

## NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE FOR ONOMASTICS

A review of ANTHONY FREEMAN, *The Moneyer and the Mint in the Reign of Edward the Confessor, 1042-1066*, British Archaeological Reports: British Series CXLV (i and ii), Oxford, 1985, 582 pp., £30.

Freeman's work, offering the most complete catalogue of name-forms on coins of Edward the Confessor to date, provides a remarkable source of evidence for late Old English names and name-forms. It presents analyses of the mints operating for the reign, in terms of the number of moneyers, length of tenure and possible movement of moneyers between mints. A list of all moneyers is given in Appendix VI. Now, given well-known variation in the spelling of OE names, such analyses rest heavily on the interpretations of various forms: as representing either the same name, whether or not referring to the same moneyer, or separate names referring to different moneyers. Freeman presents detailed citation and discussion of spelling variants, so that the bases for his assignment of forms to a particular name or names are available for the reader's assessment. The present paper focuses on some of the more problematic forms, suggesting principles by which their assignment may be tested.<sup>1</sup>

Reconstruction of the past rests on interpretation of data, which cannot be achieved without association between the concerns of various disciplines. The linguist reconstructing OE phonology, for instance, is dependent on the archaeologist and the palaeographer, for the very availability of material data, as well as for evidence concerning their interpretation. Toon and Hogg, for example, have illustrated the extent to which reconstruction of external history, and of socio-economic factors, may influence interpretations of OE dialect variation.<sup>2</sup> Any reconstruction necessarily also implies a theoretical claim; and if this is acknowledged in terms of an explicit theoretical framework, the plausibility of the reconstruction may in turn be evaluated. I suggest that interpretation of the onomastic data available on late Anglo-Saxon coins should be based on theories relating to at least the areas outlined below.

Onomastic theory distinguishes names from common words in terms of syntactic and morphological behaviour, which may also relate to different phonological patterns. For OE names, etyma cognate with common words are to be expected: the task is to identify a possible etymon for a name-element, given possible spelling variation between forms of the putatively cognate common word and those of the name-element, as well as between forms all putatively representing the same

name-element.<sup>3</sup> Assignment of a name-form to a particular etymon necessarily involves among other things phonological theory.

Phonological theory allows plausibility of spelling variation to be evaluated in terms of attested diatopic and diachronic phonological variation (i.e. between regions or periods of time), as well as of synchronic alternation within the phonological system of a single dialect (and less directly in terms of phonological naturalness). No phonological claim can be isolated from the orthographic forms which, after all, provide the primary evidence for phonological reconstruction; but, for the OE spelling system, variation may not necessarily correlate directly with phonological variation. On the one hand, traditions of scribal practice may obscure phonological variation; on the other, variation may be permissible within the bounds of the spelling and phonological systems, without directly reflecting phonological variation.<sup>4</sup>

The primary evidence for orthographic, phonological and onomastic theories lies in the material records of OE data: manuscripts, coins, lapidary inscriptions, and so on. Interpretation of orthography, and in the case of the coin-spellings, of epigraphy, considers the possible variations in shape to be grouped as representing the same graph, as well as reconstructions of scribal and epigraphic techniques as a basis for classifying a form as erroneous. Moreover, it must consider possible influences on the choice of form recorded, in terms of the purpose of the record, and the nature of the material on which it is preserved. A personal-name form, for instance, presumably functions to identify an individual,<sup>5</sup> and so may continue to fulfil this function when abbreviated. Abbreviation may also be determined by the design of the object: if a coin-design, for instance, leaves no room for a complete name-form, then just enough of the form to identify an individual need be recorded.

Finally, we have to respect the scribes and engravers: we must not 're-write' what is recorded to fit a favourite theory; and not dismiss as an 'error' any 'undesirable' form without having exhausted all possible interpretations of it as a genuine spelling. In what follows, I consider some of Freeman's interpretations of the name-material in the light of the theoretical considerations outlined above.

On all such grounds, we can endorse for instance the grouping of variant forms from the Lincoln mint (p.113). **PURCIL** must be a form of **ÐORCTEL**, given the absence of any known etymon **wur-**, as well as the phonological plausibility of **u/o** alternation, and the epigraphic plausibility of interpreting **P** as an

error for Ð (that is, of assuming that the die-engraver has produced wynn instead of eth); AS and OS are phonologically acceptable variants of the same Old Norse etymon, allowing association of ASLAC with OSLAC, ASFERÐ with OSFERÐ; ÞULF and ULF represent diatopic variants (OE and ON) of the same etymon; OÐBEORN and ÞULBEORN, in contrast, not only 'seem entirely separate philologically', but surely must be kept apart on onomastic criteria, which recognize the existence of a discrete etymon for each prototheme (ON oð/auð; OE or ON wulf/ulf); and there can be no doubt about the identity of BERHTRIC with "Brihtric", given attested phonological development of the cognate common word, OE beorht, Present-day English bright.

Specifically onomastic theory may be invoked in an interpretation of the form LOC, cited for Winchester coins (p.136): 'The conjunction of "Loc" and "Æstan Loc" forms suggests that they might be representative of a single moneyer "Æstan Loc", but the independence of "Loc" in the Small Flan and Expanding Cross types and its recognition by Smart as a discrete form suggests that an alternative interpretation might be possible, of "Loc" coining both independently ... and in conjunction with Æthestan'. The implied inference here of two moneyers, with both their names on the same coin, is certainly not forced on us by evidence about the use of by-names in late OE: 'By-names also occur independently of any other name, and it appears that one man could have been identified by personal name, by personal name plus by-name, or by by-name alone'.<sup>6</sup> Onomastic theory will support re-attribution of BM 1151: FARGHIR, from Sandwich, and association with "Færgim" at Stamford (p.119), partly on negative grounds: in the absence of any possible etymon for a deutertheme \*ghir, there seems no reason not to group it with the name attested at Stamford, especially given phonologically plausible variation between A and Æ in the prototheme, and epigraphically explicable H for M, and transposition of the letters, in the deutertheme. Interpretation of the form does not require introduction to Stamford of 'an otherwise unrecorded moneyer'.

Phonological analysis overlaps with onomastic in relation to the forms -CIL/-CETEL at York (p.82); the short form of the element, cognate with OE and ON cetel 'kettle', represents phonological reduction in the second element of compounds, well-attested for this particular name-deutertheme.<sup>7</sup> Freeman's claim that the forms are 'philologically discrete' (p.83) is supported neither by this analysis, nor by the citation of Smart,<sup>8</sup> where indeed synonymity, and thus philological identity, is endorsed.

Consideration of -CIL brings us to forms occurring as protothemes to this element, particularly the EAR-/ARN-/ERN- variants (p.83): "'Earcil" is unknown elsewhere as a moneyer's name during the period 1042-87 ... yet the deliberation with which the reproduction of what was presumably a different vowel sound was attempted - by the engraving and employment of at least two reverse dies - suggests that the coins of "Earcil" could represent the work of an otherwise unknown moneyer.' We can lend greater credence to Freeman's appropriate conclusion, that 'the balance of probabilities lies with determination of "Earcil" as a subordinate form of "Arncetel"', by recourse to phonological theory in relation to late OE spelling variation. The ARN- form represents the ON prototheme, cognate with OE earn 'eagle'. A/EA spelling alternations reflect the ON and OE reflexes of Germanic [a], viz. [a] and [æa] respectively; so EAR- may represent Anglicization (whether of spelling or phonology) of the ON name-element. The alternation can be interpreted as evidence of acceptable diatopic variation. Alternatively, A/EA forms may reflect diachronic phonological developments within OE. By the eleventh century, the OE low diphthong represented by ea has monophthongized and merged with the low front monophthong [æ], which itself merged with the low back monophthong [a], as /a/,<sup>9</sup> as evidenced by replacement of æ by a in the spelling of common words. The graphs a and ea therefore become interchangeable, since ea can now signify [a] (we need not assume a direct relationship between the digraph and a diphthongal signification, given a phonological theory that captures attested late OE sound-changes). But this would not account for the ERN-form; and what we are probably dealing with here is evidence for vowel-lengthening before homorganic consonant groups.<sup>10</sup> While the reflex of short [æa] is [a] in Middle English, spelt a, the long low diphthong [æ:a], which merges with late OE [æ:], spelt æ appears in ME spelt e, representing a long low-mid monophthong.<sup>11</sup> Variation in the vowel spelling therefore gives no grounds for dissociation of EAR- from ARN-/ERN-; and the absence of element-final N is readily explained as the result of phonological reduction of consonant clusters at the morphological boundary between elements of a compound.<sup>12</sup>

The type of analysis just applied to EAR- forms is relevant, too, to Freeman's association of ÆLDRED at London with the recorded moneyer Ælfred (p.164). This appears to be favoured over Smart's 'Ealdraed' so as to avoid the need to 'create' a new 'single-type' moneyer. Despite the claim that 'Transposition of "Æ" for "Ea" is unusual', I would argue that such variation is explicable in terms of a theory of late OE phonology (and such variation is

attested in OE manuscript orthography)<sup>13</sup>; and that ÆLD- more plausibly represents Eald- than Ælf-, especially since the latter interpretation involves positing an epigraphic error of D for F (to be resisted unless all other phonological and onomastic interpretations fail; on the desirability of respecting the material record, see below).

Given attested types of diatopic variation within OE, we can support Freeman's association of DIRMAN with the moneyer Deorman recorded at London (p.162). The form need not, however, be interpreted vaguely as 'indicative perhaps of a difficult vowel sound', but can be linked with regional phonological variation evidenced also in the -yr and eor forms for Durinc (p.162);<sup>14</sup> the y vowel graph is typical of the late OE orthographic alternation of i and y. Since the protothemes of Deorman and Durinc have an identical etymon, viz. OE dēor, 'dear', with original development of the Germanic diphthong [eu] to OE [e:o], they might helpfully be classified under the same head-form.

Examples of forms which may be interpreted as abbreviations of attested names include ÆLLFF at Gloucester, for which there is no difficulty in agreeing with Freeman's attribution to the recorded moneyer Ælfsige (p.365), rather than to Æpulf (the latter interpretation would imply perhaps too great a degree of epigraphic variation, not readily explicable in terms of what may be known about epigraphic practice and coin-making procedure). WULFSTE, at Hereford, is most plausibly read, in agreement with Smart, as a form of Wulfstān rather than of Wulfsige (given the presence of T), even though 'this is to introduce to the mint on the evidence of an ambiguous name-form a moneyer otherwise unknown at Hereford' (p.374). This leads me to illustrate my final point: that of the importance of respecting the material: while I do not see WULFSTE as ambiguous, others may agree with Freeman; but, for at least two forms, it would appear that interpretation of the data is forced by Freeman to fit the numismatic theory.

The form EARNPIG at Shrewsbury (p.345) would, for Freeman, be more happily associated with the recorded moneyer Ægelric: but, unless the coin (M 430) has been seriously misread, onomastic and epigraphic criteria demand acceptance of a moneyer Earnwig, whose name is not only composed of recognized OE elements cognate with OE earn 'eagle' and wīg 'war', respectively, but is itself adequately attested. It would stretch the bounds of epigraphic variation to posit EARN for ÆGEL (or ÆIEL/ÆEL, or other acceptable variants of this element) as well as PIG for RIC. On the corpus of Winchester moneyers, Freeman suggests

(p.134): 'In view of the virtually complete absence of the full ÆGELPINE form, the name-form would be discounted from the canon of Winchester moneyers were it not for the precepts of the philologist ...'. Now it may depend on how one interprets 'virtually', but I regard the two forms given in Table 30 (p.135), viz. ÆGELPINI and ÆIELPINE, as strong counter-evidence to the 'absence' of the name Ægelwine. It is one thing to group variant forms together as representative of the same name when no attested discrete etyma warrant their separation (see, e.g., FARGHIR/FERGRIM above), but Ælf- and Ægel- are well-known as name-elements in OE, with readily identifiable common-word cognates: ælf 'elf', and æthele 'noble'.

The present paper has deliberately focused on problematic forms in the hope of illustrating both the value of numismatic data for OE onomastics and a belief that this data can be interpreted only in the light of theoretical reconstructions of OE onomastic, phonological (and morphological) and orthographic systems, in turn informed by a respect for the materials which survive to offer such data. Such a treatment will inevitably appear 'nit-picking' and perhaps ungenerous. But it is far from my intention to undervalue the rôle that Freeman's volumes will assume in future research into the several areas of interest necessarily involved in a study of the Anglo-Saxon mint: numismatics, history, onomastics, and the study of the OE language (philological and linguistic). Crucially, the analyses presented by Freeman are based on data clearly and precisely presented: there are no covert assumptions, about for instance the name-forms, to deceive the reader: I shall certainly make use of these volumes in teaching courses on OE onomastics.

As for the production of the volumes, I think the reader is well served for the £30: the number of misprints resulting in spelling errors may cause misgivings - although so far I have not located these amongst the citations of coin-spellings; but one dare not contemplate the cost of production of so many informative tables and charts in a process other than that adopted by British Archaeological Reports.

FRAN COLMAN

#### NOTES

1. I have discussed some other forms, and aspects of the non-onomastic material, in another review of Freeman's book in British Numismatic Journal (1985).

2. T. Toon, The Politics of Early Old English Sound-Changes (New York, 1983); R. Hogg, 'On the impossibility of Old English dialectology', Proceedings of the Luick Symposium: Vienna, September 1985 (forthcoming).
3. F. Colman, 'Anglo-Saxon pennies and Old English phonology', Folia Linguistica Historica V (1984), 91-143.
4. F. Colman, 'What is in a name?', Proceedings of the International Conference on Historical Dialectology: Posnan, May 1986 (forthcoming).
5. Ibidem.
6. Colman, 'Anglo-Saxon pennies', 116, and see further G. Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire (Copenhagen, 1968), p.xxix.
7. Colman, 'Anglo-Saxon pennies', 134; see also A. Noreen, Altschwedische Grammatik (Halle, 1904), § 156, Anm.2.
8. V. Smart, Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles, XXVIII: Cumulative Index to Volumes I-XX (Oxford and London, 1981), 14.
9. A. Campbell, Old English Grammar (Oxford, 1959), § 329.
10. Ibidem, § 283.
11. F. Colman, 'A Philological Study of the Moneyers' Names on Coins of Edward the Confessor', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford 1981, 193, and references therein.
12. Colman, 'Anglo-Saxon pennies', 130.
13. Colman, 'What is in a name?'.
14. Colman, 'Anglo-Saxon pennies', 118-19.

TOPONYMY AND SETTLEMENT IN THE NORTH-WEST

A review of GILLIAN FELLOWS-JENSEN, Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West, Navnestudier udgivet af Institut for Navneforskning XXV, C. A. Reitzels Forlag: Copenhagen, 1985, xxii + 455 pp., 33 maps.

Gillian Fellows-Jensen's study of Scandinavian settlement-names in the North-West treats the pre-1974 English counties of Cheshire, Lancashire, Westmorland and Cumberland, together with Dumfriesshire in south-west Scotland. It is organized in a similar way to the author's earlier studies of Scandinavian settlement-names in Yorkshire (1972) and in the East Midlands (1978). After the bibliography and the list of abbreviations comes an introductory chapter dealing with the historical background and the onomastic material; this concludes with an explanation of the plan upon which the work is based. Just under two-thirds of the book (chaps II-VI) consists of an examination of the relevant place-name types, together with a corpus of material. The last third is largely taken up by two chapters (VII-VIII) dealing with the distribution of the names and with the various types of evidence which can be used for assessing the Scandinavian colonization of the North-West and its rôle in the toponymy of this region; this is accompanied by a series of short regional sketches which are particularly useful. The final section consists of an appendix of place-names previously thought to be of Scandinavian origin but for which the author prefers other interpretations, followed by a Danish summary and a comprehensive index to the place-names treated.

At present, any analysis of the Scandinavian settlement-names of the North-West, even one of this size, must still remain somewhat provisional, owing to the uneven nature of the material available. For Cheshire we have, in John Dodgson's EPNS volumes (1970-81), a definitive body of material backed up by mostly sound etymologies; and for Cumberland and Westmorland the EPNS surveys (1950-2 and 1967, respectively) provide excellent corpora of material supported by etymologies which are in the main correct. However, Dodgson's introduction to his Cheshire volumes has not yet appeared and those to the Cumberland and Westmorland surveys already look somewhat dated, especially when considered in the light of recent work on settlement patterns. For Lancashire, the situation is, on the whole, less satisfactory. Eilert Ekwall's The Place-Names of Lancashire appeared as long ago as 1922 and, although it was in its own time a model for future surveys and contains a still-valuable body of material, its age is often apparent. In particular,