Distinctive Additions in English Settlement Names: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach

Andrea Bölcskei
Károli Gáspár University, Budapest

1. Introduction

This paper attempts to describe and account for the semantic diversity of distinctive additions used in English settlement names. Relevant data were collected from the classic etymological dictionary *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* compiled by Eilert Ekwall.[1] As theoretical background, the basic principles of cognitive linguistics[2] and those of the compatible functional-semantic component of István Hoffmann's model of place-name analysis[3] have been adopted in the investigation. In working out an adequate semantic categorisation of the observed distinctive additions, we may well come to an understanding of the speakers' conceptualisations of such entities as settlements.

2. Distinctive additions

Langacker argues that, in contrast with the traditional view that considers names as meaningless units of the language, able only to refer to certain entities in the world, names do have meanings. The meaning of a name

[1] The 4th, revised edition of the dictionary (hereafter: Ekwall, *DEPN*), used as a primary source of data, was published in Oxford fifty years ago, in 1960. Thus, settlement names collected from *DEPN* are best considered as historical place-names, though many of them still exist. Ekwall gives very detailed discussions of distinctive additions in settlement name entries, which proved especially useful for our purposes.

[2] These principles are introduced and explained by R. W. Langacker in his works *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, 2 vols (Stanford, 1987–91) and *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction* (Oxford, 2008).

[3] I. Hoffmann, *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése [Linguistic Analysis of Place-Names]*, 2nd edn (Budapest, 2007): in this model of place-name analysis, descriptive and historical examinations of toponyms form two different, but interrelating levels of enquiry. In descriptive, structural analysis, names are examined from functional-semantic, lexical-morphological and syntactic points of view. Functional-semantic analysis deals with elements of the name, labelled as 'name constituents' (i.e. units of the toponym 'which—in the situation of name formation—express any semantic feature that is connected with the signalled denotatum' (p. 176)), in their relationship with the denotative meaning of the place-name. Lexical-morphological analysis enumerates the lexical and morphological means by which the functional-semantic categories are realised in the name. Names of two constituents are also subject to syntactic analysis, which focuses on the grammatical relation between the name constituents. Historical analysis discovers possible methods of place-name formation.

results partly from the speakers' conventionalised encyclopaedic knowledge about the denotatum bearing the name, based on the mental construal of the designated entity, and partly from an idealised cognitive model on conventions of name use in a speech community, which presupposes that each relevant entity bears a distinct name that uniquely identifies it. As a result, names are epistemically grounded by default. The semantics of names differs from the semantics of common nouns in the fact that 'the type/instance distinction is neutralized' in names: 'the type has just one instance'. From this it follows that whenever reality fails to meet the expectations of the idealised cognitive model (i.e. when different entities bear the same name), the type/instance distinction is activated (i.e. based on the several instances it is possible to abstract the type) and names become common nouns requiring overt grounding in discourse.[4]

This is exactly what happens in certain situations of place-naming. In the course of history different settlements in the country could get the same name, either because there was more than just one prototypical instance of a habitation displaying the feature(s) expressed in the name within the territory of the country,[5] or because settlements were divided into distinct habitations and multiplied as a result of overpopulation or changes in ownership.[6] Insofar as the identical names have been used in different speech communities, unique identification of the relevant settlements has been provided by the names. With the extension of people's geographical knowledge about more or less distant areas resulting from improved communications, government administration and postal services, however, members of the same speech community soon became aware of the existence of identical settlement names. Obviously, identical settlement names denoting different habitations, when used in a single speech community, cannot fulfil their identifying function properly: polysemous habitation names need separate grounding to be able to satisfy the requirements of the idealised cognitive model on name use. By attaching distinctive additions to the identical habitation names, ground-

[4] Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar*, pp. 316–8 (quotation is from p. 317).
[5] The importance of prototypicality as opposed to distinctiveness in place-names has recently been demonstrated by C. Hough in her study 'Commonplace place-names', *Nomina*, 30 (2007), 101–20.
[6] I. Szabó, *A falurendszer kialakulása Magyarországon. X–XV. század [Development of Village System in Hungary. 10–15th century]* (Budapest, 1966), pp. 119–38. This book quotes Western European examples as well.

ing takes place, and as a result, the settlement names regain their special ability to identify habitations unambiguously.

In general, adding a distinctive addition to a settlement name is the result of the speakers' active problem-solving activity to re-establish the identifying potential of a malfunctioning place-name in communication, a cognitive act depending on the way that speakers conceptualise the designated entity. In other words, identifying settlements of the same name in cognition is manifested in the process of attaching distinctive additions to identical settlement names in the language: on the basis of salient, often opposing features of the settlements under discussion, relevant cognitive domains are activated to be reflected in appended distinctive additions in new, improved name forms to promote unique identification. As a result, in each case a prominent, thus identifying feature of the settlement is profiled in the distinctive addition with other, less prominent features of the same settlement as well as striking features of the surrounding settlements, especially of the one(s) bearing the same primary name in the background.[7] The profiled unique features in the distinctive additions effectively help speakers' conceptualisation of the settlements. In fact, in the new, differentiated name forms distinctive additions function as reference points: they open a mental space for conceptualisation and direct understanding of the concept of the required entity.[8]

Settlement names grounded by distinctive additions should be considered as name forms consisting of two functionally relevant name components: a basic constituent (i.e. the original, primary name) denoting the settlement itself and a distinguishing complement constituent (i.e. the distinctive addition) reflecting a characteristic feature of the settlement. It means that the functional-semantic structure of such a settlement name as *Danby Wiske*, for example, can be described as follows: that settlement called *Danby* (1, a basic constituent denoting the settlement itself) which can be found on the bank of the river *Wiske* (2, a distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement). The fact that the original name *Danby* is itself a name of two constituents: a *by* 'village', 'homestead' (1, a basic constituent denoting the type of the settlement) possessed or inhabited by *the Danes* (2, a non-distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement), is,

[7] Settlement name differentiation, whether appearing immediately or long after primary name construction, as a linguistic process in many respects bears a close affinity with the mechanism of place-name formation in general.

[8] See R. W. Langacker's discussion of 'Reference point constructions', in *Grammar and Conceptualization* (Berlin and New York, 1999), pp. 171–202.

from this standpoint, unimportant: in the process of identifying a settlement name by way of attaching a distinctive addition to it, the internal structure of the primary name is irrelevant, which is clearly reflected in the fact that the functions of the name constituents in the two cases, as it is indicated above, are essentially different.[9]

3. Terminology

The basic linguistic features of the process of distinguishing identical settlement names with distinctive elements in the English language are discussed in the relevant literature either from a theoretical,[10] or from a practical[11] point of view. Regarding terminology, the unmodified, identical place-names, regardless of their internal structure, are usually labelled as 'generics', 'primary names' or 'basic names';[12] whilst the differentiating elements are also called 'distinctive additions',[13] 'distinguishing/distinctive affixes',[14] 'additional/secondary names',[15] 'modifiers',[16] 'attributes',[17] 'secondary specifiers'[18] or 'distinguishing specifics'.[19] The pro-

[9] This description is based on I. Hoffmann's place-name analysis in *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*, pp. 53–66; for its main concepts see footnote 3. By presenting the functional-semantic structures of settlement names in the above way we by no means deny the principle of the universal two-fold structure of place-names (i.e. a place-name usually consists of a generic and a specific constituent) identified by G. R. Stewart in his book *Names on the Globe* (New York, 1975), pp. 20–25; we simply adapt it to the observed process, emphasising the last step (i.e. differentiation) of name formation.

[10] See, for example, Stewart, *Names on the Globe*, pp. 20–25; C. Clark, 'Onomastics', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, edited by N. Blake (Cambridge, 1992), II, 542–606.

[11] See, for example, K. Cameron, *English Place-Names* (London, 1996), pp. 102–13; C. M. Matthews, *Place-Names of the English-Speaking World* (Worcester and London, 1975), pp. 108–18; Stewart, *Names on the Globe*, pp. 341–45.

[12] See, for example, Stewart, *Names on the Globe*, pp. 20–25.

[13] See, for example, Ekwall, *DEPN*, ix–xii.

[14] See, for example, Cameron, *English Place-Names*, pp. 102–13; Clark, 'Onomastics', pp. 542–606.

[15] See, for example, Matthews, *Place-Names of the English-Speaking World*, pp. 108–18.

[16] See, for example, D. Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 140–55.

[17] See, for example, P. H. Reaney, *The Origin of English Place-Names* (London, 1960), pp. 203–06.

[18] See, for example, Stewart, *Names on the Globe*, pp. 20–25.

[19] *Ibid*., pp. 341–45 (p. 345).

cess itself is sometimes referred to as 'settlement name differentiation'.[20] Describing distinctive additions in most of the cases is a secondary aspect for consideration in works of place-name analysis.[21]

4. Types of distinctive additions

Cognitive linguists claim that our understanding of the world is manifested in the language structures we use to describe it: linguistic expressions reflect all relevant aspects of our experiential knowledge about an entity, an action, a situation, etc. of the world. This knowledge is gained by way of perceiving, mentally scanning, abstracting and schematising the most important features of the entity concerned.[22] On the basis of these mental processes, we decide upon the category to which the entity belongs in cognition: an entity is declared to be a member of a category if its features bear a striking resemblance to those of the prototype, i.e. the 'best example' of the category. Features as abstractions are stored in cognitive domains comprising the mental concept of the relevant entity.

In the same way, the concept of SETTLEMENT is made up of a complex matrix of several cognitive domains. Common nouns referring to distinct forms of human settlement, such as *city, town, village, hamlet, farmstead* reflect most of these cognitive domains simultaneously, without suggesting possible divisions among them. Elements of habitation names, especially single-component distinctive additions, however, regularly profile only one such cognitive domain. Thus, elaborating the semantic categorisation of distinctive additions might help us to identify what sort of cognitive domains are to be found in the concept of SETTLEMENT.

Langacker's 'encyclopedic view of linguistic semantics' claims that 'the matrix for an expression comprises an open-ended set of domains, whose specifications differ in centrality and in how intrinsic they are to the designated entity'.[23] As will soon become apparent, distinctive additions as distinguishing constituents can also reflect (i) a central feature

[20] A. Bölcskei, 'The correlational system of Hungarian historical place-names', in *Settlement Names in the Uralian Languages*, edited by S. Maticsák, Onomastica Uralica, 3 (Debrecen and Helsinki, 2005), pp. 155–82.

[21] For already existing analyses see Cameron, *English Place-Names*, pp. 102–13; Matthews, *Place-Names of the English Speaking World*, pp. 108–18; V. Zinkin, 'The Specifying Component in West Jersey Place-Names', *Names*, 34 (1986), 62–82; Clark, 'Onomastics', pp. 542–606; etc.

[22] As this paper is devoted to names of settlements, our concern is restricted to entities. N.B. the word *entity* used in its broadest sense could also involve actions, situations, etc.

[23] Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* II, 60.

(i.e. a property of the settlement itself); (ii) a peripheral feature (i.e. an additional attribute of the settlement); or even (iii) a positional feature (i.e. the geographic position) of the settlement.[24] Descriptive distinctive additions, though surely apt at the time when they were attached to the settlement names, may have lost their relevance for today. Localising distinctive additions, however, may remain valid more permanently. In some (iv) special cases, distinctive additions of describing and localising function are used parallel with each other to help the identification of a single settlement. As presented below,[25] each of the above blanket categories consists of several sub-categories (for the statistics of each category see Appendix).[26]

[24] I. Hoffmann in the functional-semantic component of his place-name analysis presents name constituents whose function is to express a feature of the place in essentially the same categories, but labels the categories in a different way: he speaks about name constituents referring to (i) 'the attribute of the place'; (ii) 'the relationship of the place with something not inherent in it'; (iii) 'the relationship of the place with another place'; cf. *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*, pp. 53–66 and 171–80. I prefer to use the above labels here, as they are more compatible with the cognitive theory. Here I would like to record my thanks to Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy, who called my attention to this fact, for his helpful comments on my work.

[25] When categorising distinctive additions one faces several problems: first, formally identical distinctive additions could manifest different cognitive domains in different settlement names; second, attaching a distinctive addition to a name form could be induced by a number of simultaneously activated cognitive domains; third, sources sometimes do not give us enough information to decide about the domains reflected in certain distinctive additions. Thus, the categorisation presented here is based on the most plausible motivation of each distinctive addition, so at best it can be considered as a tentative attempt at factual classification.

[26] Illustrative examples as well as explanations below, if not stated otherwise, are taken from Ekwall's *DEPN*; for details see its relevant entries. Names are spelt according to Ekwall's practice. The name forms are followed in parentheses by the abbreviation of the county in which the settlement bearing the name can be found. The abbreviations employed are those of the *DEPN*: Bd = Bedfordshire, Bk = Buckinghamshire, Brk = Berkshire, Ca = Cambridgeshire, Chs = Cheshire, Co = Cornwall, Cu = Cumberland, D = Devonshire, Db = Derbyshire, Do = Dorset, Du = Durham, Ess = Essex, Gl = Gloucestershire, Ha = Hampshire, He = Herefordshire, Hrt = Hertfordshire, Hu = Huntingdonshire, K = Kent, La = Lancashire, Le = Leicestershire, Li = Lincolnshire, Mx = Middlesex, Nb = Northumberland, Nf = Norfolk, Np = Northamptonshire, Nt = Nottinghamshire, O = Oxfordshire, Ru = Rutland, Sa = Shropshire, Sf = Suffolk, So = Somerset, Sr = Surrey, St = Staffordshire, Sx = Sussex, W = Wiltshire, Wa = Warwickshire, We = Westmorland, Wo = Worcestershire, YE = East Yorkshire, YN = North Yorkshire, YW = West Yorkshire.

4.1. Distinctive additions reflecting a central feature identify the habitation by indicating a prominent characteristic of the settlement itself. Central features highlighted in distinctive additions seem to be manifestations of such cognitive domains as SIZE, AGE, SHAPE and STATUS.

4.1.1. SIZE as a domain is represented most commonly in the pair of distinctive additions *Great* and *Little*, usually in correlation with each other, e.g. *Great* and *Little Kelk* (YE). The same domain is manifested in the opposing distinctive elements *Much* (< Old English (OE) *micel, mycel* 'great') and *Little, Mickle* (< Old Scandinavian (OScand) *mikill* 'great') and *Little, Magna* (< Latin (Lat) *magnus* 'great') and *Parva* (< Lat *parvus* 'little'), *Major* (< Lat *maior* 'great, bigger') and *Minor* (< Lat *minor* 'little, smaller'), e.g. *Much* and *Little Cowarne* (He), *Mickleover* and *Littleover* (Db), *Linstead Magna* and *Parva* (Sf), *St. Columb Major* and *Minor* (Co). The (once) smaller settlement is usually the daughter village of the bigger one, so it is not uncommon that contrasting name forms of this sort indicate settlements in close proximity.

4.1.2. *New* and *Old* as distinctive additions reflect AGE, usually in correlative name forms of neighbouring settlements, e.g. *New* and *Old Lakenham* (Nf). The addition in *All Cannings* (W) is also a derivative of *old*.

4.1.3. SHAPE is typically represented in three distinctive additions, cf. names such as *Long Riston* (YE), *Broad Hinton* (W), *Acton Round* (Sa), etc.; though Ekwall believes that *Broad* as a distinguishing element was also used in the sense of 'great' in settlement names.[27]

4.1.4. Some distinctive additions demonstrate STATUS as an identifying feature of the habitations, e.g. *Bower Chalk* (< OE *burg*, *burh* 'town, borough', W), *Milborne Port* (< OE *port* 'town', So), *Bircham Tofts* (< OScand *toft, topt* 'homestead', Nf).

4.2. Identification of a habitation could also be promoted by foregrounding a characteristic peripheral feature of the settlement in the distinctive addition. Data show that distinguishing elements indicating a peripheral feature manifest the domains NATURAL SURROUNDINGS, BUILDING, PROPRIETOR, INHABITANTS, ECONOMIC LIFE and OTHER PERIPHERAL FEATURE, many of which comprise several smaller domains.

[27] Ekwall, *DEPN*, p. 57, s.v. *brād*.

4.2.1. Distinctive additions reflecting NATURAL SURROUNDINGS as the identifying peripheral feature of the settlement could demonstrate the more restricted domains of SOIL, FLORA or FAUNA.

4.2.1.1. Distinguishing constituents representing SOIL usually highlight the colour, e.g. *Black* and *White Notley* (Ess);[28] or the poor quality, e.g. *Norton le Clay* (clayey soil, YN), *Hungry Bentley* (the soil needs added nutrients, Db), *Stoney Stratton* (stony soil, So), less frequently the good quality, e.g. *Buttercrambe* (rich pastures, YN) of the ground.

4.2.1.2. Distinctive additions foregrounding FLORA as an identifying feature of the settlement might have reference to plants growing wild, e.g. *Walmley Ash* (Wa), *Walsham le Willows* (Sf), *Coton in the Elms* (Db); or the lack of them, e.g. *Aston Blank* (Gl) as well as to cultivated plants, e.g. *Thornton le Beans* (YN), *Flax Bourton* (So).

4.2.1.3. Distinguishing elements reflecting FAUNA usually indicate animals bred typically in the settlement, e.g. *Cow Honeyborne* (Gl), *Tŏller Porcorum* (< Lat 'of the pigs', Do).

4.2.2. Distinctive additions manifesting BUILDING highlight the specified domains of RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE, INDUSTRIAL BUILDING and FORTIFICATION.

4.2.2.1. The RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE whose presence is indicated in the distinctive addition can be a church, e.g. *Gresley Church* (Db), *Kirk Smeaton* (YW), *Ainderby Steeple* (YN), *Lytchett Minster* (Do); a chapel, e.g. *Chapel Haddlesey* (YW); a cloister, e.g. *Newstead Abbey* (Nt), *Hinton Charterhouse* (So); a cross, e.g. *Ampney Crucis* (Gl), *Rood Ashton* (W), *Kingston Cross* (Ha). Sometimes it is the colour of the church that is foregrounded in the distinctive addition, e.g. *Leaden Roding* (the roof of the church is supposed to have been greyish, Ess), *White Roding* (from its white church, Ess), *Frome Vauchurch* (< OE *fāg* 'multicoloured', from its coloured church, Do). The patron saint of the church is reflected in distinguishing components including or lacking the element *saint*, e.g. *Norton St. Philip* (So), *George Nympton* (D); sometimes in possessive structures, e.g. *Rockland St. Andrew's* (Nf).

[28] Cameron, *English Place-Names*, p. 103.

4.2.2.2. INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS manifested in distinctive additions include mills, e.g. *Barton Mills* (Sf), *Corfe Mullen* (< Old French *mulin* 'mill', Do); or farm buildings, e.g. *Cerney Wick* (< OE *wīc* 'dairy farm', Gl).

4.2.2.3. Distinctive additions highlighting FORTIFICATION might refer to castles, e.g. *Castle Morton* (Wo); or Roman walls, e.g. *Heddon on the Wall* (Nb).

4.2.3. Distinctive additions reflecting PROPRIETOR are very popular distinguishing elements. In these additions domains of INDIVIDUAL OWNER and INSTITUTIONAL OWNER are manifested. Proprietary distinctive constituents very often follow the primary names they were attached to.

4.2.3.1. Proprietary distinctive additions representing INDIVIDUAL OWNER often display the name of a former possessor. The births of these name forms were encouraged by history. In the Middle Ages, as is well known, a nobleman's demesne after his death could be divided among the inheritors: the heirs either legally or physically often divided up the inherited settlements as well. This fact was usually indicated in the names of the divisions in the form of added distinguishing elements naming the actual owners. A clear, linguistic sign of real ownership is revealed in the presence of a possessive structure in the name form, which often disappears when the ownership is terminated, e.g. *Milton Abbot's* (1297, belonged to the Abbey of Tavistock) later becomes *Milton Abbot* (D); *Staunton Prior's* (1276, held by the Prior of Bath) changes to *Stanton Prior* (So). Male and female first names, family names as well as nicknames of former owners can equally be found as distinctive additions in relevant settlement names, e.g. *Brightwell Baldwin* (possessed by Sir Baldwin de Bereford in 1373, O), *Winterbourne Gunner* (owned by Gunnora de la Mare in 1250, W), *Milton Keynes* (possession of Lucas de Kaynes in 1221, Bk), *Colly Weston* (held by Nicholas de Segrave at the beginning of the fourteenth century; *Colly* comes from *Colin*, a nickname form of *Nicholas,* Np). Distinctive additions displaying family names of proprietors might confirm the statements of historical documents regarding possession, e.g. settlement names suggest that the Basset family must have owned large areas of land in the middle and southern parts of the country: *Berwick Bassett* (W), *Colston Basset* (Nt), *Compton Bassett* (W), *Drayton Bassett* (St), *Dunton Bassett* (Le), *Easton Bassett* (W),

Letcombe Basset (Brk), *Sutton Bassett* (Np), *Thorpe Bassett* (YE), *Winterbourne Bassett* (W), *Wootton Bassett* (W). Distinctive additions sometimes preserve the name of a former tenant, e.g. *Ashford Bowdler* (rented by Henry de Boulers in 1211–2, Sa), *Weston Birt* (Richard le Bret was a local tenant in 1242, Gl).

4.2.3.2. INSTITUTIONAL OWNER could be demonstrated in distinctive additions either by indicating the rank, whether lay or ecclesiastic, of the proprietor or by naming the institution in possession. Social ranks highlighted in distinctive additions declare the former possession of royalties, noblemen and people in office, e.g. *Easton Royal* (royal estate at the time of the Norman Conquest, W), *Kings Pyon* (held by Edward the Confessor in 1066, He), *Queen Charlton* (gifted to Catherine Parr by Henry VIII, So), *Princes Risborough* (held by the Black Prince, Bk), *Collingbourne Ducis* (possessed by the Earls, later Dukes of Lancaster, W), *Earl Soham* (owned by the Earl of Norfolk, Sf), *Child Okeford* (< OE *cild* 'knight', Do), *Sheriff Hutton* (belonged to the sheriff of York, YN), *Thornton Steward* (possessed by Wymar steward to the Earl of Richmond around 1100, YN). Ecclesiastical ranks appearing in distinctive additions are also varied, e.g. *Melbury Abbas* (possessed by the Abbess of Shaftesbury, Do), *Bishops Offley* (belonged to the Bishop of Lichfield, St), *Canon Frome* (held by the canons of Lanthony, He), *Leamington Priors* (owned by Kenilworth Priory from 1122, Wa). Distinctive additions foregrounding an institution as a proprietor indicate the former possessions of the Knights Templars, e.g. *Temple Balsall* (held by the Knights Templars in 1185, Wa), *Temple Guiting* (the Knights Templars came to possess it around 1160, Gl); and those of monasteries, e.g. *Hurstbourne Tarrant* (owned by Tarrant Abbey, Ha), *Acaster Selby* (belonged to Shelby Abbey from around 1110, YW), *St. Paul's Walden* (belonged to St. Paul's, London, Hrt).

4.2.4. Distinctive additions manifesting INHABITANTS indicate the nationality of the former dwellers of the settlements, sometimes in correlative name forms, e.g. *English* and *Welsh Frankton* (Sa). Examining the geographical distribution of these distinctive additions might help to clarify which ethnic groups immigrated into which parts of the country, even if we know that not all settlements populated by ethnic minorities were named after the nationality of their original inhabitants.

4.2.5. ECONOMIC LIFE as an identifying feature is reflected in distinctive additions highlighting the specified domains of PRODUCT, MINING, TRADE and COMMUNICATIONS.

4.2.5.1. Distinctive additions foregrounding PRODUCT indicate the typical industrial product, e.g. *Potter Brompton* (from potteries, YE), *Kirkby Overblow* (< OE **ōrblāwere* 'smelter', YW) produced in the settlement.

4.2.5.2. MINING is manifested in a few distinctive additions, e.g. *Cole Orton* (from coal mines, Le), *Iron Acton* (from iron mines, Gl).

4.2.5.3. Distinctive additions representing TRADE foreground the settlement's right of holding markets, e.g. *Market Drayton* (Sa), *Blandford Forum* (< Lat *forum* 'market place', Do), *Chipping Barnet* (< OE *cēping, cīeping* 'market, market town', Mx).

4.2.5.4. The domain of COMMUNICATIONS is reflected in distinctive additions referring to a distinct road, e.g. *Appleton le Street* (next to a Roman road, YN), *Gate Fulford* (< OScand *gata* 'road', next to the York-Doncaster road, YE); a gate, e.g. *Burnham Westgate* (Nf); a bridge or a ford, e.g. *Bridge Hewick* (YW), *St. Nicholas at Wade* (< OE *gewæd* 'ford', K); a ferry, e.g. *Ferry Fryston* (YW) in or near the settlements.

4.2.6. Distinctive additions demonstrating OTHER PERIPHERAL FEATURES describe the weather conditions, the exposed situation of the settlement, e.g. *Cold Overton* (Le); express a generalising (often negative) judgement about the village, e.g. *Full Sutton* (i.e. *foul* < OE *fūl* 'dirty', YE) or indicate a special identifying feature of the settlement, e.g. *Midsomer Norton* (from festivals held on the day of St. John, the patron saint of the habitation, So).

4.3. Distinctive additions manifesting POSITIONAL FEATURE achieve identification by localising settlements. This localisation is carried out by way of activating the relevant restricted domains of PRECISE POSITION, or RELATIVE POSITION.

4.3.1. Distinctive additions representing PRECISE POSITION determine the more or less exact location of the settlements by foregrounding the specific domains of RIVERS (BODIES OF WATER), GEOGRAPHIC REGION, NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENT and ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT. In case of settlement

names including distinctive additions representing PRECISE POSITION exact localisation is effected by speakers' common background knowledge about the location of the large, stable entity profiled in the distinctive addition: this knowledge helps them to construe the place of the smaller, less striking entity (i.e. the settlement). If the background knowledge is not shared, distinctive additions of this type prove useless in localisation.

4.3.1.1. Distinctive additions naming the stream (lake) on the bank (shore) of which the settlement is situated reflect RIVER (or BODIES OF WATER). Rivers, usually bearing unique, stable names known by the surrounding population, were very important in the everyday life of medieval villages in many respects (thoroughfare, source of energy and irrigation, supply of drinking water, etc.), so speakers for obvious reasons must have felt the need to include appropriate river names into the habitation names as distinguishing elements. Names of medium-sized rivers as distinctive additions seem to have proved especially useful in localising a settlement by virtue of its name. River names were included into the settlement names as attributive nouns or as elements of prepositional structures, e.g. *Severn Stoke* (Wo), *Steepleton Iwerne* (Do), *Clifton on Teme* (Wo), *Kirkandrews upon Eden* (Cu), *Weston by Welland* (Np); sometimes as components of incomplete French prepositional structures (cf. French *en le* 'in the'), e.g. *Preston le Skerne* (Du), *Witton le Wear* (Du).

4.3.1.2. Distinctive additions representing GEOGRAPHIC REGION name the valley, e.g. *Monnington in Straddel* (*Straddle* is the old name of the Golden Valley, He), *Horton in Ribblesdale* (in the valley of the river Ribble, YW); the mountain, e.g. *Hope under Dinmore* (near Dinmore Hill, He), *Sutton under Whitestone Cliffe* (at the foot of Whitestone Cliffe, YN); the forest, e.g. *Barton under Needwood* (near Needwood Forest, St), *Bolton by Bowland* (near Bowland Forest, YW) in or in the vicinity of which the settlement is situated.

4.3.1.3. To identify location, distinctive additions demonstrating NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENT indicate a widely known, usually big town in the vicinity, e.g. *Brough Sowerby* (We), *Hutton Mulgrave* (YN); sometimes in prepositional structures, e.g. *Ash next Ridley* (K), *Morton by Lincoln* (Li), *Preston near Wingham* (K), *Norton juxta Kempsey* (Wo).

4.3.1.4. Distinctive additions reflecting ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT name the (former) district in which the settlement is located, e.g. *Hemel Hempstead* (in the former Hemel district, Hrt), *Hutton Hang* (in Hang wapentake, YN); often in prepositional structures, e.g. *St. Just in Roseland* (in the former Roseland district, Co); in French prepositional structures, e.g. *Laughton en le Morthen* (in the old district of Morthen, YW).

4.3.2. Distinctive additions manifesting RELATIVE POSITION determine the location of a settlement by giving its position in relation to another habitation bearing the same primary name. Distinctive additions of this type well exemplify the fact that 'language does not reflect objective properties of situations but mediates conceptualisation':[29] these additions reflect namers' perspective as well as the process called subjectification, i.e. the conceptualiser's mental scanning of the position of a place in relation to other, related places in its environment. Relative position is defined in distinguishing elements by foregrounding domains of POINTS OF THE COMPASS, HEIGHT and GEOGRAPHICAL OBJECT.

4.3.2.1. Distinctive additions reflecting POINTS OF THE COMPASS may appear in opposing name forms in pairs, e.g. *East* and *West Bilney* (Nf), *North* and *South Molton* (D); in threes, e.g. *West, East* and *South Hanningfield* (Ess) *East, Middle* and *West Chinnock* (So); in fours, e.g. *East, West, North* and *South Brunton* (Nb); but they can also emerge in contrast with distinctive additions of different types, e.g. *South* and *Goose Bradon* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, So), *West* and *Kirk Ella* (RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE, YE).

4.3.2.2. HEIGHT is typically manifested in pairs of contrasting distinctive additions, included usually in name forms which indicate neighbouring settlements, e.g. *High* and *Low Worsall* (YN), *Nether* and *Over Kellet* (La), *Down* and *Up Hatherley* (Gl). The additions are sometimes in comparative forms, emphasising relativity, e.g. *Lower* and *Upper Arncot* (O), *Rickinghall Inferior* and *Superior* (Sf). These distinctive additions primarily highlight the configurations of the terrain, which, incidentally, determine the direction of rivers' flow, thus the *low*-settlements are usually situated downstream and the *high*-settlements are often found upstream. Less typical examples of the category usually are in opposition

[29] D. Lee, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 147–56 (pp. 153–54).

to distinctive additions of different types, e.g. *Ault Hucknall* (< French *haut* 'high(er)', Db) and *Hucknall Torkard* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, Nt); or stand in contrast with primary names, e.g. *Far Cotton* and *Coton* (Np).

4.3.2.3. Distinctive additions representing GEOGRAPHICAL OBJECT direct attention to an outstanding, striking landmark in the vicinity of which the settlement is situated. These distinctive additions do not name the nearby object; instead, they simply refer to the presence of a characteristic landmark using a geographical common noun, often in a prepositional structure, indicating the spatial relation between the landmark and the settlement. Landmarks highlighted in this way can be mountains, hills, cliffs, e.g. *Theydon Mount* (Ess), *Bourton on the Hill* (Gl), *Preston under Scar* (YN); rivers, the sea, e.g. *Fleet Marston* (Bk), *Barnoldby le Beck* ('by the brook', Li), *Luddington in the Brook* (Np), *Newbiggin by the Sea* (Nb), *Wells next the Sea* (Nf); moors, e.g. *Marsh Baldon* (O), *Fen Ditton* (Ca), *Draycott in the Moors* (St), *Carleton le Moorland* (Li); valleys, ditches, e.g. *Burton Dale* (YN), *Thorpe le Vale* (Li), *Barton Bendish* (inside the Devil's Ditch, Nf); forests, e.g. *Wood Rising* (Nf), *Hutton Scough* (< OScand *skōgr* 'wood', in Inglewood Forest, Cu), *Harrow Weald* (< OE *wald*, *weald* 'wood', Mx), *Hamble le Rice* (< OE *hrīs* 'brushwood', Ha), *Sutton on the Forest* (YN); meadows, e.g. *Bradley Field* (We), *Westley Waterless* (*-less* here is the plural of OE *lēah* 'open land, meadow', Ca); and (boundary) stones, e.g. *Stone Easton* (So), *Sutton at Hone* (< OE *hān* 'stone', K).

4.4. Special distinctive additions, if their motivations can be recognised, typically profile more than one identifying feature of the designated settlements.

4.4.1. Consecutive distinctive additions were created in a unique process: settlements designated by names including distinctive additions could also be divided; the new habitations in such cases needed unique names, which were often produced by attaching secondary distinctive additions to the already differentiated name forms, e.g. *Compton Abbas* and *Compton Abbas West* (Do), *Eastleach Martin* and *Eastleach Turville* (cf. neighbouring *Northleach*, Gl).

4.4.2. In some cases names including alternating distinctive additions are used to designate a settlement, e.g. *Chaldon Herring/East Chaldon* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER/POINTS OF THE COMPASS, Do), *Lower Sapey/Sapey*

Pichard (HEIGHT/INDIVIDUAL OWNER, Wo). Sometimes all name forms derived from the same primary name display alternating distinctive additions, e.g. *Bishop's/West Lavington* (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER/POINTS OF THE COMPASS, W) and *Market*/*East Lavington* (TRADE/POINTS OF THE COMPASS, W). As we can see, the alternating distinctive additions attached to stable primary names reflect different identifying features of the settlements: differences in focal prominence result in alternative construals of the settlements, which evolve alternating distinctive additions in the name forms. As time passes one construal usually is conventionalised; thus, one of the alternating distinguishing constituents becomes a constant element of the settlement name by eliminating the other potential modifier.

4.4.3. Comprehensive distinctive additions highlight the fact that two neighbouring settlements of the same primary name have a common designation, e.g. *Wendens Ambo* (< Lat *ambo* 'both', *Great* and *Little Wenden* collectively, Ess).

4.4.4. In some name forms the referent of the distinctive addition cannot surely be detected, e.g. the additions in names *Brent Pelham* (Hrt), *Brant Broughton* (Li), *Bradfield Combust* (Sf) are explained by Ekwall as reflecting the fact that the settlements had been burnt down some time in the past and became repopulated only later;[30] however, Cameron believes that these distinctive additions manifest the circumstances in which the settlements were born, i.e. their territories and croplands were gained by burning up patches of forests.[31] Other doubtful cases include *Carleton Forehoe* (near Forehoe Hills, which gave its name to Forehoe hundred, Nf), *Gate Burton* (< OScand *geit* 'goat' or from the family name *Gait*, Li), *Ashton by Tarvin* (indicating either the river or the settlement called *Tarvin,* Chs).

5. Distinctive additions in time and space

Historical data provided by Ekwall throw light upon the question of when settlement names including distinctive additions were created, even if we know that the first appearance of these name forms in extant documents is unlikely to coincide with their date of formation. Data suggest that relevant settlement names have continuously been developing from the

[30] Ekwall, *DEPN*, pp. 360, 70 and 58.
[31] Cameron, *English Place-Names*, p. 104.

seventh century up to the present; still, the greatest majority (81,11%) of them, regardless of the type of the distinctive addition involved, were formed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, e.g. 1206: *Church Oakley* (RELIGIUOS STRUCTURE, Ha), 1212: *Little Dalby* (SIZE, Le), 1219: *Sand Hutton* (SOIL, YN), 1242: *Mansell Lacy* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, He), 1260: *Long Newton* (SHAPE, Du), 1291: *North Fambridge* (POINT OF THE COMPASS, Ess), 1292: *Temple Sowerby* (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, We), 1312: *Market Harborough* (TRADE, Le), 1313: *Chewton Mendip* (GEOGRAPHIC REGION, So), 1343: *Old Buckenham* (AGE, Nf).[32]

The earliest recorded examples of settlement names displaying distinctive additions include, e.g. 652: *Bradford on Avon* (RIVER, W), 706: *Childs Wickham* (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, Gl), 892: *North Newnton* (POINT OF THE COMPASS, W), 1005: *Upottery* (HEIGHT, D), 1038: *Hill Croome* (GEOGRAPHICAL OBJECT, Wo), 1043: *Potters Marston* (PRODUCT, Le), 1066: *Stamford Bridge* (COMMUNICATIONS, YE), *c*.1075: *Bures St. Mary* (RELIGIUOS STRUCTURE, Sf). Some examples from the Domesday Book (1086): *Abbots Lench* (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, Wo), *Buttercrambe* (SOIL, YN), *Uffculme* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, D), *Hemel Hempstead* (ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT, Hrt).[33] Differentiated settlement names that appeared first between the seventh and the twelfth centuries constitute 13.43% of all name forms including distinctive additions.

Ekwall presents some late instances as well, e.g. 1483: *Aston le Walls* (FORTIFICATION, Np), 1526: *Clifford Chambers* (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, Gl), 1534: *Westbury on Trym* (RIVER, Gl), 1571: *Cole Orton* (MINE, Le), 1578: *Holme on the Wolds* (GEOGRAPHICAL OBJECT, YE), 1582: *Saffron Walden* (FLORA, Ess), 1590: *Darcy Lever* (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, La), 1600: *Mungrisedale* (RELIGIUOS STRUCTURE, Cu), 1645: *Eaton Socon* (ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT, Bd), 1799: *Kirby Muxloe* (OTHER PERIPHERAL FEATURE, Le).[34] Differentiated habitation names first recorded in or after the

[32] Original spellings in Ekwall's *DEPN* are: 1206: *Chirchocle* (p. 347), 1212: *parva Dalby* (p. 138), 1219: *Sandhouton* (p. 259), 1242: *Maumeshull Lacy* (p. 313), 1260: *Lang Newton* (p. 341), 1291: *North Fambregg* (p. 173), 1292: *Templessoureby* (p. 432), 1312: *Mercat Heburgh* (p. 218), 1313: *Cheuton by Menedep* (p. 102), 1343: *Vetus Bokenham* (p. 71).

[33] Original spellings in Ekwall's *DEPN* are: 652: (æt) *Bradanforda be Afne* (p. 58), 706: *Childeswicwon* (p. 516), 892: *Norþniwetune* (p. 340), 1005: *Upoteri* (p. 352), 1038: *Hylcromban* (p. 132), 1043: *Poteresmerston* (p. 316), 1066: *Stanfordbrycg* (p. 436), *c*.1075: *St. Mary in Buri* (p. 74), 1086: *Abeleng* (p. 295), 1086: *Butecrame* (p. 128), 1086: *Offecoma* (p. 136), 1086: *Hamelamstede* (p. 233).

[34] Original spellings in Ekwall's *DEPN* are: 1483: *Aston in the Walles* (p. 17), 1526: *Clifford Chamberer* (p. 112), 1534: *Westbury-upon-Trymme* (p. 507–08), 1571: *Cole*

fifteenth century form 5,46% of all relevant name forms. As may be seen, both the earliest and the latest names can include distinctive additions manifesting any of the types of cognitive domains described above.

Ekwall makes some random references to the distance of settlements designated by opposing habitation names. In some cases he emphasises that the settlements are next to each other, e.g. Cockayne Hatley (Bd), East Hatley and Hatley St. George (Ca): '[t]he three Hatleys are close together on a piece of elevated land'; Cow Honeyborne (Gl) and Church Honeyborne (Wo): '[t]he two Honeybournes are close together'; South Tedworth (Ha) and North Tedworth (W): '[t]he two Tedworths are close together, though in different counties'. Sometimes, although the settlements are not far apart, they are separated by a river, a valley, or a forest. To quote Ekwall's examples again: English (Gl) and Welsh Bicknor (He) are 'on opposite sides of the Wye on prominent spurs of hills'; Sulhampstead Abbots and Sulhampstead Bannister (Brk) are situated 'on opposite sides of a narrow valley'; North and South Baddesley (Ha) are 'at opposite sides of the New Forest'.[35]

When he finds that the opposing settlement names indicate habitations which are relatively far from each other, Ekwall gives the distance between the settlements in miles: although Great and Little Tew are neighbouring villages, Duns Tew (O) can be found *c*.4 miles from them; Morchard Bishop and Cruwys Morchard (D) are *c*.5 miles from each other; Ault Hucknall (Db) and Hucknall Torkard (Nt) are *c*.11 miles apart; the largest distance mentioned by Ekwall is that of Baddesley Clinton and Baddesley Ensor (Wa), which are 'over 15 miles apart, but at each end of a long ridge'.[36]

By examining the distance of settlements designated by correlative name forms on maps[37] one can easily realise that the types of the distinctive additions in name forms and the average distance of the settlements they designate are interrelated: names in oppositions reflecting SIZE, e.g. *Great* and *Little Massingham* (Nf), *Peatling Magna* and *Parva* (Le); POINTS OF THE COMPASS, e.g. *North* and *South Kelsey* (Li), *East* and

Orton (p. 351), 1578: *Holme super Wolde* (p. 246), 1582: *Saffornewalden* (p. 492), 1590: *Darcye Lever* (p. 296), 1600: *Mounge Gricesdell* (p. 334), 1645: *Eaton cum Soca* (p. 158), 1799: *Kerby Muckless* (p. 279).

[35] The quotations were taken from Ekwall's *DEPN*, pp. 225, 248, 462, 41, 453 and 21, respectively.

[36] Ekwall, *DEPN*, pp. 464, 330, 255 and 21.

[37] The maps used were those of *Collins Road Atlas. Superscale Britain* (London, 2003).

West Wellow (Ha); or HEIGHT, e.g. *Lower* and *Upper Dunsforth* (YW), *Nether* and *Over Whitacre* (Wa) usually indicate neighbouring settlements. In some other cases, however, considerable distances could be observed, e.g. Caister next Yarmouth and Caister St. Edmunds (NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENT and RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE, Nf) are located *c*.18 miles from each other; Melbury Abbas is found *c*.20 miles from the group of the neighbouring Melbury Bubb, Melbury Sampford and Melbury Osmond (INSTITUTIONAL, INDIVIDUAL OWNER and RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE, Do); Bratton Clovelly and Bratton Fleming (INDIVIDUAL OWNER, D) are situated *c*.32 miles apart. Names in correlations consisting of a primary name and a differentiated form usually designate settlements at greater distances, e.g. Atherstone and Atherstone upon Stour (RIVER, Wa) are *c*.32 miles apart; Salcombe and Salcombe Regis (INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, D) are found *c*.45 miles apart. In the case of widely known settlements, opposing name forms may span even more significant distances, e.g. Southampton (Ha) and Northampton (POINTS OF THE COMPASS, Np) are situated *c*.102 miles from each other.

6. Conclusions

The frame of our knowledge with respect to such entities of the physical world as settlements seems to consist of two interwoven components: one rooted in reality (our knowledge about basic geographical, historical and social features of settlements), the other relying on language use (our knowledge about prototypical settlement names as they are conventionalised in the language). Cognitivists postulate the existence of 'a universal set of cognitive categories that structure the way in which human beings perceive and interpret the world around them'.[38] The process of attaching distinctive additions to identical primary names designating different settlements to provide grounding and thus to achieve identification has been described here as an overt mode of category construction. The semantic categorisation of distinctive additions occurring in English settlement names casts light upon the fact that the concept of SETTLEMENT consists of a complex matrix of several cognitive domains, each reflecting an element of our experiential knowledge about such entities. We seem to conceptualise a settlement as a place (TYPE) of a special kind (STATUS), displaying a specific extension (SIZE, SHAPE), consisting of buildings (BUILDING), possessed by someone in the course of history (PROPRIETOR), surrounded by a characteristic environment (NATURAL SURROUNDINGS),

[38] Lee, *Cognitive Linguistics*, p. 166.

situated somewhere on the surface of the earth (PRECISE or RELATIVE POSITION), where a group of people live (INHABITANTS) and also work together (ECONOMIC LIFE) for a time (AGE). Though settlement names including distinctive additions were formed from the seventh century up to the most recent times in the country, most relevant habitation names seem to have developed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Correlative name forms very often designate neighbouring settlements. Farther habitations indicated by opposing name forms are found 30–40 miles from each other: this is the typical distance within which identical settlement names seem to mislead orientation, thus requiring unique identification. Atypically long distances spanned by a correlation can only be observed if well-known settlements are involved.

Appendix: Distinctive additions in English settlement names

(Source: E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford, 1960)

Motivation: the distinctive addition profiles a characteristic feature of the settlement	**Number of examples**	**Percentage**
1. a central feature	***482***	***13.43%***
1.1. size	395	11.00%
1.2. age	23	0.64%
1.3. shape	53	1.48%
1.4. status	11	0.31%
2. a peripheral feature	***1511***	***42.10%***
2.1. natural surroundings	95	2.65%
2.1.1. soil	*30*	*0.84%*
2.1.2. flora	*61*	*1.70%*
2.1.3. fauna	*4*	*0.11%*
2.2. building	271	7.55%
2.2.1. religious structure	*227*	*6.32%*
2.2.2. industrial building	*9*	*0.25%*
2.2.3. fortification	*35*	*0.98%*

2.3. proprietor	1014	28.25%
2.3.1. individual owner	*744*	*20.73%*
2.3.2. institutional owner	*270*	*7.52%*
2.4. inhabitants	6	0.17%
2.5. economic life	91	2.53%
2.5.1. product	*11*	*0.31%*
2.5.2. mining	*5*	*0.14%*
2.5.3. trade	*25*	*0.69%*
2.5.4. communications	*50*	*1.39%*
2.6. other features	34	0.95%
3. a positional feature	***1448***	***40.35%***
3.1. precise position	425	11.84%
3.1.1. river, body of water	*120*	*3.34%*
3.1.2. geographic region	*107*	*2.98%*
3.1.3. neighbouring settlement	*160*	*4.46%*
3.1.4. administrative unit	*38*	*1.06%*
3.2. relative position	1023	28.51%
3.2.1. points of the compass	*572*	*15.94%*
3.2.2. height	*188*	*5.24%*
3.2.3. geographical object	*263*	*7.33%*
4. Special distinctive additions	***148***	***4.12%***
4.1. consecutive distinctive additions	5	0.14%
4.2. alternating distinctive additions	31	0.86%
4.3. comprehensive distinctive additions	26	0.72%
4.4. distinctive additions of uncertain, unknown motivation	86	2.40%
Total:	**3589**	**100.00%**