London bynames by Elliott Ekwall, who paid meticulous attention to the nature of his source materials, to local and biographical history, and to the development of suitable comparative methods. We are promised another volume from Dr JHnsjö, dealing with the simplex nicknames from the same body of documents. I do hope that further thought will be given to the research, presentation, and explanation of the material, before it goes to press.

PETER McCLURE
University of Hull

A. L. F. RIVET and COLIN SMITH, The Place-Names of Roman Britain, Batsford: London, 1979, xviii + 526 pp., 33 maps, 2 plates, £45.50.

This is a magnificent book. It is a pity that the price is so high, but there is no alternative to ownership, since every future discussion of any Romano-British place-name must start from here. If Rivet and Smith had been available two years earlier, the task of writing Chapter II of my Suggestions to the Past would have been lighter, and the result better. No-one will ever again set off into this particular jungle so ill-equipped as I was, but I am not altogether sorry to have made my amateur sortie. The conclusions I reached about the general nature of the material do not appear to be hopelessly at variance with those put forward by Rivet and Smith; though now that the full complexity of the subject has been made visible I feel that any success on my part must have been due more to luck than to judgment.

The Preface names a number of scholars who have answered queries, but, as Professor S.S. Frere commented in an early review, the authors eschewed large-scale systematic consultation, and most reviewers will probably note points they would have been glad to comment on if given the opportunity. Perhaps the authors felt that the only hope of reaching journey's end lay in paddling their own canoe.

Despite its great authority, the book is probably not definitive in any respect other than the assemblage of names to be discussed. Now that the material is easily available between these covers everyone will join in the discussion, and the reviews which have so far appeared indicate that there is scope for alternative proposals about both the location and the interpretation of some of the place-names listed.

The Preface states that though the work is to be seen as a joint production, C.C.S. has been primarily responsible for Chapters I, V, VI and VII of the Introduction and for the linguistic discussions in the list of names, A. L. F. R., for Chapters II, III and IV, and for the identifications and cartography.

Chapter I is uneven in quality. The section on the history of the subject is witty, and the first pages of the section on the languages of Roman Britain contain a full and authoritative discussion with a stimulating passage (pp. 14-16) on the possibility of the British language having been written in Roman letters, though no evidence of this survives. But the discussion which begins on p. 20 with the words "The names of wholly British origin are so numerous and diverse that few general remarks can be ventured about them" is not well-organised, and fails to give a clear impression of the types of statement which British people felt to constitute serviceable place-names. The material does lend itself to analysis, as I tried to indicate in Chapter II of Suggestions to the Past. A statement on p. 24 - "Germanic invaders took over their Latin and Celtic names ... freely interpreting the elements to suit themselves" - and the footnote - "There are numerous instances of Celtic-Latin elements being assimilated to more meaningful elements in Germanic" - are misleading. There are a few such instances (like York and Speen), but these only serve to emphasise the general abstention from such popular etymologying on the part of the Germanic invaders. The same footnote says that the true derivation of Hrodecemere, the Old English name of Duororvica (Rochester) could have been explained to Bede by "any available Briton". Since Professor Smith accepts Ekwall's involved (and to my mind not compelling) equation of Hrof with Duororvica, the
mind can only boggle at the capacity for philological ingenuity which he attributes to the Britons of Bede's time. This not entirely satisfactory section is followed by some stimulating pages on the probable conservatism of Roman spelling, and the retardation of sound-developments in Romano-British place-names which might have been caused by the fossilisation of the official written forms; and the third section of Chapter I, on 'Textual and Linguistic Problems', is businesslike and useful.

It is with the discussion of the sources in Professor Rivet's Chapters II-IV that the awe-inspiring complexities of the subject become apparent. The worst problems of all are those tackled by Professor Smith in Chapter V, the subject of which is The Ravenna Cosmography. For more than three decades English place-name specialists dealing with this text have relied on the article: "The British Section of the Ravenna Cosmography" by J. A. Richmond, O. G. S. Crawford and Ifor Williams in *Archaeologia* 93 (1949). Although it has been the practice since 1953 to check Ifor Williams's etymological comments against Kenneth Jackson's Language and History in Early Britain, the general interpretation of the text which was put forward in 1949 has not been questioned. This has now been shown to require substantial emendations, the most important from my own viewpoint being the revelation that the four places named Landini-Tamase-Britavis-Aluna, which I had accepted as being in Berkshire and Oxfordshire, are actually London-B. Thames-Rochester--Ælester in Warwickshire. Section 6 of this chapter is entitled Errors of Copying, and here are assembled the most glaring errors of transmission in the sources available for Romano-British place-name study. One point which emerges from the book is that while miscopying is probably at its worst in the Ravenna text, all classical sources are more liable to it than the medieval sources which are the basis of English place-name study. It is clear that clerks compiling administrative records in the Middle Ages were obliged to be more accurate in their rendering of place-names than learned geographers in the ancient world, and that the discipline of accurate reproduction was more highly developed in English administrative and monastic circles than in the Continental monasteries where such texts as the Ravenna Cosmography and the Antonine Itinerary were copied. Scholars whose education has been mainly in the Classics sometimes refuse to accept the faith of English place-name specialists in the medieval spellings on which their etymologies are based, and reading Section 6 of Chapter V, and Section 7 in which the Ravenna text is set out, one can see why the notions of faithful copying and true representation of speech by English medieval clerks seem strange to scholars accustomed to dealing with classical texts.

The Alphabetic List of Names occupies pp. 237-514. Under each item there is a summary of the information previously available (often from widely scattered sources), and under many there are new suggestions about the possible meanings. Discussions of common elements (e.g. *dunum*, *duro*, *magos*, *nemet*, *ritu*, *venta*) are included in the article on the first relevant name (e.g. *Brandunum*, *Durobrivae*, *Caesaromagus*, *Aqua Armentiae*, *Anderitum*, *Bennavens*). These discussions, which relate the British material to comparable names elsewhere in Europe, are of major importance, and might usefully have been indexed. At any rate it is desirable that students should note that they are there.

The maps include seven which show the distribution of river-names derived from *Aba*, *Aluna*, *Derventio*, *Devra*, *Isca*, *Iunna* and *Trisantona*. These are an 'extra', since most of the instances mapped are only known from much later sources. They are most welcome, and will facilitate consideration of whether some Celtic terms which appear to mean 'water' or 'river' were really proper names or were mistakenly perceived as such by the Anglo-Saxons. Fig. 33 is a "Map of Great Britain showing names which can be located with certainty or probability". This is excellent, but it is necessarily rather empty in the S.W., where the Ravenna Cosmographer names a great many places which cannot be located with sufficient precision to be shown. Dr. A. H. A. Hogg's map, which was designed to show the survival of Romano-British place-names in southern Britain, and which was published in *Antiquity* in 1964 and reproduced in *Studies in Topography and the History of Place-Names*, had the merit (among others) of showing this cluster of names. Dr. Hogg's map might well be redrawn taking account of the new information in Rivet and Smith. Much rewriting and rewriting of earlier maps and articles will doubtless be required when the vast amount of information presented in this book has been assessed by experts in Romano-British studies and in Celtic philology, and assimilated by historians and archaeologists.

MARGARET GELLING
Mr John Dodgson brought order to the classification of ing compound names, but no reference is made here to the possible significance and implications, for example, of assimilation in names like Alltrincham, Bengeo and Birmingham. Two decades have passed since Dr Nicolaisen brought order to the hazardous business of classifying the pre-Celtic hydronymy of the British Isles, but his results are all but unnoticed.

Few scholars, indeed, could claim to be at home with both the Germanic and Celtic language groups and one has every sympathy for anyone attempting to grapple with the philology of British, Celtic, Cornish, Cumbric and Welsh elements as well as Old English, and Old Norse, not to speak of Gaelic, Irish and Pictish. That such an enterprise will occasionally go wrong is neither surprising nor unpardonable. But there is a certain pervasive carelessness over detail which mars this book. All place-name scholars and transcribers are familiar with the tricks which letters, dates, minims and suspensions play with even the most meticulous of procedures. But there are just too many slips here, and they are not simply due to bad proof reading. Early forms are mis-spelled (e.g. Eldeberie Albury O, recte Aldeberie), mistyped (e.g. Alstholte 1189 Alice Holt, recte 1169), undated (e.g. Cheppham Clippemham BK), or assigned to the wrong head name (e.g. Passetum 1223 Aston Ingham He, recte Aston He and 1123): there is inconsistency in presenting Brythonic etyma as between forms appropriate to British and forms appropriate to Primitive Welsh - a term Mr Field does not employ - (e.g. B *ceto- (minus length mark) Cheadle, B *cæld Lichfield) and in giving them in root or in word form (e.g. *glasio Dawlish, *glasio- Dowlas); forms are given as etyma which are chronologically posterior to the names they are supposed to explain (e.g. W torig for Torridge, recte B *Torig; W wight for Wight, recte B *Wext or which are cognate rather than antecedent forms (e.g. c. Kil Kyo, *kypo Speen, recte caps and either *spon or *spna) or are otherwise unacceptable (e.g. *rak Reculver, recte *roc; hengo Stonehenge, a ghost word, recte henge or, better, hengen); length marks are frequently omitted or given in the wrong form (e.g. see Seaford, Seaford etc, street Stratfield, Stratford etc. etc., sol Solway etc.); Romano-British names are cited in unacceptable forms and wrongly identified (although to judge from his bibliography Mr Field may well have gone to press before the availability of The Place-Names of Roman Britain). Examples could be multiplied several times over. This book may not be intended for the specialist, but the general reader too is no less entitled to rigorous standards, evidential accuracy and philological consistency.

V. E. WATTIS

People living in, or interested in, Greater London should welcome this popular but accurate approach to place-names in the area, written in laymen’s terms by an author experienced in making the experts’ theories accessible to the general reader. John Field’s book ought certainly to be bought by every public library, school, and local history society in the region, in spite of the limitations in its scope noted below. It is brave of him to attempt a ‘comprehensive’ (if also ‘informal’) survey of the district names of Greater London, while the English Place-Name Society volumes for Surrey (1934), Essex (1936), Hertfordshire (1938), and Middlesex (1942) await revision, and that for Kent has yet to be published.

The immediate inspiration for the book would seem to have been that landmark in British place-name literature, The Names of Towns and Cities in Britain, edited by W. Nicolaelsen, M. Cellig, and M. Richards (Batsford: London, 1970). This included a 15-page dictionary section on names in Greater London, which John Field has now much expanded, accepting their etymologies on the whole, occasionally shedding jargon, improving the typographic layout, and adding the odd note or two (see Chingford, Harrow). He sets out to cover many more names with the purpose of interesting readers who may never have heard of the English Place-Name Society, yet who deserve accurate explanations based on the latest research (something which Batsford books in the recent past have not always offered).

Such a general readership might not realise that, in other circumstances, the Dictionary of Greater London Place-Names (Part 1 of the book) would certainly have been longer than 78 and a half pages. Some omissions, are, unfortunately, easily spotted: what happened to Woolwich, and where are Deptford, Hither Green and Plumstead, all noted on the rather basic map (pp. viii-ix), but also passed over in silence? Certainly the local historians, from whose number may well come those detailed studies called for by the author (p. 165), will regret the gaps in coverage, but perhaps this will speed their own work.

The criteria for inclusion are not clear. Reference to the AA Greater London Street Atlas (Geographia, 1977) immediately suggests further names. Some small areas, nonetheless ‘component parts of the conurbation’, appear to have been rejected (e.g., Southborough, Widmore (Bromley); Broad Green, Coombe (Croydon)), whereas other places of a similar size, or even smaller - parks, lakes, bridges - have been included when the author had material to hand. Monumental names, now often lost unless fossilized or revived in street-names, are discussed (like some other street-names) in both parts of the book. This leads to a few minor omissions, at least to the south of the Thames again - Battersea (Mitcham); Benson (Croydon); Leyton (SW16). These particular inconsistencies possibly reflect the reviewer’s bias, but the Bibliography does tend to confirm an emphasis on material from the northern area. Naturally, local knowledge will enable readers to offer additional or alternative information; for instance, the Isthmian Royal Hospital (see Bedlam, p. 28) is still within the region, at Monks Orchard Road, Beckenham.

There are only a few places where corrections might be offered, one being that Little Roke (Parley) is so-called in distinction from the former neighbouring estate of Great Roke, rather than from the Roke in Witley, Surrey.

Much has been written previously about London street-names. Leslie Dunkling provides a short general review of the literature in the Guinness Book of Names (Guinness Superlatives: London, 1974, pp. 164-8). Perhaps two per cent of Greater London’s total are considered by John Field in ‘Street-names of Greater London’ (part 2 of the present book), but since street-naming processes are similar from town to town, this section ought to be read by a wider public than those who may first be interested in this book. One may suspect that these 61 pages, a useful attempt at the classification of these mainly modern names, began life intended for a different publication. At any rate, John Field’s treatment of street-names in both Parts of his book must have been influenced by the existence of G. Bebbington’s London Street-Names (Batsford: London, 1972). The relationship is not formally emphasised, but it is clear that deliberate overlap has been avoided. A good deal of the necessary duplication remaining is in order to correct or add further information (e.g. Aldgate, Aldwych, Batterbridge, Borough, and many more). However, a newcomer to the subject will look in vain for a number of well-known inner London names which might otherwise have been discussed (Haymarket, Ludgate Hill, Rotten Row, and so on).

‘Street-names of Greater London’ is naturally very selective, but covers a wide range of topics from ‘ale, bottled to ‘umbrellas’, as the General Index shows. The suggested classification is a beginning, but needs further refining, as the sections and their subdivisions are not all that clear. The different generic terms for street, which could have been a section on their own, are only given a passing reference under ‘Trees and flowering plants’. The older names in ancient market or administrative centres now within the region have been slightly neglected; at any rate, more could have been said about the shape of the early settlements, the survival of their back lanes and footpaths, greens and commons, as well as field-names. There is only a hint about the importance of maps, and hardly any indication of the relevance of current developments in urban and landscape history and archaeology. Perhaps more practical guidance could have been given for those who might want to start work in this field. The Bibliography should surely have included more of the local lists already existing - of whatever value - if only to let the reader know what has been achieved since Cefora gave Instructions in Teach Yourself Local History (English Universities’ Press: London, 1958). Barnes and Mortlake, Kensington and Chelsea, Hanwell, Fulham and Hammersmith, Brent, Waltham Forest and Hackney at least have published material; other areas may have collections in progress.

An interesting topic, hinted at under Welsh Harp (p. 96), is that of the popular, or unofficial, name for a local landmark. This is perhaps not the work in which to record them, but detailed local surveys ought to note them for the social and historical insights they provide. The people of Croydon refer to the Addington Hills as Shirley Hills (thereby including them within their own parish bounds); they know a tree-lined, widely-pavemented stretch of the Upper Addiscombe Road as The Boulevard; Dalmally Passage, under a railway line, used to be called The Cattle Arch, from its original purpose. Greater London must have hundreds of such alternative names which are yet to be studied.

It is unfortunate that the general appearance of the book is marred by a number of printing errors, spelling mistakes, and examples of poor indexing, the latter being the most frequent problem and the most annoying. Paladins and pirates...
may appear in the General Index, but not charcoal burners, who are at least as worthy of attention (p. 40). The street-name Downage is explained on p.10, but not indexed anywhere; Viola Ave. and Violet Ave. have disappeared from the Index of Street-Names. There is no mention of 'crosses, wayside' on p.198 - not surprisingly, since the book stops at p.184. Hasty proof-reading is presumably to blame for these and other slips.

John Field has done much in the past to encourage the local collection and examination of field-names. Perhaps the most important result of this book will be the inspiration of a new generation of workers in town and city street-names.

JENNIFER SCHERR


It is a great pity that this book, first published in 1970, has been resurrected by its publishers, without alteration, in a paperback edition. It is now dangerously out of step with the results of the research of the last fifteen years into the historical significance of English place-names and should have undergone a total revision before being reissued. This is all the more serious since the book was intended as 'a popular introduction . . . in which there was rather less concentration upon technical linguistic matters, and rather more upon history at large, than is . . . usual in place-name books' (Foreword). Why should the intelligent layman have to put up with such out-of-date notions of the Anglo-Saxon Settlement as are contained in this book? For example, the statement (p.7) that 'the nearest recent parallel is the gradual encroachment of the Americans over the western prairies. In both instances there were great empty spaces to be occupied: a scanty population of indigenous people to be fought, conquered and displaced; and lands to be won for a living', and (p.74) 'the Great Trek of the Boers would be a more recent parallel'. Inevitably, there is a map of -ings names and one of 'place-names incorporating the names of Pagan Gods', both, together with the commentaries on them, now seriously misleading to the innocent reader.

The book is embued with a simplistic idea of settlement chronology which makes very little allowance for local variations in the degree or length of survival of previous language-groups and which takes no consideration of the phenomenon of name-change within the same language (and thus of the relatively late coming of many of the names which have survived from the period before 1066). There are also a few anachronisms, e.g. (p.19) Boudica is said to have led a rebellion in which 'all the British tribes of eastern England joined', and (p.4) the form Sarum for Salisbury is said to be a Roman name which has survived into modern use whereas it is, of course, an erroneous late medieval expansion of the abbreviation Sar, for Sarsibury, etc. On p.79 'the Chronicle scribe' should read 'the Domesday scribe'; on p.85 'the Anglo-Saxon word burgh' would be more accurately described as 'the Old English word burh'; and on p.87 'Skarol' (x3) should read 'Skarlo'.

The first chapter is a general introduction, the next six are an attempt at a chronological description of the early history of England as reflected by major place-names, while the final two concentrate on more purely-linguistic aspects of the subject. Of them all, it is the last two chapters which are the most successful and in need of least revision. Chapter 8 is called 'Curiosities' and includes sections on popular etymology, back-formations, and modern names. Chapter 9 'Place-names and the English Language' is divided between personal-names, unrecorded words, and sounds and dialects.

The book includes a short bibliography of further reading. This is still in its 1970 state and is thus of no help to the present-day reader wishing to catch up with recent developments. Even in its 1970 state it is still surprising to find reference to the 3rd edition (1947) of Ekwall's Dictionary of English Place-Names, rather than to the 4th (1960), also to read that 'other writers, making specialized studies of one county or area, may disagree with occasional etymologies Ekwall suggests,
but this is unimportant. Ekwall was one of the creators of place-name studies in England, and his dictionary shows his authority on every page. So much for the Survey of English Place-Names! This unquestioning acceptance of Ekwall’s Dictionary is particularly unfortunate today since it too is still in print and is still being promoted by its publishers in a similar way to this book, in spite of its many errors of fact and its outdated commentaries.

ALEXANDER R. RUMBLE

H. D. G. FOXALL, Shropshire Field-Names, Shropshire Archaeological Society: Shrewsbury, 1980, vi + 98 pp., maps, illus., £2.50 obtainable from the Society, 23 Oak Street, Shrewsbury, SY3 7RQ.

Conciseness is a key quality in this work. The author’s own description of the book as ‘brief survey’ is justified by the actual length, but deserves to be qualified by a note that brevity does not interfere with either readability or a thorough and lucid exposition of a wide range of names.

Much of the interest, and, indeed, reliability of the book derives from Mr Foxall’s close acquaintance with the landscape of his county. Long experience has given him a deep understanding of the features of that landscape, as well as of the documentary sources of the nomenclature, particularly the Tithe Apportionments and maps. The material is presented largely under classified headings, with comments and general conclusions where appropriate. Slang, for instance, is noted as being ‘found all over the County, often as Sling in the south.’ The comment is supported by references to Badger and Heath, maps of which appear in the book. Though these places are relatively small and do not, therefore, present the range and variety of names to be found in Alberbury, say, or Whitney, or Pontesbury, the maps are of great value in illustrating local usages, whether West Midland or specifically belonging to Shropshire.

Survivals of very early names are duly noted, few though these are. One that might be overlooked is Cook’s Piece (Coreley), but Mr Foxall traces this Tithe Apportionment name to its predecessor of the same form recorded in 1431, the identity confirmed by its location. Edford (Lilleshall) is traced with some probability to an even earlier origin: a charter reference in 963 to Eoda’s ford. It is a name of this type that the author selects to illustrate the mutilation wrought by time. Lower, Middle, and Upper Purditch appear in the Tithe Apportionment for Shrewsbury St Mary, successors to Purdiches mentioned in a document of 1593; Mr Foxall has found a still earlier form, Prudches, in the fourteenth century, owned by the Pride family whose name survives in Pride Hill, Shrewsbury.

In many categories, Welsh names are recorded. Pistol Leasow (Ellesmere) and Pyest Croft (Oswestry) are noted as being beside waterfalls (W pistly); Preston Argue is derived from W arga, ‘embankment, dam’, and so may be placed with English names such as Barrow (Cons) or Bars (Shrewsbury St Chad), alluding to flood-protection embankments. Squilver Piece (More) and Ysgwila (Clun) originate in W digywyla, ‘chateau-tower’. The Solstyn name, Scherice Field, for all its suggestion of transferred place-names, seems to be merely an English attempt at Ysgubor Isaf, ‘lower barn’, the first element of which is found in the purely Welsh name Cae Ysgubor (Oswestry).

In the Oswestry area, Mr Foxall notes, whole townships have field-names that are almost exclusively Welsh, but further south the Celtic influence is not quite so strong, mixed names being more abundant even in Clun and Bettws-y-crwyn.

This short work is an excellent example of the way in which a summary treatment of the field-names of an entire county can be presented. The author’s unrivalled knowledge of the Shropshire Tithe Apportionments, supported by his firm
grasp of the linguistic, historical, and geographical contexts in which this nomenclature is set, offers to readers a most welcome guide to as remarkable a collection of field-names as can be found in any English county. The Shropshire Archaeological Society deserves thanks and congratulations for presenting Mr Foxall’s work in such an attractive way, the booklet being embellished with photographs of fields (Ham Field and The Yields), reproductions of parts of early maps, and three maps by Mr Foxall himself - a key map of parish boundaries and two of his excellent copies of Tithe maps. Separate indexes of field-names and parish-names contribute to the usefulness of the work. Specialists in other counties will surely be encouraged to imitate Mr Foxall’s concise study, but it is not likely to be surpassed.

JOHN FIELD


This thesis is an examination of the role played by popular etymology, or, to use the author’s terminology, secondary motivation, in the formation of English surnames. It is a commonplace that orthographic and phonological modification of proper names through association with words of the general vocabulary is a well-attested phenomenon in English, but any attempt to ascertain the mechanism of the processes involved here must have proper historical foundations, and in this crucial point Dr Ruckdeschel’s thesis is unsatisfactory.

The thesis begins with a short introduction examining the nature of popular etymology/secondary motivation and the relationship between nomina propria and nomina appellativa. This introduction is somewhat superficial, with a tendency to labour points which are self-evident and, although the bibliography given in the footnotes is usefully comprehensive, the introduction adds nothing to our knowledge of the lexical and semantic processes involved in English byname and surname formation, areas in which the establishment of formal criteria is urgently necessary.

The bulk of the thesis consists of a dictionary examining some 887 surnames in which Dr Ruckdeschel assumes secondary motivation to have taken place. Her collection of material is very much a scissors-and-paste affair. The medieval forms are taken largely from P. H. Reaney’s A Dictionary of British Surnames. The Early Modern English forms are mainly from Professor Herbert Voit’s unpublished Selective Archive of Early Modern English Family Names, a collection of material from published parish registers of the years 1598-1602 and 1701-1705, while the Modern English head forms are taken from Professor Voit’s unpublished Archive of Present-Day British Family Names. Further historical material is taken from P. H. Reaney’s The Origin of English Surnames, the pitfalls of which were graphically illustrated by Cecily Clark in NOMINA 4; from George Redmonds’s Yorkshire West Riding (English Surnames Series 1); from F. G. Black’s The Surnames of Scotland and from such antiquated works as those of Bardsley and Weekley. For some 59 surnames Dr Ruckdeschel gives no historical material at all.

Dr Ruckdeschel’s arrangement of the material leaves much to be desired. Throughout the thesis, early forms are cited incomplete in terms of their onomastic and documentary contexts. Thus, to take an example, whereas Reaney’s dictionary sub SEALEAF gives a form Robertus filius Selue 1190 BuryS (Sh), Dr Ruckdeschel, in her treatment of the surname SEALEAF, has merely Rea 1190 Selue. She is, thus, content merely to give the form in its narrowest sense together with the date and a general reference to Reaney’s dictionary (Rea). She omits the source (BuryS), the county (Sh), and the textual information which shows that Selue is here a constituent of a patronymic formation. Dr Ruckdeschel also never gives the MS. dates of medieval forms. Admittedly, Reaney also did not do this in his dictionary, but, since he always gave his source, it is possible to check the MS. dates of his forms if necessary. Since Dr Ruckdeschel never takes her forms direct from the sources, she is not in the position to ascertain whether these forms have been normalized in the course of transmission by the editors of texts or by the compilers of handbooks and surname dictionaries. The absence of any indication of the geographical origin of the individual forms renders the thesis useless for dialect studies.
For etymologies, Dr Ruckdeschel's thesis is heavily dependent on Reaney's dictionary. For 504 surnames (56.62% of the total of 887) which also appear in Reaney's dictionary, an etymology has been taken from that work, though in a few cases new suggestions have been added. Sometimes, without any reason being given, only one of several etymologies proposed by Reaney is chosen. A further 55 surnames (6.20% of the total) are merely phonological or orthographic variants of names given in Reaney's dictionary, and the etymology is accordingly taken from this source. Other etymologies are taken from a variety of works, including the ones mentioned above in the account of Dr Ruckdeschel's sources, or deduced by the author herself. In this context, it should be noted that, although the bibliography is fairly comprehensive, it does not include several essential works. It omits Holthausen's Alteingeschichtliches etymologisches Woerterbuch and the Middle English Dictionary (MED), edited by H. Kurath et al., both of which are essential aids for work on OE and ME personal names and bynames. Much recent work is also missing, for example, the series of articles by George Redmonds on Yorkshire surnames and Peter McClure's important work on surnames from English place-names as evidence for mobility in the later medieval period. Works dealing with English local history, often fruitful sources for surname history, are conspicuous by their absence.

Dr Ruckdeschel's reliance on Reaney's dictionary is a major methodological shortcoming, which is inexcusable in view of the fact that the deficiencies of Reaney's work have been known for some time. I need only quote the remarks of the late Olof von Pellitzen at a conference held in 1975 at Dr Ruckdeschel's own university of Erlangen-Numberg:

In Reaney there is often a gap between say 1200 when one will find a form of an OE personal name and the 17th century or later when a modern surname form is given. The modern form may have nothing at all to do with the OE personal name. The name must always be traced back. There is a danger that Reaney's dictionary might be regarded as an authoritative work without any account being taken of the limitations of his approach, material and methods of interpretation, limitations of which I am sure that he was himself conscious.


Though the proceedings of the Erlangen conference appear in Dr Ruckdeschel's bibliography, she shows no sign of having been influenced either by these cautionary remarks of von Pellitzen or by George Redmonds's demonstration in the same volume that a detailed and properly documented history of a surname is necessary if its origin is to be properly explained. Dr Ruckdeschel repeats Reaney's methodological errors, and, indeed, her general standards with regard to the presentation and analysis of material are inferior to those of Reaney.

Dr Ruckdeschel's own attempts at etymologies belong largely to the realms of unsubstantiated speculation. Thus, we are informed, without the benefit of any earlier forms, that the surnames BILLIARD, CUWFFWIGHT, FREEGUARD, and HARTFREE belong respectively to the OE personal names bilheard, cuuferd, and frereguard.

Fridguerd, and Haurfrith. Again, without any earlier forms, the surname WHEREAT is taken to reflect an OE weor-geat 'weir-gate' and the surname YOUNGHOUSE to be a compound of OE geong 'young' and the OFr personal name Hue. Similarly, without giving any evidence, the surname MATTERFACE is interpreted as deriving from the Norman place-name Martinval (La Manche), and the surname DUNFI'RE is taken to reflect an impercative nickname 'do out the fire'. English place-names also do not escape in Dr Ruckdeschel's search for suitable etymologies. Thus, without giving any earlier forms, she takes the surnames BIRTHWRIGHT and COLDSNOW to be derived from the place-names Birthwaite (Westmorland) and Cowlishaw (Lancashire) respectively. On checking Birthwaite in A. H. Smith's The Place-Names of Westmorland and Cowlishaw in Eillert Ekwall's The Place-Names of Lancashire, we find no earlier forms which could have given rise to the surnames BIRTHWRIGHT and COLDSNOW. Dr Ruckdeschel's use of earlier material to support her etymologies also does not inspire confidence. For example, she derives the surname CAMPFIELD from the Norman place-name Caunville-les-deux-Eglesises (Seine-Inferieure), citing a form of 1146, de Caunilla, taken from Reaney's dictionary, sub CAMWELL. This 1146 form is the only earlier material which she cites sub CAMPFIELD, and it clearly does not allow us to deduce any connection between the modern surname CAMPFIELD and the Norman place-name Caunville-les-deux-Eglesises, even though Dr Ruckdeschel cites the surname BASKETFIELD, which she and Reaney derive from the Norman place-name Boscherville (Eure), as a parallel case of the replacement of French ville by English -field as a result of popular etymology/secondary motivation.

Dr Ruckdeschel not infrequently makes errors of detail, which could have been avoided if a little more care had been taken. Thus, she designates the Continental Germanic personal names found in medieval English records 'Old High German', when they are largely of West Frankish and Flemish origin. Sub HORSCGOOD and THOROUGHGOOD respectively, the Scandinavian personal names Asgot and Forgota are described as 'Old Norse', when they are, in fact, characteristically East Scandinavian forms, the Old Norse equivalents being Asguur and Forgaust. Sub SECRET OE Sigfred is given as the etymology of the 1066 form Sigreda. Dr Ruckdeschel takes this 1066 form from Reaney's dictionary, sub SIREED. Reaney grouped this form with several others in Sireudo, Syre, Sirede, Sigerith, and Sigrede, and gave the etymology as OE Sigerde 'victory-counsel' (m), or, at times, ON Sigerdr (f). In fact, the forms in Sigreda, Sigerith, and Sireda belong quite clearly to ON Sigrdr, as Dr Ruckdeschel would have realized had she referred to the entries for ON Sigrdr in Olof von Pellitzen's The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book and in Gillian Fellows Jensa's Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, both of which appear in her bibliography. Dr Ruckdeschel's use of place-name evidence is also not free of error. Sub APPLEREEE and LIGHTBOUND respectively, she cites two non-existent Lancashire place-names, Appleby and Lightbourn.

The thesis is concluded with an analysis of the material collected in the body of the work. Dr Ruckdeschel takes the period between the 16th and 18th centuries to have been decisive for the process of popular etymology/secondary motivation in the development of English surnames, and she regards formations derived from OE dithematic personal names as especially susceptible to this process. The thesis contains an English summary identical with that given by the author in NOMINA 4.
Unfortunately, the general unreliability of the methods of collection and analysis of material used by Dr Ruckdeschel forces one to treat her conclusions with the utmost scepticism. The material which she provides simply is not adequate and her etymological investigations are too uncritical. It simply will not do merely to collect forms and etymologies from a variety of secondary works or to construe etymologies just on the basis of the modern surname forms. The study of surnames requires a knowledge of primary sources and the application of this knowledge in the form of properly documented histories of individual surnames. Without reliable histories of individual surnames all historical and linguistic conclusions based on these surnames must remain speculation. The awareness of the need for properly documented surname histories with continuous runs of forms has been one of the major advances in English surname studies over the last decade, and, in this sense, we have moved into a 'post-Reaney' era in English surname research. Dr Ruckdeschel's thesis shows scant appreciation of these methodological advances, and, indeed, in terms of both its use of documentary evidence and its etymological principles it is inferior to Reaney's works. Its approach to historic material is inadequate and anachronistic, and, for this reason, the deductions contained in it are often extremely speculative. Any study of the role of popular etymology in the formation of English surnames must be based on sound etymological principles and be properly documented. The extent of the material which would have to be examined suggests that regional studies would be more realistic than an all-embracing national study like that of Dr Ruckdeschel.

JOHN INSLEY


Research into modern English nicknaming has rarely ventured beyond the anecdotal, and the publication of this small collection of studies is to be warmly welcomed as marking the beginning of a systematic approach to the sociology of English nicknaming. Some impression of its contribution to the subject may be gathered from the paper on 'Nickname and Pet-Names' printed elsewhere in this issue of NOMINA, and I shall not repeat the details in this review. Pleasure that an important topic is receiving some overdue attention is tempered, however, by disappointment that the enthusiastic efforts of the authors of this book fall short of what was possible and desirable in terms of materials, methods, and presentation.

To begin with, the title is misleading: Nicknames is not a study of nicknaming in general but a study of nicknaming among a selective sample of English school-children. (Note that the book forms part of a series called 'Social Worlds of Childhood'.) True enough, the authors claim that 'to set the nicknaming practices of children in a larger framework we have been obliged to make some study of the socio-psychological role of names in adult life' (Prefatory Note). But this 'larger framework' is pathetically flimsy: a half-page Appendix called 'Adult Nicknames', which is no more than a list of six names recorded in a ship-building yard and a plea for further research; a short, scrappy chapter on 'Nicknaming in Other Cultures' (in Japan, Arabia, Spain, Ceylon, and-most of the evidence is of children's naming); and two chapters on parental naming of children (official Christian names and 'pet names', a term the authors use to cover all unofficial domestic renaming).

In the same Prefatory Note the authors confess that their framework is 'rudimentary'- they are too complimentary - and disarmingly declare: 'we are only too aware how much remains to be elucidated in the field of nicknames proper, and how speculative are many of our conclusions. We hope that others will be encouraged to put us right.' Well, the invitation is there, and turning to the Bibliography I am alarmed to see that they have failed to consult any of the published onomastic works in which adult nicknames are discussed: Julian Franklin's Nicknames, P. H. Reaney's Origin of English Surnames (published, one cannot help remarking, by the same house as their own book), Leslie Dunkling's Guinness Book of Names, several older works by Weekley, Ewen, Kneen, Black, and others, and a fair number of articles in anthropological, onomastic, and linguistic journals. It is high time that sociologists and onomasticians got to know each others' work, and, to show that the boot fits both feet, I must admit that there are articles on the sociology and psychology of first names that I was not aware of until I looked at Morgan, O'Neill, and Harré's bibliography.

The authors conclude the Bibliography by singling out standard socio-linguistic text-books that contain no mention of names or nicknames. That is a fair criticism. For their own part, it must be said that Morgan, O'Neill, and Harré's knowledge and understanding of academic work in names in general is far from adequate, and that their linguistic treatment of names is confused and inconsistent. Persistent problems of analysis occur from misconceiving a distinction between internal methods of name-coining, where 'the choice of name is determined . . . by systematic
features of the naming system itself, as a part of a language', and external methods, where choice is motivated by 'empirical properties of the subject or individual named' (Nicknames p.9). In chapter 4, 'The Origins of Nicknames', the authors apply this distinction in ways that baffle logic. For example, the nickname Underwear, derived from the surname Underwood, is classified as internally motivated, but Haybag and Hayfield, from the surname Brayfield, are classified as externally motivated. In fact all three nicknames are puns turning a surname into a partly similar sounding word, and require the same classification. This confused approach to lexically meaningful nicknames arises from a failure to distinguish consistently between the semantic properties of referents and referends, and thus between nicknames derived from aspects of the person and those derived from the person's official names. It produces a most unsatisfactory analysis of external methods of naming on pages 38-42. Consider Nobby for Clark, Tug for Gordon, Duck for Donald, Bean for Broad, Flea for the original nickname Mosquito (from Jackie Amos), Coat for Parker, Chic for Shurt, and Creamed Rice for Ambrose. These are classed with nicknames of behaviour (Brain-box, Stinker) and appearance (Copper-knob, Fatty) as externally motivated, instead of being grouped with names like Britches (='breeches') for Britchford, Isaac for Newton (cf. Duck for Donald), and Weed for Cardener, which are classed as internally motivated. In short, the chapter on 'The Origins of Nicknames' (pp. 36-45) is a disaster.

Since Morgan, O'Neill, and Harré are hopelessly inconsistent as well as illogical in their classification of names, how is one to interpret statements such as that on page 42 where it is claimed that the distribution of internally and externally motivated names differs between junior and senior school? In view of their frequent allocation of punning nicknames to the externally motivated category, one would guess that they underestimate rather than overstate the difference. But although there is much illustration of schoolchildren's nicknames, there are no full lists of primary data, so one cannot construct one's own statistics on a better analytical model. This is a particular hindrance whenever the authors employ such ill-defined terms as 'traditional nicknames', the qualifying properties of which appear to change each time the term is used.

One is also entitled to know more about the methods of research. One learns here and there that data on naming practices was gathered by questionnaires and interviews, but the form of these questionnaires is not exemplified except in the case of two (in chapter 5) which are designed to elicit information not on nicknames but on social attitudes and relations. The authors are well aware of the dangers of self-reporting questionnaires (see e.g. Nicknames pp. 59-60) but they do not state clearly when their statistics are drawn from all the reported nicknames and when solely from objectively confirmed nicknames (which would have a superior evidential status). One regrets, too, the lack of clear information about the number, size, geographical location, and type of social catchment of the schools where nicknaming was studied. A fully thought-out study would surely have examined nicknaming according to a much wider range of contrastive criteria than is apparent in this case. The most notable omission is a study of differences, if any, between the nicknaming practices of the two sexes, for example by comparing the practices in an all-male boarding school with those in an all-female one, or the usage among boys and girls in the same co-educational school. More attention could have been given to the type and function of nicknames according to whether they are used in first-person, second-person, or third-person reference.

Nicknames, Their Origins and Social Consequences should and could have been a better book than it is, and gives the impression of having been compiled in some haste, in spite of (or perhaps because of) the fact that it has three authors and half a dozen helpers who contributed unpublished 'empirical studies'. But having dwelt on its vices I must conclude by emphasising the book's virtues. The authors make many detailed and convincing observations on the functions of nicknames in school societies. They show how 'nicknames, by their existence, absence or implication, ... can shade in the social map of a class, its groups, hostilities and great friendships' (p. 56). They examine what I would call primary nicknames (of behaviour and appearance) in their relationship with the social norms of pupil society, and demonstrate how these names are employed in playground games of ritual abuse. They identify the kind of society in which nicknaming flourishes most intensively and extensively, and discuss at length the motives and social roles of name-givers and the responses of those who are named. Three of the central chapters, 'The Creation and Maintenance of Social Classes', 'The Pronunciation and Enforcement of Norms', and 'Name-Givers' are, in my view, exceptionally valuable, as I hope I have indicated sufficiently (but not by any means exhaustively) in the conference paper printed in this issue. Other chapters deal with 'The Practical Uses of Insult', 'Names as Character Sketches', 'Name Autobiographies', and 'Miscellaneous Naming Practices', and there is an Appendix (regrettably brief but useful) on 'The Nicknaming of Teachers'.

In sum this is an important but uneven book: on the one hand, the findings and arguments of chapters 5 to 9 deserve careful consideration, particularly by those of us who are not specialists in sociology; on the other hand the whole book, and some of the earlier and later chapters in particular, would have benefited from wider reading, longer preparation and research, and some advice on linguistic analysis. In one respect, however, Morgan, O'Neill and Harré have achieved an unqualified success, in that it has already stimulated, and I hope will continue to stimulate, further study in a relatively neglected area of socio-linguistics.

PETER McCLURE

The aim of the author has been to provide etymological and sociological notes on the first names that have been used in Scotland during the last hundred years or so, and though I shall express some reservations, it seems to me to be one of the better dictionaries of Christian names to have been produced for the popular end of the market. It has a brief Introduction, discussing the social aspects of current names and name usage (with some special advice to parents about to choose names for their offspring) and providing a list of sources for the comments that are made on the relative popularity of each name at different periods; an annotated alphabetical list of more than 300 names and their variants; a select bibliography; and an index which serves as a cross-reference to pet-names, etc.

The weakest part of the Dictionary is its treatment of etymologies. These are, perhaps forgivably, only as good as Mr Dunkling's limited range of authorities (most prominently the 3rd and inadequately revised edition of E. G. Withcombe's Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names, 1977), but they have been included with little conviction of their possible interest or value to the reader. What is the intelligent Scottish parent supposed to deduce from the bald assertion that William is 'Old Germanic, 'will, volition' and 'helmet'? It would have been more to the purpose to have stated that the name was brought into England and Scotland by the Normans and to have said something in the Introduction about the onomastic impact of the Norman Conquest and about the possible social meanings implied by Germanic methods of name-coinage. A similar point applies to names whose ultimate source is said to be Gaelic, Old Norse, Hebrew, Greek, and so on.

However, this book is not principally to be judged on its half-hearted handling of the etymological nettle (Dunkling's aversion to which is well evidenced in his other publications), but on its original contribution to a knowledge of modern naming preferences. The entry for Jessie is a representative example of the method and style of glossing:

Jessie (f) Gaelic Seasaidh. In Scotland this is the diminutive of Janet, though elsewhere the name would be associated with Jessica. Compare Scottish Maisie for Margaret. Jessie has been much celebrated in Scottish poetry. Robert Tannahill (1774-1811), the Paisley poet, wrote of Janet Tennant as 'charming young Jessie, the flow' r o' Dunblane,' while Burns wrote of the 'grace, beauty and elegance' which kept Jessie's lover by her side. In the nineteenth century this form of the name was almost as popular in Scotland as Janet itself. Jessie was the 12th most frequently used name in 1858, 14th in 1935. By 1958, however, it had dropped dramatically to 97th place. The use of Jessie to describe an effeminate man presumably contributed to its downfall.

If one compares this with Withcombe's entry in her Oxford Dictionary one finds the same literary material but not the information on changing name fashions. Indeed, when Withcombe does offer comments on name popularity, they sometimes seem to be based on little more than vague impressions, whereas Dunkling's always derive from firm research. On Griselda, Dunkling remarks 'The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names (1977) says that 'it is still quite common in Scotland', but

the various reports of the Scottish Registrar General make it quite clear that the name has hardly been used in Scotland since at least 1858'; on Ninian, "'Ninian is now almost entirely Scottish' says The Oxford Dictionary . . . . Be that as it may, not a single boy born in Scotland in 1958 received the name, nor did it make an appearance in a count of Scottish names made in 1975; and on Wanda, 'In spite of the comment in The Oxford Dictionary . . . that 'Wanda has lately been used a good deal in England' (a statement which name counts in no way confirm), the name has been most used this century in Scotland.' Anyone who requires reliable information on recent Christian name usage in northern Britain, and who turns (for want of anything better) to Withcombe, would do well to make room on the same shelf for Leslie Dunkling's very reasonably-priced dictionary.

PETER McCLURE
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GEOFFREY HANDLEY-TAYLOR, *POGG*, being a fragmentary key to that elusive place together with some brief observations on the gentle art of pogging. Published by the author, BCM Box 8455, London, WC1V 6XX; 1980, 20 pp., 30p.

A lighthearted stocking-filler (cf. Tangerine Loodlam, licensee of *The Toad and Cuckoo*, Faddle Cessberry, p.13), listing imaginary place-names, personal names, and personal descriptions associated with the author’s fictional kingdom of Pogg.
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