 113 85 Stockholm, Sweden.

The Swedish journal of settlement history has devoted the whole of its fourth volume to ten studies of ancient land divisions in Sweden. Acknowledging that these present a complex of problems that require an interdisciplinary approach, the editors have assembled contributions from an archivist, two archaeologists, a church historian, two historical geographers, three historians and a philologist who has specialised in the study of place-names. All the contributions are well illustrated with maps and photographs and accompanied by useful bibliographies and English summaries. The editors have prefaced the book with an excellent summary of the state of research on land divisions in Sweden and brief accounts of the main conclusions presented by the individual contributors. The value of the book to the reader who does not understand Swedish would have been much enhanced if an English translation of this concise and balanced assessment could have been printed in its full extent.

While several of the problems discussed are of specialised appeal to those interested in the early administrative history of Sweden, others are of more general interest and some are of particular significance for students of place-names and administrative divisions in pre-Conquest England.

There has hitherto been a good deal of disagreement between Swedish scholars both as to the age, extent and creation of the early administrative divisions and as to the relationship between secular and ecclesiastical divisions. There is a span of over a thousand years, for example, between the earliest and latest dates hitherto proposed for the formation of the hundredal divisions and the present contributions reveal that there is still no consensus of opinion on this matter. The very nature of the evidence means that there will probably always be room for differences of opinion.

It is a historian, Erik Lönnroth, who advocates the latest date, c. 1100, for the creation of the known territorial divisions in Swedish Uppland. He looks upon them as being secondary to the ecclesiastical organisation that came in the wake of Christianity. Before that period Lönnroth reckons with a less stable organisation, based on the power which was wielded locally by the 'rune-stone boosters'. These were peasants who had acquired wealth either as travelling merchants or as hired warriors in Viking armies and who, having generally been converted to Christianity, cooperated with the missionaries in establishing local district meeting-places, built bridges and roads so that people could attend the assemblies, and then boasted of their exploits on the eleventh-century rune-stones which are such a characteristic feature of the Uppland landscape.

One of the two archaeologists, Björn Ambrosiani, examines the phases in the development of the administrative system in the light of the information about the density of early settlement that can be gained from a study of the burial fields in Uppland and Västmanland, while the other archaeologist, Åke Hyenström, concentrates on the problem of the Swedish names in -tuna. Acknowledging that there must have been variations from region to region, he points out that if the tuna-names in the Lake Mälaren region are related to the pattern of settlement and the territorial divisions there, certain correspondences become apparent that suggest that villages with tuna-names must have played a key role in the pre-Christian administrative system. He

notes that an earlier study has drawn attention to the fact that in England there are several instances of a hundredal division being administered from a centre with a name in -tūn, a centre that may have been in the possession of the crown; cf. J.A. Hellström, Biskop och landskapssamhälle i tidig svensk medeltid (Stockholm, 1971). For the English reader it is of interest to compare this statement with Peter Sawyer's recent survey of 'The royal tun in pre-Conquest England', Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society, ed. P. Wormald et al. (Oxford, 1983), 273-99. The list of royal tūns compiled by Sawyer reveals that 17% of the vills which can be proven to have been crown property before the Conquest have names in -tūn.

Thorsten Andersson, a philologist whose interest in administrative divisions and their names has persisted since the publication of his doctoral thesis Svenska Häradsnamn (Lund, 1965), examines the terms hund, hundare and härad. These were used at different times and in different places for districts that correspond roughly to the English hundred. Andersson shows that the hundare-districts in Svealand were preceded by hund-districts and he argues that both terms must have referred to a 'group of one hundred men', presumably the number of men that the district had to provide for defence levies. The English hundred, on the other hand, is usually explained as being a district that paid geld for one hundred hides. The districts corresponding to hundare-districts in Götaland were known as härads, a term which would seem to have spread to southern Sweden from Denmark and whose original significance may have been judicial rather than military. Andersson argues that this difference in terminology points to the creation of the districts before the unification of Sweden, probably early in the Viking period or even before, and suggests that the difference between the origin of the hundare and that of the härad need not have been as different as the terminology may lead one to believe.

Two of the contributors are historical geographers. Sölve Göransson's study of administrative divisions in Öland reveals that whereas there would seem to be an older type of härad in the north of the island, where the härad-names refer to the meeting-places of the local courts, the divisions in the south of the island would seem to have been created in the eleventh century by the central Swedish authorities for the purposes of the organisation of naval defence. Ingvar Jonsson, who describes the early fiscal organisation of Southern Norrland, accepts the view proposed earlier by Gerhard Hafström that the Swedish parishes had a pre-Christian origin, and he argues that most of the early administrative divisions known as tolfter 'territories made up of twelve primary settlement units' later developed into parishes. The feasibility of such an identification, however, is drawn in question by three other contributors, an archivist, Birger Lundberg, an historian, Sigurd Rahmqvist, who produces evidence to suggest that parish boundaries were not drawn until after the building of the churches, and a church historian, Gunnar Smedberg. Smedberg emphasises that the development of parishes must have varied from region to region but he argues that most parishes were probably created by informal groupings of the peasants in a local district, while some new parishes were created when private individuals built a church.

Finally, the historian Birgitta Fritz discusses the super-imposition of a castle-based provincial administration on the older administrative units in the Middle Ages.

Birger Lundberg also discusses the division known as the trening, Old Swedish priöunger. This term is used of the third part of something: a farm, a parcel of land, a sum of money, a field. As an administrative unit in Sweden it is of great antiquity and antedates the levy-system, by which it is exploited, but it is only sparsely represented in the period from which records survive. Gunnar Smedberg suggests

that a division into tredingar may lie behind the division of the sees of Strängnäs and Gotland into three rural deaneries. In the hundred of Trögd in Uppland, the treding would seem to have been equivalent to a tolft 'a district containing twelve units'. Lundberg draws attention to the division of Yorkshire into three ridings. He might also have mentioned the three ridings of Lindsey and the Domesday hundred of Tring (Tredunga) in Hertfordshire, which embraced eleven named settlements (cf. John Morris, ed., Domesday Book 12. Hertfordshire (Chichester, 1976), map at end of book) and which is now absorbed in Dacorum Hundred 'the hundred of the Danes', a name which points to Scandinavian settlement in the area in spite of the lack of surviving Scandinavian settlement names.

Although the contributions to this volume can by no means be said to have solved all the problems connected with the history of administrative divisions in Sweden, the editorial board of the journal is to be thanked for its initiative and the editors of this special number congratulated on their achievement.

GILLIAN FELLOWS-JENSEN

ALEXANDER R. RUMBLE, ed., The Dorset Lay Subsidy Roll of 1327, Dorset Record Society, Publication No. 6: Dorchester, 1980, xxxv + 160 pp., no price stated.

Lay subsidy rolls, with their lists of vills and taxpayers for an entire county, are particularly important sources for the student of medieval names. Regrettably most of the rolls remain unprinted and those that are in print have all too often been inaccurately transcribed by scholars unfamiliar with medieval nomenclature. The Dorset Record Society has been unusually fortunate in that the two surviving county rolls for Dorset have been prepared for publication by members of the Council for Name Studies, the 1332 roll by A. D. Mills (vol. 4 of the Society's series, published in 1971) and now the 1327 roll by Alexander Rumble. The standard of transcription is impeccable and the decision to reflect the original lay-out of the manuscripts (in two columns of assessments) is one that should be followed by all future editors of this type of document. It is sad, but perhaps inevitable, that Dr Rumble's edition has been subject to economies in production. Though the title page and indexes of place-names and personal names appear in professional type-face, the Introduction and the text of the rolls are reproduced in typescript, as is also, by a printer's oversight, an alternative (incomplete and incorrect) version of the contents page. The typescript of the text is generally clean and legible but occasionally, where the printing is fainter, letters and figures are only just discernible, and on some pages the narrow inner margin of a half to three-quarters of an inch has been insufficient to prevent some of the text disappearing into the tight cleft formed by the stapled binding. These, however, are minor inconveniences arising from financial exigencies all too familiar to editors and publishers producing substantial works for a small buying public. In its painstaking scholarship Rumble's edition is a model of its kind, and by making this subsidy roll available in printed form, the Dorset Record Society has performed a valuable service to historians of many different specialisms.

The Introduction to the text discusses the origin and nature of the lay subsidies, the manuscripts of the 1327 roll (and which of the two scribes were responsible for which portions of the text), the accuracy and arrangement of the onomastic and financial information, the assessments, the types of name and their characteristics, the delivery of the roll, and the editor's principles with regard to the lay-out and transliteration of the text. Some points of onomastic interest raised by the editor deserve some comment. First, the reliability of the name forms. The Dorset subsidy rolls are 'collated extracts, written by the chief taxers' clerks, of the rolls compiled for the sub-taxers' (p. vii). Copying creates two potential problems for the linguistic historian: orthographic translation (which reflects the provenance of the scribe, or rather the scriptorium where he was trained) and mistaken readings. In the Dorset rolls, the extent of orthographic translation has not been estimated, chiefly because none of the documents survive from which the clerks of the chief taxers compiled the extant county roll (itself a duplicate prepared for deposit in the Exchequer at Westminster). Copying errors, however, can sometimes be recognised. Rumble concludes (p. xiv):

We cannot define with any degree of certainty how accurate the chief taxers' clerks were in general when copying the local and unfamiliar material before them, but particular instances of inaccuracy may often be observed through close study of individual county rolls. Some obvious errors are to be found in the 1327 Dorset roll while others are to be suspected in either the 1327 or the 1332 roll from discrepancies which appear when these rolls are compared one to the other.

Several examples of probable errors are cited, including instances of omission of letters 'probably resulting from the speed with which the copyist was working' (p.xv). Naturally, the greater the number of copying stages, the greater the risk that the name forms in the duplicate county roll will not exactly reproduce those in the original local assessments. For Dorset, Rumble suggests that there may have been intermediate summary rolls, one for the rural areas and another for the boroughs and royal manors (pp.vii, xvii). Even the suspicion, let alone the proof, that, from a linguistic point of view, a lay subsidy roll is not entirely reliable ought to induce some caution in those scholars who, quite reasonably, wish to use the vernacular name forms in these rolls as evidence for local dialect. Spellings in the 1332 Dorset roll have already been employed for this purpose by B. Sundby in his *Dialect and Provenance of the Middle English Poem 'The Owl and the Nightingale'* (Lund, 1950). But as Rumble observes, 'Whether the official written form of surnames in the subsidy rolls reflected more the dialect and education of the chief taxer's clerk, who wrote the county roll, or that of the local communities and taxpayers named in it is a matter of controversy' (p.xi). His own view, which the present reviewer endorses, is expressed as follows (p.xxv):

It is because of the probability that the chief taxers' scribes, who wrote the county rolls of the lay subsidy, were not intimate with every individual taxpayer and every place in the county that the spellings of place- and surnames which they wrote cannot be accepted as reflecting the differential phonology of very local areas within each county. Variations in spelling of names in and between the county rolls and local assessment rolls where they survive, reflect rather the degree of familiarity on the part of the chief taxers' scribes with the material before them which was a collation from various sources.

Another topic aired in the Introduction is the hypothesis that the requirements of large-scale public records may have contributed to the creation of official names. Rumble (p.xxi) suggests for example that

It was perhaps on the development of the modern forms of place-names of a common type, such as Wootton, Okeford, Winterbourne, Milton, etc., that the frequent recording of place-names on a county, if not a national, scale by officers of the royal administration in records such as the lay subsidy rolls had the greatest effect; royal officials found it very convenient to add such manorial, and other types of, affixes to the place-names most likely to be confused. Outside the official written record and in the locality of the places themselves however such affixes were no doubt rarely applied until comparatively recently, and even now are not always used in informal circumstances.

There is undoubtedly some truth in this, though one wonders how the inhabitants of a district with, say, several Piddles, could have distinguished one from the other without using an affix or a substitute name. In modern times, at least, it is a common enough practice for locals to use the affix alone when several places with the same name occur in close proximity: in the East Riding of Yorkshire, Bishop Burton is normally referred to locally as 'Bishop'; in Buckinghamshire, the two *Iselhamstedes* have long been known only by their manorial additions, 'Chenies' and 'Latimer'. Turning to surnames Rumble further proposes that the disuse of aliases in favour of one (eventually hereditary) by-name per person was another consequence of the increasing number of large-scale official records for which certain identity of the individual was essential. This suggestion possibly oversimplifies the history of single and alternative by-naming (the extent of which is impossible to establish at the time of the 1327

subsidy roll) and probably exaggerates the intermittent influence of central government records. The key documents in any discussion of community naming practices in the late Middle Ages must be those produced for and by the community itself on a frequent and customary basis: deeds, rentals, and court rolls.

Because the traditional four-fold classification of surnames into occupational names, relationship names, locative names, and nicknames does not allow the importance of some sub-types, it is tempting to extend the list of categories. To do so sometimes serves one well, sometimes not. Rumble (pp.xxv-xxvi) adopts useful distinctions between 'status' names (e.g. *Cherl*) and 'occupational' names (e.g. *Smeremangere*) and between 'nationality' names (e.g. *le Frensche*) and 'locational' names (e.g. *atte Lynche* and *de Wollecombe* - which, however, inconveniently lumps together two distinct types, topographical by-names and *noms d'origine*); but why the traditionally miscalled 'imperative' names (e.g. *Brekeuat*) required separate categorisation from 'nicknames' is unclear. More troubling is the distinction between 'relationship' names (*Johanesone* and *Mabyly* are given as examples) and 'ancestral' names (*Algar* and *Edmund* are the instances given). Rumble's rule of thumb appears to be that by 1327 a surname from an Anglo-Saxon personal name (most of which had fallen into disuse as forenames by the mid-thirteenth century) would be hereditary (and therefore 'ancestral') whereas a surname from a currently popular forename of Norman introduction would not. Unfortunately these assumptions are too crude, as their application illustrates. In early fourteenth-century Dorset there is no reason why *Edmund*, recorded as a forename in the 1332 subsidy roll (see Mill's edition, p. ix), should not occur as a fresh patronymic or *Mabyly* occur as a hereditary by-name of two or three generations' antiquity.

There are at least 504 women named in the 1327 roll and these - perhaps mostly widows, as Mills suggests in his edition of the 1332 roll, p. vii - form only a small portion of the taxpayers listed, roughly seven per cent as in the 1332 roll. Rumble points out, however, that the women taxpayers of 1327 were unevenly distributed within the county, varying from ten per cent (at least 63 out of 612) in Badbury Hundred to 1.3 per cent (one out of 75) in Frampton Liberty. What significance, if any, is to be drawn from such marked differences in percentages remains to be determined. Certainly more work needs to be done by way of comparing the naming patterns of different communities. Rumble rightly draws attention also to the relatively high proportion of occupational names in the Newland list of taxpayers (at least 17 out of 47) and wonders if this reflects 'its attraction, as a liberty and as a new settlement, for a particular type of skilled inhabitant whose attributes were more in demand than in communities that had been settled longer' (p.xxvi). As he recognises, however, subsidy rolls, which usually provide the names of only a minority, and a socially top-heavy minority, in each community, 'can often suggest questions for further investigation through other sources but cannot supply the answers themselves'. In spite of such limitations the lay subsidy rolls are a major source of historical data for the interpretation of late medieval English society and language, and one hopes that the excellent edition of this particular county roll will stimulate record societies to publish others like it.

PETER McCLURE

LESLIE ALAN DUNKLING, The Guinness Book of Names, Guinness Superlatives Limited: Enfield, 1983 (2nd edition, limpback), 192 pp., £5.95.

It is a pity that the cover of this book looks so 'common' (acid-green, with a cigarette card of Marilyn Monroe and other splashes), because it is an honest, decent, religious, healthy, non-smoking (p.160), well-argued piece of work, and packed with information varying from Maltese Lorry Names to 140 names of cocktails (it is not, I regret, a teetotal book as well). The keynote is enthusiasm and unforced cheerfulness, with nice oddities like calling one page George instead of 21 to show us what we miss when a sequence of number 'names' is denied us. Though much research has gone to its making, the book avoids the traditional approach through etymology ('almost irrelevant in modern life' - why?) and concentrates on the comings and goings of names, the graph of their fashions, and 'entertainment rather than information'; indeed, some of it is aimed straight for the Sun reader - Tracy, Joanne and Sharon are 'vital names', the last having slipped in after Karen and Darren by follow-my-leader. All the fun masks the serious historical and educational aspects of name study: Mr Dunkling makes the interesting point that whereas our store of words increases only slowly after we are 18, we go on steadily adding to our name-ward, and there are now more registered trade-names in English-speaking countries than words in the OED.

My own favourite discovery here is that Gale Storm's real name was Josephine Cottle, but the greatest single item is the chart on p.61 for naming your baby; as one who has suffered lifelong from being Basil, I would make it a Registrar's compulsory issue to every pair of parents, with its eleven criteria leading to a points score. On first names, Mr Dunkling is wonderfully well informed, with his lists of black naming, his proof of Mary's holding on in the USA, and the fact that boys' middle names tend to be daring whereas girls' are conventional. There never was a Reverend Fiddle D.D. (p.24), by the way - the solecism of omitting his Christian name or his initials is proof (if one were needed) - but I knew of a Canon Ball in the 1950s, with a daughter Pat; and I would add that there is now a schoolboy in South Somerset called Duane Pipe. Of the 185 'conversions from words to first name status' listed, apparently as odd, on p.25, I have known an Angel and (after Miss Pilbeam, an actress) a Nova; and of the funny full names on p.178, James Middlemiss doesn't affect me, and Omar Shakespear Pound is Ezra's son with his mother's middle name as his second. I gather that Connie and Oliver didn't go so far as to use each other's first names (or, at least, Lawrence's inaccurate ear didn't hear them). Some of the interpretations of given names are a little shaky: the exact relationship of the elements in Nicholas, Gerard, Richard and Timothy is seen rather wishfully, and I would like proof that Cassandra is 'entangling men' rather than a female version of Alexander; the awfully wrong form Jehovah is used throughout; Harvey is Breton rather than 'Old French', and likewise Vernon is ultimately Gaulish; Mary may indeed mean 'wished-for child', but with a hyphen to make it clear. On the other hand, the possibility of Rebecca's being a 'heifer', and not just a 'snare', might have been mentioned; Lucy could just be allowed to be from Latin luc-, 'light'; and Graham - 'origin disputed' - goes on having a place-name look. I have always understood that Lorraine was bestowed on girls out of sympathy with France after 1871, rather than from St Joan and certainly not from Mary Queen of Scots.

Mr Dunkling shows a tendency to fuss. The section (pp.15ff.) on how to 'classify' and categorize names appears to me unnecessary and rather stodgy, and I do not agree that books on 'the psychology of naming' are a serious lack. I observe that I am

unfairly pilloried on p.72 for beginning my Penguin Dictionary of Surnames with the traditional four types of origin - first name, locality, occupation or status, nickname, which classes are then said to be 'woefully inadequate'. Well, I didn't invent them, and far from being an occasion of woe they are an accurate summing-up of the situation, and inadequate only if we want to subdivide at once (before the reader has settled in) into, say, local names from villages, from spots in villages, and from countries of origin; these remain local names, however much we subdivide them and even if we call them (with him and McKinley) 'topographical' or 'locative' or 'provenance'. Of course I know that 'nephew' and 'uncle' names are relationship names, but they are still fishy examples of nicknames. His headings 'Converted Surnames', 'Invented Surnames', and so on, forget that the surname lexicographer must write of names, not of the adventures of people who swapped them or swapped into them; they remain names in my four categories. McKinley's names with 'more than one possible origin' will still find their origins in my four classes, as will Mr Dunkling's 'direct' and 'metaphorical'. Nothing he says contradicts my simpler scheme, and his relegating 'Transferred' names (all of them of English villages) to the end is unhelpful - they belong to places as surely as do his 'locatives'. By the time he is telling you how to trace your origins on p.75, he is back to my scheme, with a, b, c, d, but in an order that (according to the frequency of names) should be c, d, a, b. But whether Miller milled or behaved like a miller is nearer to meta-physics than to onomastics. However, most of the book is relaxed and joyous; the chapter on house names contains horrors that were new to me - Shay When, House at Pooh Corner (near a sewage farm), Ca d'oro with its notice 'Beware of the Doges', Cobwebs acronimby from 'Currently owned by Woolwich Equitable Building Society'.

The proof-reading is impeccable, but I don't like 'Burns' Night' - it is either 'Burns' or 'Burns's' - or 'Guy Fawkes' Day' (pp.12, 13). It wasn't St Kentigern's own ring that was returned by a fish (p.141), and I have always supposed that madeira cake (ultimately from Latin materia, 'matter') was to be eaten with the rich wine, not flavoured with it (p.22). Farmer George was George III, not George II (p.100). Given so much here, we want more: Denver (p.121) might be interestingly taken back to the Norfolk village, 'the route of the Danes'; Monmouth's River Mynwy (p.109) means 'little Wye'. Sheer Thursday (p.14) meant 'Bright', not 'to shine', and the original meanings of Ember and Low Sunday should be explored. For the first 'choice' in a Thomas Hood poem (p.87), read 'voice'. Some explanation should be given of the -s on locality surnames like Hayes, Holmes, Knowles, Yates, though they are at least shown correctly as singular. 'Celtic' is used as a smothering term on p.71 - Burns is Old English, Opie (if it is from Osbert) and Ritchie are Germanic, Sinclair is Old French, and Stewart and Sutherland haven't any Gaelic in them, either. The impression is given silently (p.110) that since 'British' place names are hard to interpret, this will be especially the case now with really British (i.e., Welsh) ones, and this is wholly untrue - they are exceedingly vocal, and a Welsh dictionary will reveal all (which is more than you can say for English place names); Eglo- (Eglos-would be better) is rarer than the forms that gave Eccles, and, if 'Britain' includes Wales, Llan- should be noted for the beginner rather than Cornish Lan-. The surname Dutch (p.77) is as likely to mean German as Netherlandish, and this is what the adjective meant to Margery Kempe, who had been to Germany; likewise, the various families of Wallace are from wider areas than mere shrunken Wales. The many substitutes for the word 'street' are usefully compiled; but is not Pavement found in York and Nottingham as well as in USA? - and does Fennell perhaps cover the mysterious Northern Finkle? Mr Dunkling is, I feel, a little harsh towards Ekwall's philological approach to London street names, holding that the 'amateur' approach is

better; but he is no vague amateur himself, and he gives us proof through his complicated subject that 'the English language is alive and well'.

BASIL COTTLE

ROSIE BOYCOTT, Batty, Bloomers and Boycott: A Little Etymology of Eponymous Words, Hutchinson: London, &c., 1982, 128 pp., £3.95.

Inspired by its compiler's own surname, this little book aims at treating, in dictionary-form, such English words of eponymous origin as, having lost their capital letters, now function 'not just as proper nouns, but as verbs, common nouns and adjectives as well'. Terms in purely scientific currency are excluded; so are place- and street-names, unless they have in their turn (like Sir Hans Sloane - Sloane Square - Sloane Ranger) spawned eponyms of their own. Miss Boycott remarks how unexpectedly frequent she has found such words to be, their eponymous origins 'often at odds' with seemingly obvious derivations of more ordinary sorts. We shall see.

Her work has enjoyed some notice, partly because comments of Philip Howard's in The Times provoked a correspondence debating, *inter alia*, whether the supposedly eponymous Batty was (as Miss Boycott asserts) a Jamaican barrister certified insane in 1839 or the celebrated English alienist William Battie (ob. 1776, leaving a fortune) [24.i.83, p.10; also 27.i. and 7.ii.83, under 'Letters']. Whatever the rights or wrongs of that and whatever the priorities of usage, it does seem, as Howard remarked, odd to find no mention here of belfries or of their alliterative inhabitants.

Worse than that, this 'little etymology', like some other bedside books, sometimes sets the philological hand itching, perhaps unfairly, to swing the sledgehammer. Admittedly, colloquial usages are hard to pin down. Besides, as original contributions to historical lexicography are not expected in such guise, academic-style documentation would have been otiose. Accuracy is, on the other hand, never dispensable, and in its service rather more obeisance might have been made towards the booklet's bigger brethren. Without bibliography or references ('according to some sources' is the formula favoured), the compiler's reading can be only conjectured; but the abounding mis-hits imply that it embraced few of the standard reference-books. Thus, gaga - here suggested perhaps to allude to Gauguin, who went mad - properly means (as Miss Boycott does half-acknowledge), not 'insane', but 'senile', being derived by reputable lexicographers from gâteux [see Dictionnaire 'Robert', s.vv.]. For crap - here taken as a back-formation from the surname Crapper - no reference is made to the noun meaning 'chaff, waste' listed in OED as well as MED. Although OED is cited in the passing (e.g., under Baroque, inaccurately), the interpretation it establishes of barmy as 'frothy', from barm 'yeast', is discounted as just 'another derivation', on a par with alleged links with St Bartholomew or with Barming, Kent. This means that the historical dimension is a constant casualty. The common noun blanket is, for instance, in disregard of the DBS citation of it from the 1182 Pipe Roll and Reaney's reasonable deduction that by-name instances probably denoted merchants dealing in such wares, obstinately linked with the surname of a Bristol weaver flourishing c. 1340. Although a ME equivalent of booze is recognized, it is not wholly allowed to impugn 'the story that it derives from one Colonel E. Booze', an early nineteenth-century whisky-dealer. The medieval currency of to pry and nineteenth-century styles of giving fictional personages descriptive names based on common vocabulary are alike disregarded in favour of deriving this verb from the name of a character in an 1825 farce. The phrase His name is mud can hardly allude to the Dr Mudd who in 1865 attended Abraham Lincoln's assassin: the Penguin Dictionary of Historical Slang offers a citation dated 1823. Yet, while eponymous etymologies are

thus preferred in the teeth of the evidence, some well-authenticated words-from-names are ignored: gamgee, for instance, as well as the verb to hobday (far from being purely technical: constantly found in daily journalism).

Had it been only the historical dimension that suffered, the book's entertainment-value might have come through unscathed. What proves its fatal defect is insensitivity to current usage, formal and vernacular alike. The compiler's own style is verbose, didactic, patronizing: 'Adam's ale is a euphemism for water: the first human obviously had nothing else with which to quench his thirst.' In the etymologies, the fun and the irony of slang get pounded flat, when not ignored entirely. The failure to bring in bats (predicative only) alongside batty (also used attributively; cf. nuts/nutty) has been noted. The slang for 'garibaldi biscuit' is given only as squashed-fly, with no mention of the more picturesque fly-cemetery (complete with slabs). Hooker 'prostitute', said to be current 'especially' in America, is surely so ONLY there; the English homonym - although in earlier times doubling as slang both for 'thief' and for 'ship' - denotes (so they tell me) a specialist member of a rugby-team, being no eponym but a regularly-formed agent-noun, 'one who hooks the ball'. Juggernaut is said to be 'applied to any huge motor vehicle', its pejorative connotations - as well as the wide currency of the curtailed form - being ignored. Ignored too is the irony in donkey-derby, cited to support a definition of derby as 'a general term for any kind of flat race with an open field of contestants', this being topped off by a reference to Earl Derby (the same or another? or perhaps a Negro jazz-singer?) and his bowler hat. As for the note on (Sweet) Fanny Adams, even to the chastest mind it seems incomplete.

Suspensions of an oddly-innocent commentator from another planet are confirmed when bloomers is defined as 'now a slightly wry generic term for loose trousers worn by women'. After its undoubtedly eponymous birth, this term became (as OED Supp just manages to recognize), and remained at least until the 1940s, a usual demotic one for the voluminous UNDERgarments - marketed, if memory serves, as directoire [dr'ratwa:] knickers; cf. OED Supp - then favoured by respectable matrons and spinsters of mature years. 'Now', unless some usage among the very young escapes an ageing reviewer, who has, however, questioned a (girl) under-graduate or two, it is as obsolete as that style. Had Miss Boycott no grandmother, no great-aunt?

CECILY CLARK

ADRIAN ROOM, Room's Classical Dictionary: The Origins of the Names of Characters in Classical Mythology, Routledge and Kegan Paul: London, Boston (Mass.) & Henley, 1983, 343 pp., 26 Pls., £8.95.

Three earlier publications of this author were reviewed in NOMINA 6. Of the first (Place-Name Changes since 1900) it was noted by Alex Rumble that 'the Acknowledgements bear witness to the interest in the project shown by the staff of the many national bureaux concerned', and of the other two (Naming Names and Dictionary of Trade Name Origins) Cecily Clark observed that 'these are both bedside books, gossipy and dippable, dealing in whimsicalities rather than systems or principles.' In the effusion here considered the gossipiness and whimsicality persist, but any reference to expert advice seems to have been deliberately avoided. Instead, the author specifically states (p.10): 'I make no apologies for including explanations that professional classicists will doubtless deride.' Well, yes, no doubt they will.

In the first place, his knowledge of Greek appears to be limited. It is not simply the persistent translation of the first person singular of the present indicative as an infinitive, but almost every entry in the Dictionary section reveals a lack of etymological research, and facts that could be obtained merely by consulting Liddell and Scott are constantly overlooked. To take just the content of its first page: 1. Abas. How could the last four letters of scalabos 'give' his name (seeing that -os is a normal nominative ending)? 2. Abderus. But abdes means 'scourge', at least according to Hesychius; 3. Acacallis. But ακακαλίσ (admittedly with only one lambda) is a flower or tree; 4. Academos. This is also Hecademos, just as the older form of Ἀκαδημία was Ἐκαδημία, so that the demos is more likely to be 'distant' (suitably applied in Athens to Arcadia) than 'silent'. And there is worse to follow. For example, on the third page of the Dictionary section, under Achelous (which, it should be mentioned, was the name of at least four rivers in Greece, not only of the longest one, and so could possibly be of pre-Greek origin) we find the astonishing statement that 'we might expect some influence (sic) of Latin aqua in his name' - regardless, presumably, of the fact that it appears in Hesiod and Homer.

But it is not merely etymological weakness that shows itself. Equally distressing is the apparent failure fully to understand how polytheism enabled people not only to take in gods from other cultures but also to identify some of the new ones with their own when some aspects coincided. The bland statement (p.5) that 'most of the Roman gods and goddesses were "imported" from Greece' is misleading, for on the whole the Romans did not 'import' Greek deities but merged their own with them whenever they could, and for a full understanding of the matter it is necessary to list all their attributes. Curiously the difference between Hermes and Mercury is mentioned (though the latter may indeed have been an 'importation'), but that between Ares and Mars is not, and the agricultural associations of the latter (which are significant not only because Mars was not 'imported' from Greece but also, for example, when one considers the numerous Celtic deities with whom he was ultimately associated) are not stated. On the other hand, the cases where Greeks or Romans really had accepted otherwise unidentifiable gods demand some research into other languages and cultures; but there is no mention here of the interesting fact that Herodotus gives the Lydian spelling of Cybele (who originated in Asia Minor) as Cybebe, and on the Roman side the list of so-called 'Technical Terms' (pp.13-16), while including entries like 'Cretan' and 'Phoenician', omits 'Etruscan' (though it is occasionally mentioned in the Dictionary), let alone 'Villanovan'.

The plates are mainly reproductions from pottery, but the date and source of the pottery are never stated and this reduces their value. For example, that on p. 219, which shows the boy Oedipus without a swollen foot, needs more explanation; and it should also have been made clear that the Euphorbus carrying him is certainly not the Euphorbus listed on p. 133 (of whom, it might have been added, Pythagoras claimed to be a reincarnation).

Finally, despite the fact that, as already indicated, the book is not intended for classicists, accents and quantities are deliberately omitted (as stated on p. 12, where classicists are scoffed at again) - so much so that one is tempted to wonder if it was Roominess that Ronald Knox foresaw when he wrote his memorable lines:

'But why should we use the absurd Ps and Qs the pedant invented of yore?
How sweet to the ears are the praises of Ceres, and to speak of her daughter
as Core!'

More seriously, on p. 5 of the Introduction it is claimed that 'this dictionary aims to summarise what has already been proposed and to move the study of classical name origins a step further forward'. This it certainly fails to do. Not recommended.

A. L. F. RIVET

GEORGE STEWART, American Given Names: Their Origin and History in the Context of the English Language, Oxford University Press: New York, 1979, viii + 264 pp., £7.50.

American Given Names is a handsomely produced volume from a press renowned for authoritative dictionaries. It comprises a Historical Sketch (from 'The Anglo-Saxons' to 'The Twentieth Century'), an A-Z Dictionary, some linguistic notes, and a list of sources. Dictionaries of Christian names, usually aiming to provide for each name an etymology and a potted history of usage, are especially prone to copy information from each other, since their compilers, not altogether surprisingly, lack the personal knowledge to do otherwise. What one looks for, then, is (i) an element of originality derived from properly conducted private research, (ii) competence in sorting out the wheat from the chaff in other dictionaries, and (iii) a high level of accuracy in re-stating and interpreting linguistic and historical information falling outside the expertise of the compiler.

On grounds of originality, Stewart has something worthwhile to offer. 'The overall basis of this book has been my own countings of the individual names, which cover a wide field' (p. 263). They include birth lists of five London parishes 1540-49 and four London parishes 1640-49 (though how typical of naming fashions in the rest of England these unidentified baptismal registers were is a question neither asked nor answered); lists of early colonists in Roanoke, Jamestown, Massachusetts, and Plymouth; the muster rolls of four regiments of the Continental Army; all the graduate lists of Harvard and Princeton; the list of Mount Holyoke College (1837-1924, gathered, as are some 'samplings of Vassar College', in order partially to compensate for the overwhelming bias towards men's names in the other lists); and some modern school lists. Stewart's countings, set out in the Historical Sketch (pp. 8ff.) indicate that names among the early settlers exhibited, as one would expect, broadly similar patterns to those found in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century London, but that names of male children born in the Boston colony in the middle of the seventeenth century show a steep rise in the proportion of Biblical origin, from 52 per cent among the settling fathers to 90 per cent among their offspring, Old Testament names showing the sharpest increase, from eleven per cent to 40 per cent. In the eighteenth century, preferences in naming boys in the eastern, central, and southern colonies reflect differences in the geographical origins and religious affiliations of immigrants (pp. 21 ff.). As in Britain, the nineteenth century was marked by the development of middle names, by a Romantic flavour in many girls' names, and by the use of surnames as forenames (pp. 28ff.). The twentieth century, observes Stewart, is characterised by coinage of new names and an increasing abandonment of tradition in the naming of babies (pp. 37-42). The value of these generalisations is limited somewhat by the social narrowness of Stewart's eighteenth- and nineteenth-century material and by his lack of interest in current names of blacks which are not favoured by whites.

The next consideration is whether these research findings (the best of them already published over thirty years ago) provided a broad enough basis from which to embark upon the more ambitious undertaking of a historical dictionary, in which such material outside Stewart's personal knowledge has necessarily to be drawn from secondary sources, chiefly Withycombe's not entirely trustworthy Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names. Perhaps all would have gone passably well if only the author had taken greater trouble in extracting his secondary material and had received advice from scholars better informed than himself on early English names

and their etymologies. As it is, this dictionary is spoiled by unscholarly carelessness and ignorance, leading to muddle and misinformation in many of the dictionary entries and in sections of the Historical Sketch. Here are a few of numerous examples in the Dictionary. Leslie, he states, is transferred from the Scottish family name and its meaning 'is probably to be distantly connected with Latin laetitia "gladness" '; thus he confuses two entirely independent names - the Scottish family name, which is from a place-name in Fife (see P. H. Reaney, Dictionary of British Surnames and G. F. Black, Surnames of Scotland, s.n.) and the Middle English Christian name Letselin, diminutive of Lettice (from Lat. laetitia), which is not the source of modern Leslie. Stewart has, it seems, conflated two adjacent entries in Withycombe (Leslie and Lettice). Another misreading or Withycombe leads him to attribute the popularity of Hubert among the Anglo-Normans to St Hubert's patronage of hunting but at the same time to derive the ME name from 'Anglo-Saxon Hygebeorht' instead of Old Germanic Hugubert. A similar problem lies behind the curious entry for Florence: its late nineteenth-century popularity is attributed to admiration for Florence Nightingale but the only origin given is the ME (masculine) name, well known in romance but rare in real life, instead of the Italian city where Miss Nightingale was born and after which she was named.

At other times the author is no better off when he does (more or less) faithfully follow his crib. For example he repeats Withycombe's error in assigning the source of Chaucer's story about patient Griseida to Boccaccio instead of Petrarch (p.131). Regarding the origin and history of Averil (marked as masculine), Stewart's version of Withycombe's account manages to combine sins of omission and commission within the briefest compass:

The Anglo-Saxon form is Everild, and is probably 'boar-favour'. The name was in use in the medieval period, particularly in northern England, where a local saint was so named. The history of the name is uncertain, but it survives (though very rarely) in the United States.

In fact the 'local saint' was female and the OE form of the name would have been *Eoforhild, hild signifying 'battle' (not 'favour'). In so far as Stewart records Withycombe's comments accurately, in asserting that the name was in medieval use and is the source of the modern forename Av(e)rill (but exclusively feminine according to Withycombe), he does so in spite of Reaney's well-founded objections in the Dictionary of British Surnames (s.nn. April, Averill, Avril) which Stewart cites as one of his basic reference works. There is no evidence I know of for Everild as a ME baptismal name. Its later currency, intensely localised in place and time, appears from personal investigation to be almost wholly restricted to communities associated with members and relatives of the crypto-Catholic Constable family of Everingham, East Riding of Yorkshire, where the church has been dedicated to St Everild(a) since at least the early fourteenth century. The transference of Everild or Averill (a post-medieval variant) to the United States is unproven and seems unlikely. The modern American Averil, when masculine, is perhaps from the surname, or if feminine (as in England) may alternatively have been coined from Fr avril 'April'.

The constant repetition of Withycombe's generalisations (not all of them reliable) serves to emphasise how little actual research has been done, particularly in late medieval and early modern naming. It was predictable that Stewart would re-iterate Withycombe's blanket assertion that non-Biblical saints' names fell out of fashion after the Reformation, even though he is obliged to acknowledge from his own name counts that Francis, George, and Catherine, for example, showed no diminution in popularity.

His statement (following a similar one by Withycombe) that the use of Mary 'fell off during the later sixteenth century' (p.189) - partly because 'the Reformation de-emphasised the role of the Virgin Mary' and partly because of the unpopularity of 'Bloody Mary' and Mary Queen of Scots - is contradicted by my own regional studies of baptismal registers, which indicate that the liking for Mary grew rapidly during the latter part of Elizabeth's reign to the point where it was one of the most popular font-names at the turn of the new century.

The worst parts of this book are the accounts of Anglo-Saxon and Norman naming (pp.3-5 of the Historical Sketch). It is astonishing to read that in Anglo-Saxon times 'there was no clear way of distinguishing between men's and women's names' (p.4). Fuzzy concepts and misinformation are rendered even less palatable by the sloppiness of the diction and syntax. 'As a result of the Conquest and of Norman rule, the Anglo-Saxon nobility disappeared, often adopting Norman customs and names' (p.4). However, 'the peasants went on being (sic) Dene or Kragg or Cada, just as they had been before the Conquest' (ibid.). Dene and Kragg! (Not to mention Wurth, the 'Anglo-Saxon' name of a typical post-Conquest townsman, p.5.) When the inventions of the strip cartoonist or the romantic novelist supplant genuine historical evidence there is no knowing what further comic misadventures might befall this Historical Sketch. Well, the Normans 'were suffering what we might call a drought of names' because, having adopted French, 'a language which had lost the dithemic system, . . . they took over into French . . . a certain number of men's names which they were already using' (p.4). Which names? No, not Anketel or Tursten but William, Henry, Richard, Robert, Walter, Roger, Ralph, and Hugh, which were not Scandinavian, of course, but Frankish and borrowed by the Normans from the French. The ignorance is inexcusable.

If the author's knowledge of early onomastic history is weak, his grasp of linguistic matters in general is no better. We are given guth instead of gyð as the second element of Edith (p.3). In the name Katherine 'the use of K instead of C probably indicates that the name was brought into English by returning crusaders directly from the Greek, and not by way of the French, since that language scarcely uses k' (pp.166-7). Ill-informed and misleading speculation of this kind has no place in a book pretending to scholarship. Confusion of the written and spoken forms of names crop up frequently, as in the treatment of Henry and Harry (p.137) and of Sally, which Stewart proposes (p.227) to derive from an unrecorded Salah, apparently not realising that the common spoken form of Sarah was Sarey. He writes of Peter as if it were the usual vernacular form in medieval England (p.212). It is claimed that Nancy must be from Agnes (colloquially Annes) not Ann (Nan) because 'there is no reasonable place from which the c or s can develop' (p.197). Evidently he is unaware of the hypocoristic suffix -sy (as in Betsy, Patsy) and ignores the fact that in the eighteenth century Agnes was uncommon while Ann, Nan, and the newly coined Nancy were extremely popular. Most extraordinary of all is the general information that in the Dictionary 'the language of origin, as given, is that from which the name was immediately received into English, though in many instances the word itself may be traced back clear to Indo-European' (pp.261-2). Was William 'immediately' received into English from 'Germanic' (p.253), John from 'Hebrew' (p.158), Nicholas from 'Greek' (p.200)? Stewart does not know what he is saying; nor do the publishers when they claim on the dust-jacket that 'American Given Names is a fitting capstone to his long and distinguished career'. Least of all should the title have specified that the dictionary would treat names 'in the context of the English language' and it is on the dust-jacket, of course, that the publishers unhappily choose as an irresistible selling

point the work's most serious weakness: 'A browser's delight, the book is also an important contribution to the history of language . . .'. Caveat emptor.

PETER McCLURE

ALSO RECEIVED

MARGARET L. FAULL (ed.), Medieval Manorial Records, lectures by P. D. A. Harvey and Sylvia Thomas, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Medieval Section: 1983, 30pp., price £1 from Mrs V. Hall, 73 Lake Lock Drive, Stanley, Yorks., WF3 4HL.

This pamphlet comprises lectures on 'Manorial Records' and 'Manorial Court Rolls and their Contents'. These are useful either as an introduction to the subject or as a short 'refresher-course', and each has a relevant and up-to-date bibliography. Sylvia Thomas's inclusion (pp. 19-20) of 'outfangenethef' among the manorial legal rights granted by Anglo-Saxon kings to their favoured subjects should be deleted however, as there is no reliable pre-Conquest evidence of this.

A.R.R.

J. McN. Dodgson, Department of English, University College London.
Peter McClure, Department of English, University of Hull.
A. D. Mills, Department of English, Queen Mary College London.
Alexander Rumble, Department of Palaeography, University of Manchester.

THE COUNCIL FOR NAME STUDIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Chairman: Professor D. Ellis Evans, Jesus College Oxford.

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: I. A. Fraser, School of Scottish Studies, University of Edinburgh.

The Council concerns itself with the advancement, promotion, and support of research into the place-names and personal names of Great Britain and Ireland and related regions in respect of (i) the collection, documentation, and interpretation of such names, (ii) the publication of the material and the results of such research, (iii) the exchange of information between the various regions. Membership consists of representatives from relevant British and Irish organisations and a number of individual scholars elected by Council and usually domiciled in one of the relevant countries.

Members: Dr. G. Broderick, Professor K. Cameron, Miss C. Clark, Dr. B. Cox, J. McN. Dodgson, †Professor M. Dolley, †Professor H. Draye, Professor D. Ellis Evans, Professor A. Everitt, J. Field, Mrs. D. E. Flanagan, I. A. Fraser, Dr. M. L. Faull, P. G. M. Geelan, Dr. M. Gelling, Dr. D. Hooke, Dr. J. Insley, Professor K. Jackson, Dr. G. Fellows Jensen, Professor B. Lewis Jones, P. C. McClure, R. A. McKinley, Professor J. MacQueen, A. D. Mills, A. Macdonald, Professor W. F. H. Nicolaisen, Dr. J. P. Oakden, B. Ó Cíobháin, Professor C. Ó Cleirigh, Professor B. Ó Cúiv, Professor T. Ó Máille, The Ordnance Survey of Great Britain, Professor P. Ó Riain, O. J. Padel, Dr. G. Redmonds, Professor A. L. F. Rivet, T. Roberts, Dr. A. R. Rumble, Professor C. C. Smith, Mrs. J. Stevens, R. L. Thomson, V. E. Watts, Professor J. E. Caerwyn Williams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

English Name Studies and the Editorial Board of NOMINA are grateful to the University of Hull for providing facilities for the printing of NOMINA and to the Department of English in the same institution for many kinds of assistance. Special thanks are due to Professor J. A. V. Chapple, Head of the Department of English, to Mr. G. Sargeant and Mr. M. Ward of the Department of Design, to Mrs. M. Elliott who typed this issue, and to Mrs. D. Sharp who supervised the printing. Binding was by James Freeman, Printer, The Studio, Railway Station, Ferriby, E. Yorkshire.