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INTRODUCTION

As the title implies, this communication is a statement of work in progress. This is not a modest disclaimer: I offer suggestions not pronouncements. Furthermore, I invite constructive criticism.

The generic -wich represents a palatalized form of the OE noun wic, a loanword from Latin vicus. The c is palatalized in Old English by the preceding front vowel, but in certain plural cases (e.g., dative plural vicum) is velarized by the following back vowel.

I am concerned with the palatalized forms only, although they cannot be studied without some reference to the velarized ones. (By definition, Wic- names are excluded from this present survey.) For dialectal reasons, the study is currently confined to the area south of the Ribble-Humber line.

Wic, in common with many other place-name elements, raises two interrelated questions: one is linguistic, the other is historical. The linguistic one must be considered primary, in that historical inferences are in part dependent on the establishment of place-name forms. Thus, although I am currently working on the historical dimension, this preliminary survey is deliberately confined to linguistic matters.

The pioneer study of these palatalized forms is in Ekwall’s monograph on all forms of wic place-names. It was a magisterial work which still commands respect, but over twenty years later a re-appraisal is clearly due.

As regards sources, I have started with Ekwall’s data. I have checked the relevant available EPNS county volumes, but at this preliminary stage they are only noted if they provide information additional to Ekwall. Other works are duly referenced.

GENDER AND CASE

1. The gender and declension of OE wic are somewhat problematic. Latin vicus is masculine (second declension). Ekwall could identify only one example of masculine wic, and this occurs in a Biblical context, not as an OE toponym. One has to
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remember, however, that it is not always possible to determine gender.

It would appear that OE wic was, at least in origin, a strong neuter noun. Thus palatalization would be retained in all cases of the singular. The nominative and accusative plural would remain palatalized if the form was uninflected, but it would be velarized if the form was the inflected one wiccu. According to Wrander, wic was the norm and wiccu irregular and late.5

There would appear to be a difference of opinion as regards the feminine noun. Ekwall apparently gave it equal weighting, and implied a declension comparable to the neuter in terms of the palatalization of the singular cases and the nominative or accusative plural.6 Wrander asserts that the feminine is a late occurrence and a weak noun, giving rise to the adoption of nominative and accusative plural wican.7

2. The fact that palatalized wic can be either singular or plural clearly raises the problem of grammatical number. In some cases it is possible to determine number, but unfortunately in many others it is not (see section (d), below). In a few cases Latin vicus has been substituted for wic or added as a gloss. It is difficult, however, to decide whether the usage of the Latin singular necessarily indicates an OE singular.

If Wrander is correct about the late adoption of wiccu and wican (though he nowhere defines what he means by late), there could be chronological implications in the usage of the palatalized plural forms. A factor, however, which could obviate such a generalized scheme is regional or dialectal variation.

COMPOSITION OF THE GAZETTEER

1. The accompanying Gazetteer (see below) is a preliminary working list. At some future stage some entries may be deleted and others added. Inevitably, given the deficiency of the data, a question-mark will always hang over some of the putative examples. I have started in the main from what may seen an unscholarly basis, namely modern palatalized pronunciation, and then worked backwards.

Initially I have struck out those which are known or deemed to have a different derivation. Thus those in which the element is OE wice 'meadow' have been excluded. I have also omitted those in which the element is taken to be OE wice 'wich-elm'; although I do wonder whether some of these should be reconsidered as possible dative singular examples of wic. The proposed etymology of Wychough (Cheshire) highlights this question.8

I have jettisoned those modern -wic names which Ekwall included solely on the basis that from the mid- to late thirteenth century the orthography -ch does indicate a genuine palatalized form.9 I am not convinced that this is always so, and in default of corroborative evidence I am inclined to omit them at this stage.

I have accepted that Anglo-Norman, and later, -z (sometimes -s) does represent a palatalized pronunciation of OE final e. Indeed, at present it would appear to be the most important indicator. (The absence of this form in the extant records, however, does not in itself exclude a particular place, given that medieval records are frequently deficient.) Clearly in attested instances one has to be sure that the element is wic. (This orthography also represents OE wics. Furthermore, there is the possible complication of a misreading of (m)ys < Old French mes < Latin manus.)

The orthography of OE written sources is difficult to evaluate. Most of them, even if textually genuine, are copies of a later date, and the form of the name may have been altered inadvertently by Norman-French scribes ignorant of Old English, or may have been deliberately 'updated' by scribes used to writing Middle English. Furthermore, although Anglo-Saxon coins are contemporary, their abbreviated place-name forms could be misleading.

2. Clearly consideration must be given to the problem of lost or altered names. What follows is very much a provisional preview (see below, Gazetteer B).

Ekwall listed examples from Anglo-Saxon charters of lost names which have uninflected wic: six in the singular; one in the plural; and sixteen which may be either singular or plural.10 Their acceptability depends on two assumptions. First, that the orthography is reliable, given that most of the charters are preserved in later copies. Second, that for those which are preceded by an OE preposition the form does represent the usual form of the place-name, and is not merely observing the rules of declension. This applies particularly to those which occur as landmarks in charter bounds. In the one certain plural example, hornic (Hants), there is in the same charter bounds both (on) hornic and (of) hornycan (BCS 1200; Sawyer 754).11 I assume that a 'free-standing' place-name would have a 'fixed' form in the nominative, accusative or dative, and that, if it had been in the dative, this would have been 'fossilized' in the basic name-form irrespective of any syntactical case endings. Thus provisionally I accept these as palatalized wic names. (If the implication of alternating forms is that the form of the actual place-name was
There is an evident number of pairs and, hence, fractions of pairs, in a population. However, the frequencies in a population are not directly related to the frequencies in a population. The frequencies in a population are not directly related to the frequencies in a population. It is possible that, in a possible, no thought continues.

In the theory that is another possible, the rest of the entities, this is well-under.

There is a second possible reason for the existence of the existence of the existence.
or 'people' name. (Droit)wich, (Middle)wich, (Nant)wich, (North)wich and Wic are also in the singular.

(b) Probably Singular
In Aldwich, Bromwich (Hants), Harwich and Ledwyche the elements are respectively 'old', 'river, stream', 'army' and a river name. Fulwich (Cheshire/Flintshire) is assumed to be 'foul, dirty'. The first element of Woolwich is 'wool, woollen goods'. Chadwich (1086 Celsheic) is problematic. It may be an OE pers.n. Cealh/ceald, but I am inclined to think that it is OE ceald 'spring', with subsequent metathesis of l and d, giving the appearance of a personal name with Anglo-Norman -el termination. The first element of Outwich is apparently the Norman pers.n. Ote. Leftwich (1086 Wice) has the OE pers.n. Lēofhtēt. The first element of Ludwyche is uncertain.

(c) Plural
The first element of porneic (Hants) is OE por 'thorn-bush'. That of Powick (Worc.s.) is an OE pers.n. Pohha; this place-name is classed as plural on the evidence of BCS 1282, Sawyer 786, which includes the (late OE dative plural) form into ponecgiscan.

(d) Singular or Plural
The range includes environmental or topographical elements (in which I include Chaddenwick/Charnage and Chadwick — see (b) above, under Chadwich); official names ('king', 'bishop'); personal names; livestock names (? and one concerned with dairy produce — Seswick); one probably associated with trade (Cepmundescwe); and one associated with a clerical community (Prestwick). Only the personal names and livestock names are considered here.

(i) Personal Names. The certain or possible personal names attested pre-1066 all occur as the first element of the names of lost places. The clearest examples are Snodestuc (OE Snodd) and Werburging/Werburge wic (OE Werburg). Willering wic, Cynewunung wic and Udding wic are considered to contain respectively OE Wilhere, Cynewund and Udd. This interpretation is probably correct, but it is based on the assumption that -ing is a connective particle. The first element of Suthingwic is unknown — it could be a personal name. (That of Hræmping wic is deemed to be toponographical.) Turning to the two 1086 examples, there must be a degree of doubt as to whether the first elements are really personal names. Baswic (Berceswic: GDB, fo. 247r; Staffordshire 2/2; 4) may contain the OE pers.n. Beorc, but alternatively it could contain OE beorc 'birch' with intrusive s (the l of the twelfth-century form Berclswic may be the result of the subsequent addition of the Anglo-Norman -el termination.) Bloxwich (Blokheswic: GDB, fo. 246r; Staffordshire 1/6) may be an OE pers.n. Bloca(s), but such a name is not recorded independent of place-names. Of those attested only after 1086, the current position is as follows: Bagwic may contain the OE name Barca; Grimstitch probably contains ON Grímna (though this does not mean that it is a pre-1086 formation); Gutteridge may contain an otherwise unrecorded OE pers.n. Crust; 20 Lottage may contain a personal name Lott(a) for which there is no independent pedigree; Runtime may contain the putative personal name Runo(a). 21 In none of these cases is there any firm evidence that the first element is a personal name.

(ii) Livestock Names. OE cā 'cow' is the first element of Cowage (four instances) and the genitive plural cuina occurs in Conrish. (Calwich may contain OE ceal 'calf', but one cannot rule out the possibility that the element is OE calu 'bald, bare'.) OE feoh 'cattle' is probably the first element of Fuge and Fudige. OE herd 'herd, flock' is the first element of Herdestwic and OE sxs (in the genitive plural oxena) that of Oxena wic and probably of Oxwich.

There is of course the question of interchangeability singular and plural forms. Ekwall cited one example, Warwick, where the majority of pre-1066 forms are plural, but there is one attested singular. 22 He argued, however, that the singular refers specifically to the burh and not to the settlement as a whole. If he is correct, these are not interchangeable forms in the strict sense. In one charter Fordwich is described as (juxta) Fordeutwicium (BCS 36; Sawyer 7), but, in the context, -twicum is presumably Latin accusative singular. In another charter, London is described as in oppido . . . regali Lundonae vicu (BCS 335; Sawyer 168). Clearly the name is latinized, but vicu poses a problem: vicus is Latin second declension, not fourth, and therefore has no form vicu. It may be a mistake for vic; but, if it is an OE plural, it may not be a place-name element in this context. (The possibility that a plural form could be used in a text not as a place-name but as a noun descriptive of the quarters or suburbs of a trading centre, will be considered when I discuss the historical dimension — the data for 'Queenwic' point in this direction.)

2. Having considered these first elements, I would like to make the following suggestions, fully acknowledging that they are based on statistical probability:
(a) Where væc is in the singular, the first element is predominantly topographical, there is no certain personal name, and there are no domesticated livestock names (swans I include with 'wild' animals, along with badgers, etc.) or names indicating agricultural produce. Again, where væc is probably singular the first elements are mainly topographical; in the two examples with personal names, these elements are additions later than 1086, and there are no livestock or agricultural produce names (the 'wool' of Woolwich is exceptional, if not unique, in contrast to the occurrence of sheep names, and as such has an industrial and/or mercantile connotation). Thus I would suggest that the critical divide is between singular and plural forms rather than between palatalized and velarized ones per se. (It is perhaps worth noting in this context that the 'Northumbrian' names which are clearly singular are topographical, directional or group names.)

(b) I have implied that Anglo-Norman and later clerks erroneously perceived some OE elements as personal names, and treated or modified them accordingly. Thus I would argue that personal-name elements are rarer than they might appear at a casual glance.

(c) The livestock names with modern palatalized væc are concentrated in the south-western counties. This suggests a regional idiosyncracy. (It is perhaps worth noting in this context that, although ca- does occur with other second elements in other parts of the area under consideration, there do not appear to be any examples of ca + væc outside the south-west of it, with the exception of (Barton) Cowick (Derbys.). There is of course 'Northumbrian' Cowick.)

DATE

The possible phasing of those names coined before 1086 is left on one side for the present. What is under consideration is the question of the formation of names after 1086.

In the first place, there are the additions to existing simplex. Droitwich, Leftwich, Middlewich, Nantwich and Northwich are clear examples. Outwich may be another.

Secondly, in some areas palatalized væc may have been perceived as indicative of a particular type of settlement, and thus its usage may have been perpetuated. The clearest example of this is Shirleywich (Staffs.), founded in the seventeenth century as the centre of the Shirley family saltworks.

Thirdly, there is the process of transference. Oxwich (Glamorgan) must be a transferred name no earlier than the Anglo-Norman conquest of South Wales. It has been suggested that Greenwich (Derbys.) is a transference from Greenwich (Kent). Landholding or settlement fragmentation may also have led to transference within a locality (both pre- and post-1086); there is a cluster of Bromwich names in the contiguous areas of Staffs., Warks. and Worcs., of which only West Bromwich is attested in 1086, and in the thirteenth century Castle Bromwich was given the affix Magna and Little Bromwich that of Parsa.
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GAZETTEER

Note that the counties given below are those of 10-1074 date: the component te's of Droitwich and Fulwich have been excluded; and that the number in brackets is the Ek.W page number.

Key to symbols:
- = singular; ▲ = probably singular; ▼ = -e (-s) orthography;
● = OE preposition; italic = recorded in pre-1066 source or GDB.

A. CURRENT NAMES

| Aldridge ▼ | Staffs. (52) |
| Aldwich ▲ | Middx. (28) |
| Bagwich ● | Isle of Wight (48) |
| Bwjitch ▼ | Staffs. (52) |
| Blywhich ▲ | Staffs. (52) |
| Bromwich ▲ | Hants (18) |
| Bromwich, West | Staffs. (52) |
| Bromwich, Castle | Warks. (51) |
| Bromwich, Little ▼ | Warks. (51) |
| Bromwich, Wood | Worcs. (51) |
| Broomage | Staffs. (52) |
| Calwich | Devon (50) |
| Chaddewich/Charnage ▼ | Wilts. (49) |
| Chadwich ▲ ▼ | Worcs. (51) |
| Chadwich ▼ | Warks. (51) |
| Cholwich | Devon (50) |
| Colwich ▼ | Staffs. (52) |
| Comwich ▼ | Som. (49) |
| Conrith Farm ▼ | Wilts. (50) |
| Cowage | Wilts.; Foxley (49) |
| Cowage | Wilts.; Hilmarton (49) |
| Cowage Copse | Hants (49) |
Cowage Farm  Wilts.; Calne (49)
\(\text{Droitwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Worcs. (33)
\(\text{Dorwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Suffolk (19)
\(\text{Dordwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Kent (16)
Fuge  Devon (50)
Fuidege  Devon (50)
Fulwich  Cheshire/Flintshire (26)
Fulwich Lane  Kent (46)
Goddewick  Sussex (33)
Gr 의원  Staffs. (32)
Greenwich  Dock (13)
Greenwich  Kent (17)
Grimsditch Wood  Wilts. (49)
Gutteridge Hall  Essex (48)
Hammerwich  Staffs. (52)
'Hammow'  Hants; Southampton (17–18)
Harwich  Essex (19)
Harwich Street  Kent (17)
Hazelwick  Sussex (33)
Ipswich  Suffolk (19)
\(\text{Leedswich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Salop (27)
\(\text{Leftwich} \uparrow\)  Cheshire (26)
Lottage  Wilts. (49)
'Lundene'  Middx. (16)
Lutheche Hall  Salop (27)
Lydiche  Sussex (33)
Markwich  Surrey (47)
\(\text{Middlewich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Cheshire (25)
\(\text{Nimmich} \uparrow\)  Staffs. (52)
\(\text{Ninnaich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Cheshire (25)
\(\text{Northwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Cheshire (25)
Norwich  Norfolk (19–20)
Oxwich  Middx. (29)
Parwich  Glamorgan (53)
\(\text{Patwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Derbys. (N. Brooks et al., loc. cit. note 18)
Poteick  Worcs. (36)
Prestwich  Lancs. (53)
Runnage  Devon (50)
\(\text{Sandwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Kent (16)
\(\text{Sextich} \uparrow\)  Flints. (M. Richards, loc. cit. note 14)
\(\text{Sheildwich} \uparrow\)  Kent (46)
\(\text{Stradwick Wood} \uparrow\)  Sussex (33)
\(\text{Steelewich} \uparrow\)  Dorset (18–19)
\(\text{Wraywich} \uparrow\)  Warks. (37)
\(\text{Winch} \uparrow\)  Norfolk (53)
\(\text{Woolwich} \uparrow \downarrow\)  Kent (17)

\(\text{B. LOST NAMES}\)

ÆScincwic  Sussex (32)
\(\text{Bisop chinese} \downarrow\)  Kent (32)
\(\text{Botric} \downarrow\)  Herts. (32)
\(\text{Cepmundewic} \uparrow\)  Cheshire (J. McN. Dodson, loc. cit. note 12)
\(\text{Cynged wic} \downarrow\)  Berks (33)
\(\text{Cynges wic} \downarrow\)  Sussex (32)
\(\text{Ealden wic} \downarrow\)  Bucks. (33)
\(\text{Hrneving wic} \downarrow\)  Hants (33)
\(\text{Hrteving wic} \downarrow\)  Kent (32)
\(\text{Oxenwic} \downarrow\)  Bucks. (33)
\(\text{Ruganic} \downarrow\)  Oxon. (32)
\(\text{Scaclatic} \downarrow\)  Sussex (33)
\(\text{Schewewys} \downarrow\)  Cheshire (J. McN. Dodson, loc. cit. note 13)
\(\text{Sihterwic} \downarrow\)  Sussex (32)
\(\text{Snedewic} \downarrow\)  Derbys. (33)
\(\text{Sabbingwic} \downarrow\)  Worcs. (33)
\(\text{Pormic} \downarrow\)  Hants; Havant (33)
\(\text{Pormic} \downarrow\)  Hants; Meon (35)
\(\text{Ulding wic} \downarrow\)  Bucks. (33)
\(\text{Werbearig/Werburge wic} \downarrow\)  Kent (32)
\(\text{Wic} \downarrow\)  Bucks. (33)
\(\text{Willingere wic} \downarrow\)  Probably Sussex (33)
\(\text{Widig wic} \downarrow\)  Kent (32)

\(\text{NOTES}\)

Additional abbreviations
GDB  Great Domeday Book, quoted by folio and by chapter and entry number of the following volumes of the Phillimore (Chichester) edition: XXIV J. Morris, ed., Staffordshire (1976); XXVI P. Morgan, ed., Cheshire (1978).

1. I am grateful to Dr. Margaret Gelling for making encouraging noises when I discussed my preliminary observations with her; but she is in no way responsible for the contents of the present draft.
2. Ek.W.
3. Ibid.
English Place-Names
and Welsh Stress-Patterns

Hywel Wyn Owen

This article examines English place-names in Clwyd which were subject to stress-patterns of Welsh speakers. This phenomenon in the relationship between Welsh and English has already been observed in loan-words, but this is the first serious attempt at applying prosodic analysis to hitherto perplexing place-names in North-East Wales.

Discussion of English place-names in Wales has to date concentrated almost exclusively on phonology. In B. G. Charles’s pioneering Non-Celtic Place-Names in Wales, five lines of the section ‘Welsh Influence on the Development of English Place-Names’ merely list seven place-names subject to ‘the system of Welsh accentuation’, five lines within his discussion of Prestatyn declare the ‘name to be taken over by the Welsh and the accent shifted to the penultimate in accordance with the normal Welsh system of accentuation’.2 Professor Melville Richards’s later discussion of a dozen place-names incorporating forms not available to B. G. Charles adds to the documentary evidence and to the phonological data, but draws no attention to stress-patterns (with the exception of simply citing Prestatyn as ‘the outstanding example’ of Welsh influence).3

Illustrating well-established phonological features seems less pressing than examining certain prosodic features which could prove valuable in detecting similar phenomena elsewhere in Wales (and England). This article concentrates on the area selected by Melville Richards, and, in the light of stress-patterns, reinterprets some of his evidence, that of B. G. Charles, and some of my own pronouncements. Significantly these stress-patterns now make certain phonological developments less problematic. There seems to be a wider context which transcends morphological considerations. That over-riding principle is the beat, the rhythm of the word.

NATURALIZED PLACE-_NAMES

My material has been drawn from that area of Clwyd in North-East Wales where distinctive place-names still mark the Mercian advance. This took place (in the seventh and eighth centuries), westwards along the coastal strip of the the Dee from...