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

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

NOTE

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

JOAN STEVENS

St. Mary, Jersey

THE SURVIVAL OF ROMANO-BRITISH TOponyM*

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

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the linguistic situation of south and east Britain in the 5th and 6th centuries, the period after Roman authority was withdrawn and during which Germanic invaders and settlers displaced speakers of Latin and British over large areas, the philological fact is seen to be utterly dependent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

The scope of 'Romano-British toponymy' goes far beyond what is directly recorded for us. From all sources up to 460, including late texts such as the Ravenna Cosmography (early 8th century), Professor Rivet and I collected some 460 names, including not only habitation-names but also regional and ethnic names, river-names, etc., which of course have to be considered together in a mutually informative system. Some names are still missing for relatively important places, such as Lancaster fort and vicum, many among minor towns, and a few of major rivers such as the Medway. To this total of about 460, covering most of the 'major' toponymy, one must add nationally thousands of names unrecorded in any ancient text or inscription. Every river, every lake and forest and hill, had its name, surely 100% Celtic. Some of these we can detect confidently, e.g. *Briantia* (strictly, perhaps, a divine name) vs. Brent of Middlesex (compare R. Brent of Anglesey). Every small settlement had its name, perhaps 95% Celtic, allowing a few named in Latin along the roads (like the recorded Ad Ansam). Every villa had a name, usually that of the owner or of an early owner, and of the 600 villas it is likely that most would have been named in Latin because they belonged to romanized gentry, in line with the few villa-names we do know (*Albinianus, Aniceus, Sulloniaci, Villa Faustini*).
assimilation to seem 'armour'), but we have no means of knowing in perhaps hundreds of other instances. Where we do have a record that a British element was used in ancient toponymy, or was so used in older Welsh or even in modern Welsh, the possibility that it lies concealed should be borne in mind, and in such examples for detailed mention. The likelihood is that although I am sure the general argument of Myres and Alcock is sound, the demonstration in particular cases involves special pleading.

Chevwyd (Berks) is Cewnwyd in 494, and is agreed by Ekwall and others to derive from British *cæwn- 'wood'; so do Chatham and Chatenden in Kent, and Cheadle in Cheshire. In ancient toponymy we have *lẹucetum (Lichfield) 'grey wood', and of course *cæwyd commonly in Welsh toponymy. This can only have been used over a much wider area than that for some settlements. Hence it is at least possible that when we find in Shropshire (Shropshire, well to the west) Chetwynd and Chetton, these too have a concealed British *cæwyd rather than the A-S personal name Peata or Cæta as the standard authorities say. Early forms helped, and may give counterindications, but when records begin with DB, as in these instances, that is already several centuries too late to hint at the process of folk-etymology and substitution. Even when the earliest recorded form, that of DB, hints at the personal name Peata, as it does for Chetwynd, this may be an illusion. One recalls the A-S mania for eponymous solutions, as when Bede explains Hrofaesaestra as derived from the hero Hrof, or when the ASC entry for 501 offers us Portsmouth as a foundation owed to that splendid leader 'Port'. If writers of scholarly intelligence offer such things, we can hardly guess at how widespread the practice must have been among ordinary illiterate folk devoid of linguistic awareness.

A similar case is offered by British *cæcr<wbr xmlns:skos='http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core'>- 'mound, tumulus, hill', well-documented in ancient toponymy here and abroad. It seems to be recognized in Crich (Derby's), Critchel (Dorset), Cricklewood (Middlesex), Crook (Devon), and others. It could be the Welsh agreement that "it is just possible" - that some of the numerous Churchhill name variants contain this British *cæcr<wbr xmlns:skos='http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core'>- element, early assimilated (with metathesis) to A-S eowice 'church' and with unconscious tautology as often (cæc-valh) compare Fenhall, and the triple Pendle Hill, which are associated, with topographical detail in particular cases, by Mrs Geering (Signposts, 138-40). Some quantitative survey of common elements in recorded Romano-British, and also early Welsh, Cornish and Breton toponyms might have a certain predictive value for further conjectures of this kind.4

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

4
It must be made clear that there is nothing necessarily wilful or
specially ignorant about folk-etymology and substitution; nor is it
likely that sophisticated humour was involved in our cases as it is in 'trick-
cycling' or 'psychiatrist' or 'sparrow grass' for Asparagus. At any rate
the extent of contact between Germanic settlers and Romano-Britons we have to envisage
is a purely oral, not written, contact, and a fleeting one at that; it
goT no scope for inquiry about meanings in most instances. An element of
an unacknowledged assimilation to the nearest sound is not unlikely in
the language of the incomers, and this is all that is needed for minimal
identification of a place. It matters not a jot to the incomers that none
of their number is actually called Ceatte (at Chetwynd) or that there is no
church visible at some of the places now called Churchill.

At times there was notfolk-etymology or substitution, a process of
unconscious error, but accurate translation, though this must have been
relatively rare perhaps, though, again, we usually lack the requisite
material to document it. A clear case is Barnardown, the small R-B town
at Horncastle in Lincolnshire. In British *bannan- was 'horn, spur (of land)',
in this case where two rivers join, and A-S *Horne- (OE) translates
the first element. It would be too much to suppose a merely coincidental
reference to the same toponymic feature. If there was translation, there
are presumably implications of friendly contact between Romano-Britons
and Germanic speakers, perhaps at some time later, as such town names
received small garrisons of Germanic mercenary troops in the later 4th
century. Somewhat more to be expected is that Bovius should eventually be
translated 'Worcebridge' (Glam.), not directly, but via medieval Welsh
Penbridge (O.F.). This is a conventionalised form for the modern name;
it was in English Cowbridge from the 13th century.

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

To the south of Carlisle lies Bramcote, now Brougham [broum]. This
was a fort with a substantial civil vicus, in lands - Cumbria - with a
continuing R-B culture: being close to Carlisle, the community was possibly
Christian by 400, and later the place had a small Christian population.
When the church was built the place was Brugga, 1130, Brougham, 1139, Brougham, 1176, explained by
Ewail as Burg-ham, the burg in question being the Roman fort. At some
distance, certainly, there was assimilation to burg, but it might have been
quite a late one. However, as A.H. Smith remarks in EPNs Westmorland
(1967), "is not 'a rule found in form in this north country...i.e.,布鲁- (.regularly or so early'. If Bramcote (British *bracuqan"
did continue, we need no metathesis. Smith adds: "The first element of
Brougham cannot be derived from Bramcote, with a Latinisation that would have
given Brog- for which Old English would have substituted Brog-". Certainly:
but what if lenited Brog- was understood as Burg- by Anglo-
Saxons? Or what if a Christian community near Carlisle, and then the
monks, had preserved a memory of the R-B name as Latin? We cannot trace
the history of the place in detail, and any normal process has certainly been disturbed; but
it seems perverse to deny the possibility that Bramcote was (firstly only?
Or does *bannan represent *bourn *burg) survives as Brougham. The possibility is
suggested by Mrs Khan (1964) and, by implication, by Or Hugham in 1975; also,
though without commitment to it, is discussed by Mrs Gelling
(Signposts, 55-56).

A second case in the same region is that of Braundance, the fort at Kilmerton, whose actual site is called "The Burvins" in a
first record of 1777. A.H. Smith derives this, not from A-S *brenn-
'burbain-place', found commonly as Borrow, Burrow, Borrans, etc. It has
admittedly been assimilation to this A-S word, but to my ear at least Bram-
> Burvins does not tax credulity.

A third northern case gives virtual certainty of continuity. In
Northumberland is the R. Coquet and several related names. It was Coquedw (A-S)
about 1000, and Ewail says that this 'wood-creek' was originally the name
of a forest, that of the river being by back-formation. However, on a new
reading of the Ravenna Cosmography, we are given Coquedwa as a Northumbrian
river-name, with a sense 'red appearance, red-seeming'; indeed, the river is
'seened' on the map with this red-R. It is from the Chiveshith with perfect
Celtic etymology, continues as modern Coquet, without need to bring in any
back-formation. The 1000 and other records of Coquedw are simply A-S
to- etymologies, and not ones that became wholly established, since the river
is not now called 'Coquet Wood River'.

A fourth case, in the south, is more dubious. Ewail derives Silchester from the A-S *sithel-coppa*, 'willow-copse'. It is possible that
*Healewood (EPNS Berkshire, VIII): Sill may be from the substitution of OE 'hole' or stool'
'llillow-copse' for Calleva, and this is perhaps not out of the question,
though it did not seem sufficiently convincing to justify the inclusion of
Silchester on Map II (of R-B names surviving in the county). However,
Silchester is nowhere else compounded with self or with a botanical term, but
it is frequently attached to the first syllable of a R-B name. Moreover,
although the site was long abandoned and was a big place for the excavators of the
19th century, it did have some continued occupation from 4th-5th times into the
6th century, and as an important road-junction could be expected to have some
use for surviving Romano-British and incoming Saxons. If modern Sil does
represent part of Calleva (British *calli- 'wood'), it is hard to explain phonetically.
At a place the name is Silchester, but as Crawford pointed out in
1949, other medieval records have Sil-

The temptation to perceive possible continuity wherever there is a remote resemblance between modern and ancient forms must be resisted. In the end, Mr Norma Scarfe in his excellent book The Suffolk Landscape (1972) hankers, without argument, after the continuity of R-B Combretovium as Codenham (it is
agreed that the places are the same), and of Camborium = probably Camberton -
(i.e., 'Cambracemum') (Lanark, not far away). But early forms give not the slightest support for this, being respectively
Codenham and Cosaunana (or Caunathan), in MS.

Sometimes irregular phonetic processes, rarely admitted in the thinking of the authorities, should be taken into account. Binchester, a fort with
vicius in Co, Dunham, was R-B Vinovia or Vinovium, of uncertain meaning
in British. Ewail says that Binchester perhaps has as its first element A-S
*bin- 'bung, danger', later also 'stall', adding that 'The old fort may have been used as a shelter for cattle.' However, it seems natural to think that
Bin- could represent the first syllable of Vinovia. It is certain that b
and v were distinct in British, and also in the Latin of Britain on the whole.
Initial C in Vinovia should be *vin- 'stall', but early forms give not the slightest support for this, being respectively
Codenham and Cosaunana (or Caunathan), in MS.

>Win-chester. Professor Jackson allows that *Win-most, influence of A-S
bim on 'Win-chester might be postulated'. To show how continuity could have
happened, he notes to note that inscriptions show the fort to have been garrisoned
at one time by Frisians, presumably Germanic, but also by Vettovii, cavalry
from a Celtic tribe who lived between the Tegae and Duero in Lusitania. In
the Latin of Hispania, confusion of b/v was early and constant (Felix gene,
Felix vivere flere ibant, ..., ). It happens that we have a precise proof
of this in the case of the Vettovii: Pliny says (NH XXV, 46) that they discovered
the medicinal and magical properties of a plant and gave their name to it,
vetovia, now betonica, betony, with b-. Pliny names the tribe with their
correct b, and theirs plant also, but evidently their spoken Latin had b-, and
with this b- the plant-name passed into general Latin usage. At the Durham fort the three inscriptions left by the unit also have V- in correct classical form; but one distinguished member of the tribe, Flavius Vetto, centurion of this unit, is a rather confusing name of the 6th Cohort of Nervians, left his name on an altar to Victoria at Ruthin Castle, on the Antonine Wall, spelling it Vetto (RIB 2144). There is thus reason to think that the garrison in Durham pronounced R-B Vinovia as Binovia (or Bimovia), and that this is what the settlers in the area as Binchester. The association of the first syllable with Chester surely increases the likelihood of such continuity. The next station up the road is Lancaster, Lancastria in 1196, i.e. 'long...'. Possibly the settlement attached to the fort was 'long', that is, it lay along a natural valley. The town later grew in a ribbon development, but the fort itself must have been square or rectangular. Its R-B name was Longovicium, probably built on British *longos* - 'ship', perhaps in some emblematic sense. One may suggest that this, misinterpreted by Latin speakers as though it were the Latin and became, like Nex, passed in translation to Germanic speakers for their Langstrae'. Here again we have continuity involving an error, but that error of the kind that abounds in the history of languages.

Further disturbance to strict phonological processes may come from learned intrusion. The name *Corosippum* (as tentatively restored in P906) is represented by both Corchester (site of the fort) and Corbridge (the town). It has been pointed out that in popular development this first syllable should > *Che*.- Learned influence, that is an accurate oral or written memory of the ancient name, has retarded or reversed popular development (the most spectacular instance I know is in Spanish: *Emerita (Augusta)* > *Mirida*, still half-learned, for the good reason that if popular it would > *Merida*). In Northumbria the same influence was felt that of the *Manes* or *Manio* specifically from near Hexham Abbey (founded 673). Another important case is that of the R. Severn, Sabrina. This has S- in Anglo-Saxon, though if borrowed from early Welsh it should have been *Hafren*, for the S- process in South Wales was completed by the late 6th century. The difficulty in synchronizing the pronunciation of the name in view of the fact that we have Sabrina, and Breda followed him, using the river to state the limits of an episcopal see.

There is finally one purely linguistic aspect on which there seems to have been little comment (but see Sisgotts, 54-55). Although one does find a few cases of R-B names still represented in many instances, for example in some Quenouille, which a name was taken into A-S usage, and survives, and only a first syllable was retained. In part the reason is presumably a mechanical one: if -ceaster or -we or -burh were added to the full R-B name the stress stayed on, and moved to, the first syllable of the loaning syllable(s) would be just natural, thus R-B *Manucium* (British *Manuvicum*) was recorded as Mancumster in 925, and erosion of the unstressed syllable had already taken place. So too with Bricaster, Bivester, Richborough, Brexeter, and others. Moreover, since we find R-B *Durnegour* (Early English) represented as early as 684, with the term tied closely together, Gloucester, Colchester and civitas-capitalis (Chester, Leicester, etc.) down to small settlements whose R-B name we do not even know, such as Casterton (Rutland) and Alcester (Warwicks.), and even a villa such as Woodchester (Glouce.), is not likely that the changes and applications (Sisgotts, 51-53) of this period, which is itself almost complete, could be wholly confused. It is true, of course, that it is not enough to look at the official (near-classical) Latin forms in all cases were recorded for us in spoken languages and since Germanic influences tended to gather both types of habitation, town and fort, they would have learned an already confusing usage.

Anglo-Saxon ceaster was borrowed from Latin castrum at an early stage, and from Latin speakers in Britain. It was not borrowed across the Rhine at a pre-invasion stage, since it does not appear as a loanword in any other Germanic language. The sense of the word was considerable, since one finds castrum applied In Gaul to military; and to equestrians, and also equestrian centres, and in north and north-west Spain目前已知, it is not tied to the term to mean a military site, the whole line of influence from Gloucester, Colchester and civitas-capitalis (Chester, Leicester, etc.) down to small settlements whose R-B name we do not even know, such as Casterton (Rutland) and Alcester (Warwicks.) is not likely that the changes and applications (Sisgotts, 51-53) of this period, which is itself almost complete, could be wholly confused. It is true, of course, that it is not enough to look at the official (near-classical) Latin forms in all cases were recorded for us in spoken languages and since Germanic influences tended to gather both types of habitation, town and fort, they would have learned an already confusing usage.
Latin *vicus* was also borrowed from Latin speech in Britain, and applied as *wic* to a wide range of habitats (as also in Latin abroad: *Vich, Vigo, etc*). The *wic-*coined is often applied to places to indicate new Germanic settlements, but the *wic-*based compound studied by Mrs Gelling is shown to have been applied to surviving settlements of Romano-Britons, for in late Latin usage *vicus* could, both administratively and colloquially, apply to small rural settlements as well as to the civilian settlements at the forts, and *tæwinc* towns up to the not inconsiderable importance of Water Newton (*Durcorrhinæ* in PNRs) and Catterick (Bede appears to continue Roman administrative parlance in writing of *vicum Cataractam*). 11 In all this a further coining is to be noted. The numerous *wic-*compounding or further compounding or particularizing elements, are simply generic. This evidently sufficed for the purposes of the new settlers, who did not trouble to echo, or incorporate any part of, the distinctive name borne by each *R*-habitation, such as the specifically *dig granary* or *grainland valley*. 12 In the same way, the numerous *wic-*nms (now studied anew by Professor Cameron) simply designate *settlement of Britons*, without particularization or effort to take over any part of the original *R*-name. This widespread nonchalance is further shown when, in later A-S usage, we find *wic* applied to a range of wholly disparate places which include York (Eoforwic), no less. There is further compounding with ceaster too: Canterbury in 604 was *Dor-wic-ceaster* or *Durwic* in 646 (ASC) was *Durham-ceaster*. Moreover, *wic* was interchangeable with -ceaster: Dunwich was *Dunmecceaster* in 636 (ASC) and in Bede, *Dunmecceaster* about 890 (*De Bede*), and finally *Durwic* in DB (with assimilation to *Dun*). Usage of purely Germanic *burh* was just as variable and just as true, of course, that we are dealing with a late-late-8th of centuries, during which usage doubtless evolved. It is also true that, when the invaders and settlers from N. Germany entered Britain, they found a different world in which their native terminology did not properly apply; however, in the Germanic *wic* term, with the semantic baggage that often accompanies loanwords. However, I think it can be said that if there was so much vagueness and diversity in the application of generic terms, and if so many places were perceived generically rather than individually, and if even the scholarly Bede causes Mr Campbell the problems that he does with his usage, it is not logical to expect in the Anglo-Saxons, in the earliest phase of their take-over of R-name, the slightest degree of care and accuracy. Fragmentary, haphazard survivals, and much transformation by misunderstanding, folk-etymology and substitution, are the best that one can expect.

Is there, finally, anything that can usefully be said about the relative survival-rates of categories of *R*-names? Two contrasting groups of military origin high and low status units being recorded in the Notitia Dignitatum. Even if these early immigrants did not long survive (being absorbed into the *R*-population or taken to the Continent by the imperial claimants), the same assumption can be made about the *wic-*came to Kent at Vortigern's invitation: the *wic-*of fort-names from that time being more or less assured, in contrast, the great chain of forts of Hadrian's Wall and its associated systems down the Cumberland coast evidently ceased in the early 5th century that any military establishments allow something to be said. There is only a high rate of that time placed in them: the inhabitants of the once-substantial civilian vicici attached to them must have drifted away as military occupation ceased, and no one would expect, not a single name of any of these forts and vici now survives, though two may have done so for a time (see Aenica and Cambiul хрum in PNRs).

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

Canterbury, R-B Dunwerrum, probably received Germanic settlers in peaceful circumstances in Vortigern's day. The city had at least one church, and its Christian community would not have been disturbed violently. Eventually, as a unique case, the city became the capital of the thriving kingdom of Kent in which Aethelbert, married to a Christian Frankish princess, received Augustine in friendly terms in 597, and he was soon converted with his subjects. Here, if anywhere, we would expect the R-B name to survive; it should be another *Dorchester*. But this is not so. Certain in 604 the place was *Dor-wic-ceaster*, with Dor- continuing the first syllable of the R-.

The Dor- of *Dor-wic-ceaster* had proceeded from the R-name, from the lips of Latin or British speakers into the ears of the first Germanic settlers, in a typical pattern of such transfers elsewhere. But it had a long subsequent existence. From the start, the settlers had not thought of themselves as in any way city-based; to themselves they were Cantware 'men of Kent', and their town was Cantwargabur (first recorded, 754). The name *Kent* was borrowed, of course, from R-B *Kentum*; but that is natural enough; the use to which it was put, in Cantware, was entirely German, in line with other ethnic groupings such as Linnenwyre, Chesterbury, Borrow, in other parts of the region. The point I wish to make is that surviving R-B Christianity, and new Christianity from Rome (Augustine), and peaceful take-over by Germanic overlords, and the establishment of a Germanic court in a city, all seem to have had no power, ultimately, to ensure the survival of a name: the naming process in this important place is entirely Germanic, and although there is a borrowing - Cantium - this is in a way misapplied.

The next civitas-capitals along the S.coast provide contrasts. *Noviomagus* must have been lost early, being known only as the possession of a Saxons, *Ciculamoxeram*, must, the more important, survived as Uiantonaesear, Winchester, its name subsuming perhaps of its strong ecclesiastical tradition, possibly indigenous, certainly renewed from Rome in the 7th century.
As for that other Venta, of the Icen, now Caistor St Edmund (Norfolk), it is a chestertown but that is all. That it did not survive is not surprising, for the city is flanked by two large and very early Germanic cemeteries, denoting peaceful coexistence of Germanic settlers and R-B city-dwellers for a not inconceivable time. But did the name after all survive or merely metamorphose? In perusing the pedigrees of the E. Anglian kings and, in part, those of Lindsey (for they have a confused section in common), I noted that in both there is given as an immediate descendant of Woden - that is, in the early and fictional part of the pedigrees - one man with the name R-B. I can believe almost anything of Germanic anthropomorphy, but this one looks suspiciously like the name of R-B civitas-capital erroneously placed. I remember it in a written rather than an oral tradition: what had originally been an adjourn, a note of the place where an early ruler lived, has become a regal name. What more natural than that the first Germanic chieftain in Norfolk should establish himself in the political and strategic centre of the realm? There seems little doubt that the name remained, just as his colur did in Kent. Now I find to my pleasure that the same idea had occurred to John Jones in 1973 (p. 298), and is, with much else of concern, present in a Suffolk publication of 1767 by Mr Scarfe and Mr Martin.13 Clearly, if this is right, it does not involve survival of the kind which interests us here, as a continuing habitation-name, but a memory even if metamorphosed in this curious way is significant.

Among the four coloniae, the R-B names survive, allowing that of Colchester to derive from the late R-B usage of Colonia (Antonine Itinerary; see PBNH) in a way that Elwoll, Rearsy, and others would not accept (they insist that Colchester is 'place on the R. Colne'). More about the historical and archaeological background seems to be known for Lincoln than is usually the case, and there are strong reasons why the R-B name was lost surviving as only Lindum but the once-prideful name Colonia.16 Our surmise then is reserved for the fact that Rede was not fully aware of the import of the latter, for he indulges in fanciful reification of the vernacular name.14 The name of London continues the R-B name, although the process is not wholly clear.15

The same kinds of contrasts are found among the smaller towns. In some cases a slight difference in the siting of a settlement explains why a name was not changed. The R-B name of Cambridge was Dunhali, probably 'fort by the river-labile-to-flood'. The R-B town was gathered round the former fort at the top of Castle Hill and extended down to the river at Chesterton, significantly named. Its name must have been lost early, and Rede did not know it although in a way he needed it: recording the town as within the diocese of Ely he sought a stone coffin for the body of St Etheldreda, he says they went to Grantcestir, then a civitatis quondam demolata (IV, 19) and found what they wanted, presumably in the old R-B cemetery area along the road to Godmanchester. But this Grantcestir, later Grantmrica (c. 745), was really a different place, for the Anglo-Saxons settled eventually east of the river on the flat gravels (and very heavily in nearby areas, for their early cemeteries are found in several directions). Now Granta is a British river-name; presumably in R-B times, *Granta had always been the name of the river along its full length, and Durolipont referred only to the part of it near the original fort, that part specially liable to flood. We have, then, a surviving R-B river-name, total oblivion of the R-B town-name, and a record of the abandonment of the site, and a new name for a new settlement, still with -cestir indicating proximity to R-B walled town. (The modern village of Grantchester does not continue this; it was in GB Granstistes 'dwellers on the Granta'.) The assimilation to -cestir that this gives in a way is true of the name by the name of Lichfield, R-B Letocetum, originally that of the settlement of Hall on a major road, preserved (presumably) by a surviving R-B population and transferred to a new settlement two miles away at modern Lichfield; however, since this early became an important ecclesiastical centre, some revival of Letocetum from a Latin tradition is perhaps not wholly to be discounted.

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

The relatively high rate of survival of river-names of Celtic origin, even in south and east England, has long been noted.19 The reason can hardly be that water, since it contained divinities, was especially sacred to the Britons and that names were tenaciously preserved; in any case, by 400, many of their names had long since been Christianized. In the meantime, Roman Germanic penetration and settlement. Rivers are in one sense natural boundaries, and could often have formed frontiers as fixed lines over which there could be no dispute - not necessarily between peoples, but simply between land-holdings and communities. The name was then important to know. Further, the major rivers, and many lesser ones now artificially canalized, were thoroughfares for traffic and, indeed, for the first penetration by Germanic groups in the seventh and eighth, so that their names were early learned and well preserved.

When we find, well inland, names of Celtic origin preserved for even very modest streams, the first of the two reasons stated may have applied. Not all names of Celtic origin, however, are necessarily the primary 'proper' names of the rivers. As we suggested in PBNH, we have almost too many names derived from British *abana (Avon), *iscna (Exe, Axe, Usk, etc), and similar; it may be that Germanic inquiries were simply met with Welsh responses that gave general words for 'water, stream', these being adopted as though they were proper personal names: or perhaps particularizing (e.g. particulating the River Water of Luce, Water of Fleet) were not transferred. Most such names occur well to the west and north, where contacts of new settlers with retiring Welsh and others may have been brief in a generally hostile atmosphere.

In conclusion, Bede has something to tell us on these matters. He knew a goodly range of R-B names, some accurately, others in garbled or partial form, and they came to him from a variety of sources: classical authorities, ecclesiastical traditions; his own observations and recording, the more generally known as renewed from Rome, and probably accurate local traditions such as a Latin one of the kingdom of Elmet.20 Sometimes Bede collects up to three forms and remarks or implies that one is more correct, that is more ancient and primary, than the others: cuestal quae dicir Rubii portus, a gente Anglorum non corrupte Reptacaestir vocata (ME Ti: 1) ad Cuiustain legumwor, quae gentes Anglorum Lacuscestir, a Brittanyca autem rectius Carligon appellatur (ME T: 17); Dumit ad Lupulabis civitas quae populus Anglorum corrupte Ucel uocatur (ME T: 27). The name is sometimes the same as in Welsh, as in his transfer to the Britons rectius. Yet we know of no attempt to restore ancient and 'more correct' names in A-S speech and records, even though in the Latin of the Church, of forms of Bede and others had been, or were later, learned. Bede's failure to learn and incorporate these names was due to his knowledge of only the Roman past,21 learned influence in the interest of Latin or Celtic priority and 'correctness' was not going to have any effect. With the confidence of conquerors, the Anglo-Saxons had largely completed their naming processes, and these were either fully Germanic or Germanic by transformation (of names such as
It would be foolish to expect anything else; yet at all points the contrasts with the toponymy and the processes of the other Western provinces of the old Empire were very great.

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

NOTES

*A revised version of a paper given at the Twelfth Conference of the Council for Name Studies at Keele, 23 March 1980.
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2. Margaret Gelling, 'English place-names derived from the compound *YchΛ* in Medieval Archaeology, 11 (1967), 87-104; 'Latin loan-words in Old English place-names', Anglo-Saxon England, 6 (1977), 1-15; and her book, Signposts to the Past (London, 1978), 67-74. In this paper I have not included comments on such Latin elements as camp, funta, port, and ecles in Anglo-Saxon formations, having nothing to add to Mrs Gelling's admirable work, but all, of course, are relevant to the theme of this paper.


4. Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones kindly drew my attention to a paper by Melville Richards, 'Early Welsh Territorial Suffixes', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 95 (1965), 205-12, in which are listed regional names and toponymy of the 5th to 10th century formed by personal name + suffix. Examples include names in *-ag-siwis*, a suffix which is a development from British *-scaeo* (Latin -acrum, -acrum) 'estate of, property of'. Although it was no part of Richard's intention, one may suppose without difficulty that such formations of early Welsh continued an older British practice. In 480 records we have Bravaniacum, Etchilacum, possibly Turiacum, and several others; one can conjecture that there were hundreds of places so named in what is now England, and that since most of them would have been small (i.e., not forts or road-stations) they went unrecorded in our sources; also that what is observable as a gap - the seeming lack of Celtic place-names in England formed from personal and kin names - is hypothetically filled in this way.


7. For example, Dorchester (Dorset) was Dornwaraicenter in 864. The R-B name was Durnovari; in the 864 form, presumably -wara- represents an assimilation of -varia to A-S, as in Cantwara, etc. It is, of course, hard to say whether a name in south and east Britain was taken by Germanic speakers from Latin or British, and this would affect what follows. My impression is that scholars are now more prepared to accept that a good deal of Latin speech endured in the 5th century in the cities of the south and east, perhaps also in parts of the countryside; and that the Anglo-Saxons took names from this Latin speech, just as earlier, in the 4th century, Germanic mercenaries had done. Mrs Gelling's 1977 paper provides support, as does PNBR (14-15). The whole question is the theme of Chapter VI of LHEB; Professor Jackson prefers to explain most transfers in terms of A-S contacts with British, but does not wholly rule out Latin as a medium in particular instances (e.g. 252 note). It seems to me simpler to assume that ecclesi. For example, was taken into A-S speech straight from Latin, even in rural areas (for if a Christian community was basically British-speaking, its language of religion was Latin); and I think that no phonological objection can be raised to this. The transfer of the name of London makes an important example, discussed below.

8. Hogg (1964) plots survivals on the map of Britain up to Hadrian's Wall, and attempts to draw conclusions. Jackson, LHEB 220, distinguishes four zones with differing densities of survival of river-names. Both maps are reproduced in Signposts, 61, 89.


12. The analysis of types of British names recorded in R-B sources by Mrs Gelling in Signposts, Chapter 2, gives a good idea of their nature; one could naturally add to it the corpus of toponymy formed from personal names, alluded to in Note 4.


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

15. Norman Scarfe, 'The place-name Icklingham: A preliminary re-examination', with an Appendix on the Icings, by Edward A. Martin, East Anglian Archaeology, Report No. 3: Suffolk (Suffolk County Council, 1976), 127-34. A parallell is provided by a pedigree of the rulers of Dyfed, in which the son of the founder Magnus Maximus is one Dinet, an eponymous regression to Demetia or Demetani.


18. The view of Jackson is that a form *Lundonjon was heard from speakers of British, giving A-S Lundene (HMC 256-61, 308 note, etc.); Jackson argues this in terms of British and A-S phonology, and his view has been widely accepted. However, R.E. Zachrisson in Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain (Uppsala & Leipzig, 1927), BC, argued - as he had for certain other names - that the name was transferred from Latin speech to A-S. He could, in his view, well be right. Against standard Lundinig (-ium) in most R-B sources, we have late R-B forms Lundine in Itar VII of the Antonine Itinerary (3 times), Lundinum 3 times in Ammianus Marcellinus, and Lundonia in Bede (probably from a tradition maintained in Rome). This seems ample evidence of a late R-B (Latin) u as the first vowel. As for the stressed vowel, in vulgar Latin 1 > ë (1 > e) in most parts of the Empire by the 3rd century, British examples including felicenu (RIB 908), baselinia (RIB 976), demedion (RIB 306), etc., so there is no problem in postulating a late Latin spoken form *Lundunio and its settlement to the Germanic settlers.


20. Smith (1979), 4-6.


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

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

1. A preliminary to the main exercise was the consideration of what is probably the commonest structure in the place-name coverage of today, viz. 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun', e.g. Lag an Aoiil ('hollow of the lime'). Lochn an Iithir ('lake of the year'). The texts examined towards this end were A1 (Annals of Inisfallen, ed. S., Mac Ainntigh, AU (Annals of Ulster, ed. W.M., Hennessey and B., MacCairth), Loch Cé (The Annals of Loch Cé, ed. W.M., Hennessey, the Patricon biographical material In the Book of Armagh (ed, W. Stokes, The Tripartite Life of Patrick, II, pp. 269-351), Bethu Phátraic, I (ed. K. Nuichrone).

For each set of annals the proportional occurrence per century of the place-name structure 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' was presented in a series of histograms. (Proportions were based on the total count of place-names within the century, with the omission of repeats and known transferred population-/sept-names.) Excepting one 6th century entry, Róth in Draud, instances of the place-name structure in A1 begin in the 11th and 12th centuries, both with ca 2%, with a marked increase in the 13th century to ca 11%. In AU the structure is not documented with any degree of certainty until the 9th century (ca 1%) but the incidence is not markedly significant until the 12th and 13th centuries. Loch Cé covers the century-span that appears most significant in this study, the 11th - 16 centuries. Here we have a fairly steady increase in the incidence of the structure from ca 2% in the 11th century to 22% in the 16th century. The statistical tendency, on the combined evidence of the three sets of annals, would indicate that while names of the structure 'Noun governing gen. of article and noun' are instanced as early as the 9th century, it is from the 11th century onwards that there is a noticeable increase in the frequency of usage.

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

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