Introduction
It has long been recognised that the inversion compounds in the historical counties of Cumberland and Westmorland are something of a linguistic anomaly. In 1918, Ekwall suggested that these names were coined by Scandinavians who had adopted Celtic word-order. The English Place-Name Survey for Cumberland concluded that the names were coined ‘after the Irish fashion’ by Norwegians who were ‘much modified in speech by their stay in a Gaelic-speaking area’. Similarly, the Westmorland survey suggested that the Old Norse place-names were ‘influenced by the language of the Irish amongst whom these Norwegians had lived’.

The purpose of this essay is firstly to re-examine the issues of the geographic origins of the people who coined the inversion compounds in the light of more recent work on the topic, and secondly to re-address the issue of the Scandinavian adoption of Celtic word-order in the light of recent models of linguistic contact.

The nationality of the settlers: historical evidence
There are a number of reasons why the editors of the English Place-Name Survey volumes postulated that the English inversion compounds were coined by Scandinavian speakers who had come from Ireland. Firstly, the only piece of documentary evidence concerning the Scandinavian

1 This is a revised version of the essay awarded the 2001 Essay Prize by the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland.
immigration into north-west England is the story of Ingimund’s invasion, which relates that a group of Vikings were granted land near Cheshire after the expulsion from Dublin in 902. Whilst the historical reliability of this account is somewhat questionable, it has been demonstrated that the cluster of Scandinavian place-names in the Wirral peninsula would support the idea of a small-scale settlement which corresponds to the description of Ingimund’s invasion. However, this is hardly a basis for assuming that all of the Scandinavian settlement in the north-west had its origin in the expulsion from Dublin. As Smyth has pointed out, ‘the number of warriors and traders who were hemmed in behind the stockades of Dublin could scarcely have been large enough to account for the colonization which took place to the west of the Pennines in the early tenth century, and, in any case, many of these Dublin refugees ‘must have returned to Dublin by 917 under the formidable leadership of Sigtryggr II’. Therefore, although Ingimund’s invasion might account for the purely Scandinavian place-names in the Wirral, there is no real evidence to link Ingimund and his followers with the Goidelic-influenced inversion compounds, which occur further to the north, chiefly in Cumberland and Westmorland, with a handful of rather dubious instances in Lancashire.

The other evidence that the inversion compounds may have been coined by Scandinavians from Ireland is also historical in nature. It is centred on the attempts in the tenth century to unite Dublin and York into a single Scandinavian kingdom. This may, to an extent, account for the


7 A. P. Smyth, Scandinavian York and Dublin. The History and Archaeology of Two Related Viking Kingdoms, 2 vols (Dublin, 1975 and 1979), I, 79.

8 During the period 918–54, the Scandinavian rulers of Dublin made a sustained attempt to gain control over York, and create a unified kingdom which linked Dublin and York. However, York came under permanent English control in 954. See Smyth, Scandinavian York and Dublin, II, 78, and R. N. Bailey, Viking Age Sculpture in Northern England (London, 1980), p. 32.
immigration of Scandinavian speakers into the region that lies between Dublin and York (i.e. Cheshire and southern Lancashire), and it is plausible that these settlers could be responsible for the purely Scandinavian place-names in this region. Archaeological evidence such as the discovery of the Cuerdale Hoard in Lancashire would appear to support this notion. This hoard of Viking hoard was found near the river Ribble, and contains both Scandinavian arm-rings manufactured in Ireland and coins minted in York, suggesting contact and co-operation between these two Scandinavian settlements. However, there are no inversion compounds in this region, apart from one or two instances on the Lancashire coast, which Fellows-Jensen attributes to immigrants from the Isle of Man. Thus there is no clear connection between incomers from Dublin and the coining of the inversion compounds.

More recently, scholars have pointed to the Hebrides and the Isle of Man as alternative candidates for the origin of the settlers who coined the inversion compounds. Smyth notes that by the early tenth century, `the western seaboard of Scotland had become a veritable clearing-house for Scandinavian settlers streaming south from Norway in search of land in the British Isles'.

There are a number of reasons for suggesting that the inversion compounds were coined by these immigrants from the Scottish Isles rather than from Ireland. Firstly, there is evidence of a much greater degree of contact between Scandinavian speakers and Goidelic speakers in Scotland than there was in Ireland. It has been argued that in Scotland, `as Gaels and Scandinavians shared the occupations of farming and fishing, the fusion between the two peoples must have begun much earlier than in Ireland and
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13 Smyth, Scandinavian York and Dublin, I, 82.
been more complete in the end’. In contrast, the Scandinavians who settled in Ireland were largely merchants and sailors, who founded their own townships, so that ‘In spite of mixed marriages and other forms of social ties, the townspeople in Ireland remained an ethnic group apart’. It has been suggested that the Scandinavians in the Irish coastal towns must have been reliant to an extent on the countryside for provisions and building materials, which would imply a degree of interaction with the native farmers. However, it has since been demonstrated that the Scandinavians set up their own small-scale farming communities around the coastal towns (such as the Dyflinnarskiri beside Dublin) in order to provision the towns. Trading with the Irish farming community would not therefore have been necessary.

**The nationality of the settlers: linguistic evidence**
The disparity in the level of contact between Scandinavians and Goidelic speakers in Ireland, and those in western Scotland, is reflected in the relative lack of Scandinavian place-names and place-name elements in Ireland compared with western Scotland. In particular, there are the *kirk*- inversion compounds in Dumfries and Galloway, but no evidence of similar formations in Ireland. Oftedal demonstrates that names such as Ballygunner ‘*baile + Gunnar*’ and Ballytruckle ‘*baile + Þorkell*’ are essentially Gaelic constructions, ‘and must have arisen among speakers of Irish who had previously borrowed the Norse personal names in question’. There is little likelihood of Scandinavian speakers having borrowed *baile* as a loanword and used it to form inversion compounds, since it has been argued that the
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earliest *baile* names in Ireland are late formations, which did not exist before around 1150. In this case, the Scandinavians could hardly have coined the *baile* compounds as a stepping-stone towards the formation of the inversion compounds in England in the early tenth century.\textsuperscript{21}

There are other reasons for supposing that the Scandinavian-coined inversion compounds in England might be more closely linked with Scottish rather than Irish influence. Aside from the fact that identical *kirk* compounds are found in Galloway and Cumberland (such as Kirkandrews and Kirkbride), there is the matter of the Scandinavian borrowing of the Goidelic element *airge* which occurs in Scottish, but not in Irish, place-names.\textsuperscript{22} Additionally, there is substantial archaeological evidence which links tenth-century Scandinavian sculpture in Cumbria with that found in south-west Scotland in the same period.\textsuperscript{23} Interestingly, Bailey notes that ‘One area alone bordering the Irish Sea fails to show any contact with the sculpture of Cumbria, either as donor or recipient. This is Ireland’.\textsuperscript{24} Bailey suggests that this lack of Irish influence does not necessarily preclude immigration from Ireland in this period, but rather may be due to a lack of contact on the Irish mainland between Scandinavian incomers and the monastic communities who produced the sculpture. Therefore, if the English inversion compounds were coined by Scandinavians influenced by Irish place-nomenclature, they were not similarly influenced by Irish sculptural style. This seems to add weight to the idea that the Irish and Scandinavians in Ireland lived as separate cultural groups.

Additionally, examination of the inversion compounds themselves shows that there is no evidence of any specifically Irish influence, and quite

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21} G. Fellows-Jensen has recently suggested that the *baile* names could have been coined somewhat earlier than Oftedal postulated, but does not dispute that they would have been coined by Gaelic speakers: ‘Nordic names and loanwords in Ireland’, in *The Vikings in Ireland*, edited by A. Larsen (Roskilde, 2001), pp. 107–13 (p. 110).


\textsuperscript{23} Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture in Northern England*, p. 227.

often the evidence points instead towards Scottish influence. It is true that the English Place-Name Surveys for Cumberland and Westmorland often identify the Goidelic elements of the inversion compounds as being Old Irish.\textsuperscript{25} However, ‘Old Irish’ is an umbrella-term, referring to the forms of Goidelic spoken in Scotland and Man as well as in Ireland.\textsuperscript{26} These surveys are both quite old, and the Cumberland survey, at any rate, was published before Jackson’s work on the development of the Goidelic languages became widely known.\textsuperscript{27} He demonstrates that the oldest traceable divergence between Irish Gaelic and Scottish Gaelic did not occur until the tenth century, and notes that ‘we cannot really speak of a separation until about the thirteenth century’.\textsuperscript{28} Therefore, Irish Gaelic and Scottish Gaelic would have been essentially identical in the early tenth century. The Westmorland Survey states that the element \textit{poll} ‘pool, pond’ could be either Scottish or Irish Gaelic in origin.\textsuperscript{29} It is thus notable that the other vocabulary elements in the inversion compounds that are identified as possibly being ‘Irish’ or ‘Old Irish’ are all also found in modern Scottish Gaelic. The elements are \textit{carr} ‘rocky ledge’, \textit{corr} ‘point, peak’, \textit{cnocc} ‘hillock’, \textit{crag} ‘crag’, \textit{crois} ‘cross’, \textit{glenn} ‘glen’ and \textit{manach} ‘monk’, all of which appear in MacLennan’s \textit{Dictionary of the Gaelic Language}, and thus could equally indicate Scottish or Irish influence.\textsuperscript{30} There is only one element which is identified as possibly being a Middle Irish, rather than Old Irish, formation. This is \textit{tresc} ‘refuse’, which has been tenuously identified as the second element in a lost Westmorland field-name \textit{Glentreske}.\textsuperscript{31} However, the only recorded form of this name is dated \textit{a.} 1198, which is still prior to the first real divergence of the Irish and Scottish languages. In any case, the fact that this word had a Scottish Gaelic cognate form is attested by the existence of the modern Scottish Gaelic form
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‘refuse of brewed malt’, and there is no real reason to suppose that the name necessarily contains a specifically Irish element. Additionally, since both the generic and specific of this name appear to be Celtic, it is possible that it constitutes a straightforward Celtic compound-name, rather than a genuine inversion compound. In this case, it may not necessarily be connected to the Scandinavian settlement at all, and thus cannot be considered as evidence of the linguistic background of the settlers.

The other Goidelic elements in the inversion compounds are all personal names. Whilst these are also labelled ‘Old Irish’ in the English Place-Name Surveys, most of them could equally have originated in Scotland or Man. Names which can possibly be linked with Scotland rather than Ireland include Setmurthy in Cumberland (Cu), Aspatria (Cu) and Rigrimmelsuthan in Westmorland (We), which contain the Gaelic personal names Murdoch, Patrick and Maelsuthan. Smyth notes that Murdoch is a distinctively Scottish name, and Patrick is a name which was rarely used in Ireland during the Early and Middle Ages, but which is found in Icelandic records ‘in connection with viking emigrants who came out to Iceland from the Hebrides’. Similarly, Maelsuthan is a name which did not achieve popularity in Ireland. There are also two names which appear to have parallel formations in Scotland. Hobcarton (Cu) is a doublet of Hopecarton in Peebleshire, as they both contain Old English (OE) *hobb or hop and the Gaelic personal name Cartán. Kirkebibeccoch (Cu) has a parallel of sorts in another Peebleshire name, Kilbucho, as they both contain a generic designating a church or a town with a church, Old Norse (ON) kirkjuby and Gael cill, together with the diminutive form of the name of Saint Bega, which is Beghoc.

It is also notable that some of the Gaelic personal names which occur in other place-names in Cumberland and Westmorland appear to have been of
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33 Westmorland names such as Glencoyne and Glenridding may also be Celtic, but Brythonic rather than Goidelic. It is possible that Brythonic influence may have reinforced the generic + specific name-type in the north west of England.
Scottish origin. Smyth notes that Gillemichael, which is found in Gillemihelecroft (Cu), Gillenukelstagge (Cu), Gylle Michael lande (We), and Gill Michael dale (We), is a characteristically Scottish name, and as noted previously, Murdoch, which is found in Karmurdath (Cu), is distinctively Scottish. Additionally, the name Glassan, found in Glassonby (Cu), is also found in the Galloway name Airieglassan.

As Smyth points out, the personal names found in the historical documentation for the north west of England also contain a strong Scottish element. He notes that of the names which Wainwright takes to be evidence of an Irish presence in Cheshire, i.e. Gillicrist, Macsuthan, Maeldomen and Maelsuthan, none achieved popularity in Ireland, and Gillicrist is distinctly Scottish. Additionally, Smyth notes that many of the names which Ekwall lists amongst the Goidelic personal names found in north-western records are either Scottish, such as Gilandreas, Gilmichael, and Gilmor, or can be found amongst the Icelandic records of immigrants from the Hebrides, such as Bekan, Belan, Cormac, Duncan, Gilli, Kenneth, Kilan, Nel, and Patrick.

It is clear, therefore, that these names point to a considerable Scottish influence in the north-west of England. The presence of a Scottish Gaelic element in the place-names of Cumberland was in fact recognised by the English Place-Name Survey for this county, but this element was ascribed to Gaelic speakers from the lowlands of Scotland who had migrated south. It is indeed possible that the essentially Gaelic constructions in this part of England (such as Cnodentwald and Pool Darkin) were coined by Gaelic speakers from the north, together with names which contain Gaelic elements but display no signs of Scandinavian influence (such as Knockupworth, *cnocc* + *Hubert*).

However, it does not necessarily follow that the more southerly place-names containing Gaelic elements must instead be the result of an influence from Ireland. The Cumberland Survey arbitrarily assigns names such as Corby and Karmurdath (containing Gaelic names *Corc* and *Murdoch*) to be the result of an influx from Scotland, based on their

40 Ibid., I, 81.
43 Armstrong *et al, The Place-Names of Cumberland*, III, xxiv–xxv.
proximity to the border; whereas names such as Korkgill and Setmurthy (containing identical personal names) are instead considered to be the result of an influx of Scandinavians from Ireland, since they are much further away from the Scottish border, and closer to the coast of the Irish Sea.\(^{44}\) However, this geographical method of attributing linguistic origin does not take into account the possibility of a sea-borne immigration of Scandinavian speakers from the Hebrides, Galloway or Man. Given that the bulk of these names are found either in coastal areas or along the routes of major rivers, it is likely that the inversion compounds were coined by settlers who arrived by sea. Yet the evidence of the lack of linguistic and cultural contact between Scandinavians and Gaelic speakers in Ireland, coupled with the strong Scottish element in the Gaelic personal names in the north west of England, point to the Scottish Isles as the more likely candidate for the place of origin of the Scandinavian speakers responsible for coining the inversion compounds. Fellows-Jensen has argued that by the end of the ninth century the Scottish Isles had become overpopulated and that Scandinavians were moving south to England (as well as Iceland and the Faroes) in search of land to settle.\(^{45}\) This does not preclude the possibility that there was also a degree of Scandinavian settlement from Ireland into the north-west of England, but it does suggest that any such settlers are unlikely to have coined inversion compound place-names.

Examination of the inversion compounds themselves reveals that they are not a homogenous group. The predominant pattern is the generic plus personal name formation, but there are a number of compounds which do not contain a personal name. Of these, the largest group are those that refer to hydronyms. *Bechwythop* in Cumberland (now Wythop Beck) contains as its specific Wythop ‘OE wiðig + OE hop’,\(^ {46} \) which is a nearby place-name in its own right. Here, the element *bekkr* appears to have been affixed to the existing place-name to form a stream-name. This also appears to be the case with the names Beckfarlam and *Bocblencarn* in Cumberland, which contain Old English and British place-names respectively. Names such as
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Becksneuell, Beckfellican and Becksonen (all in Cumberland), may also belong in this category, but the specifics in each case are obscure, so it is impossible to be certain.\(^{47}\) None of the bekkr- names listed as inversion compounds in the Cumberland Survey is recorded prior to the twelfth century aside from Wiza Beck which is recorded as bek Troyte in Gospatric’s Writ, dated to the eleventh century. This raises the possibility that the rest of the names were coined in the post-Conquest era using the already-established inversion compound name-pattern, once ON bekkr- had passed into Middle English.

Another group of inversion compounds which are likely to post-date the period of Scandinavian settlement in the north-west are those which contain Middle English elements, Continental personal names, and surnames. These include Crag Mollet, Howe Renwick, Scam Matthew, Seatallan, Snabmurris and the field-names Croft Aikin and How Gowen, none of which is recorded prior to the sixteenth century. These, like the hydronyms, are likely to have been coined in the pattern of existing names, and in the post-Conquest era it is possible that Norman French may have reinforced this name-type.

There are also a few instances of purely topographical inversion compounds, and a few names with Old English elements. This leaves a core group of names which generally contain a Scandinavian generic, and a personal name as specific. Approximately thirty-five of these contain personal names of Scandinavian origin, including Cross Dormant, Raiseherling, Scarthulf, Aynthorfin and Briggethorfin, and approximately thirty contain personal names of Gaelic origin, including Gilgarran, Fitbrandan, Setmabanning, Watchcomon and Wath Sutton.

Theories of language contact

It is generally accepted that these inversion compounds are the result ‘of linguistic contact between Scandinavian- and Gaelic-speaking people’.\(^{48}\) However, the exact nature and extent of this contact remains unclear. Ekwall’s suggestion that the names were coined by Scandinavian speakers who had adopted Celtic word-order is problematic when viewed in the

\(^{47}\) The Cumberland Survey offers no explanations for these names.

context of language contact theory. Early scholars of contact-induced language change included Weinreich, who stressed the importance of social factors involved in what he termed language ‘interference’.\(^{49}\) Weinreich proposed a scale of the morphemic classes of linguistic borrowing, in which he determined that ‘independent adverbs and completely unintegrated interjections’ are the most likely to be transferred from one language to another.\(^{50}\) These are followed by ‘nouns, verbs and adjectives’, then ‘such “grammatical words” as prepositions, articles, or auxiliary verbs’ with ‘the most structurally and syntagmatically integrated inflectional ending’ being deemed least likely to be transferred.\(^{51}\)

Much of Weinreich’s theory forms the core of subsequent models of language contact. Vildomec echoes Weinreich in stating that ‘vocabulary loans are easiest because of the unsystematic nature of vocabulary’.\(^{52}\) However, Vildomec identifies two distinct types of borrowing which occur between bilingual groups: lexical borrowing and substratum influence. He argues that in the case of substratum influence, phonetics and syntax are more likely to be transferred than vocabulary items.\(^{53}\)

Samuels reiterates Weinreich’s theory that different types of social contact will produce different types of linguistic change. He proposes two main types of language contact, ‘the stable and continuous contact between neighbouring systems’ and ‘sudden contact, resulting from invasion, migration or other population shift, of systems not normally in contact hitherto’.\(^{54}\) Samuels also builds on Weinreich’s concept of the importance of bilingualism in language change, arguing that strong bilingualism can lead to ‘interference’ in one language from another, whereas weak bilingualism will lead instead to the development of pidgins, and in some cases, Creoles.\(^{55}\)

Winter also subscribes to a scale of language borrowing in which ‘the paradigmatic part of morphology’ is the least likely to be transferred from

\(^{50}\) *Ibid.*, p. 35.
\(^{51}\) *Ibid*.
one language to another, whilst ‘lexical transfer is by far the most common type of linguistic transfer’.\textsuperscript{56} Like Vildomec, however, he distinguishes between the borrowing of loan words and influence from substratum transfer, and notes that these differing types of transfer will give rise to differing results.\textsuperscript{57} Winter also emphasizes the importance of social factors in linguistic borrowing, arguing that ‘the adopter must be in a position to derive some gain from the transfer’.\textsuperscript{58} Additionally, like Samuels, he focuses on prestige as an important factor in borrowing.

These models of language contact form the basis of more recent studies of linguistic borrowing, such as Thomason and Kaufman\textsuperscript{59} and Odlin.\textsuperscript{60} Thomason and Kaufman give particular emphasis to the distinction between the influence a second language may have on a native language (i.e. lexical borrowing) and the influence that a native language may have on an acquired second language (i.e. substratum transfer).\textsuperscript{61} Their model of linguistic borrowing has its origins in that of Weinreich, as they argue that ‘the first foreign elements to enter the borrowing language are words’ and ‘[i]f there is strong long-term cultural pressure from source-language speakers on the borrowing-language speaker group, then structural features may be borrowed as well—phonological, phonetic, and syntactic elements’.\textsuperscript{62} However, in concurrence with Vildomec and Winter, they advocate that this model is only applicable in cases of \textit{lexical} transfer, whereas in substratum transfer, interference:

does not begin with vocabulary; it begins instead with sounds and syntax, and sometimes includes morphology as well before words from the shifting
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\textsuperscript{60} T. Odlin, \textit{Language Transfer. Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning} (Cambridge, 1989).
\textsuperscript{61} Thomason and Kaufman, \textit{Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics}, pp. 37–44.
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 37.
group’s original language appear in the Target Language.\textsuperscript{63}

This distinction between lexical transfer and substratum transfer is mirrored in Odlin.\textsuperscript{64} Odlin also emphasizes the importance of extra-linguistic influence in the causation of linguistic borrowing, noting that the ‘group exerting the influence is often, though not always, a speech community with larger numbers, greater prestige, and more political power’.\textsuperscript{65} Both Odlin and Thomason and Kaufman agree that the ‘social prestige’ factor applies only to lexical transfer, since in cases of substratum transfer ‘the interference features are sure to be nonprestigious, if not definitely stigmatised’.\textsuperscript{66}

Another factor emphasized by Thomason and Kaufman is the significance of the intensity of contact in determining the outcome of linguistic contact. Like Weinreich and Samuels, they highlight the importance of the degree of bilingualism in situations of language transfer. In their model for contact-induced language change, they stress that a low degree of bilingualism will lead only to limited vocabulary transfer in the case of lexical borrowing, and an imperfect grasp of the language (and thus the increased likelihood of substratum influence) in the case of language shift.\textsuperscript{67} Additionally, limited bilingualism may lead to pidginization, since a pidgin language usually develops due to a lack of mutual understanding.\textsuperscript{68} Where there is a high degree of bilingualism, however, there is both vocabulary and structural transfer in the case of lexical borrowing,\textsuperscript{69} and in language shift situations the substratum influence will be less marked, and less likely to spread from those learning a target language to its existing speakers.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{Language contact between Old Norse and Gaelic speakers}

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{66} Thomason and Kaufman, \textit{Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics}, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 47.
The various versions of the scale of lexical borrowing set out by Weinreich, Thomason and Kaufman, and Odlin, amongst others, all agree that structural borrowing is normally preceded by an extensive period of vocabulary borrowing. Given that Gaelic loan words into Scandinavian are not particularly numerous, especially in comparison with Scandinavian loans into Gaelic, it seems unlikely that the Gaelic speakers could have exerted sufficient linguistic pressure on the Scandinavian language to bring about structural changes such as the alteration of word-order. It is pertinent that place-name structure may not be indicative of language-structure as a whole. The possibility exists that Scandinavian speakers adopted Gaelic word-order for onomastic purposes, whilst retaining Germanic word-order in lexical matters. Yet even this would seem incongruous from a language contact perspective. It is unlikely that a dominant Scandinavian group would choose to utilize the naming-pattern of what appears to have been a minority, low-status group, when they saw fit to borrow so little lexical material.

Therefore it is necessary to look for alternative ways in which language contact between Scandinavian speakers and Gaelic speakers could have given rise to the inversion compounds. One solution may be that some sort of language mixing occurred. Sommerfelt suggested that during the initial period of contact ‘there must have existed a certain kind of pidgin in use between Norsemen and Celts’. From this, it is theoretically possible that this pidgin language could then have developed into a Creole, which included a largely Scandinavian lexis but some features of Celtic syntax. However, if a Gaelic-Scandinavian Creole is the cause of the inversion compounds, it might be expected that some evidence of this Creole would survive in other place-names, both in the western seaboard of Scotland and the settlements in the north-west of England. Yet, aside from the inversion compounds, the Scandinavian names in England appear uncorrupted by any...
Goidelic features, aside from attested loanwords such as ærgi and kross. Additionally, the inversion compounds themselves are vastly outnumbered by ordinary Scandinavian compounds with the expected Germanic word-order. Thus, if a Creole language of this type did exist, even temporarily, it could only have been utilised in England by a relatively small group of people, who would have been greatly outnumbered by speakers of Old Norse.

Similarly, both the volume of purely Scandinavian place-names found in the western seaboard of Scotland, and the emergence of a relatively uncorrupted Gaelic language after the collapse of Scandinavian power, suggest that these languages remained linguistically distinct, rather than being merged into a widely-used Creole language. As in England, any Creole that did develop, even temporarily, would therefore have remained a minority language alongside both Scandinavian and Gaelic, which would apparently defeat the purpose of its development.

I would like to suggest an alternative explanation for the causation of the inversion compounds. Given that they appear to display syntactic interference despite the lack of lexical interference, it is possible that they are the result of substratum transfer. In this case, the inversion compounds may have been coined by Gaelic speakers who had learned Old Norse and were using it deliberately to coin place-names. It remains to ask why Gaelic speakers might choose to coin place-names in Scandinavian rather than in their own native tongue. A partial answer is suggested by Cox, who points out that the Norse communities would have ‘held greater political status’ than that of the Gaelic speakers. Given this situation, he argues for ‘a tendency to speak the language of the dominant group in order to communicate with it, and this implies a certain amount of bilingualism’. The notion that any period of pidginization was superseded by bilingualism rather than creolization was suggested by Sommerfelt, who advocated a period of language contact whereby ‘people…must have spoken the two languages fluently though they must have carried idioms and constructions over from the one to the other as bilingual people do’. Under these circumstances, it seems likely that native Gaelic speakers would have

73 Cox, ‘Norse-Gaelic contact in the west of Lewis: the place-name evidence’, p. 486.
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become bilingual in order to communicate with the Scandinavian speakers. They may then have used the more dominant and prestigious Scandinavian language in situations which involved the community rather than just the family unit such as in the designation of place-names. Yet this form of Scandinavian may well have contained a Gaelic substrate element, effecting aspects such as word-order.

A parallel instance of contact between a Germanic language and a Celtic language is found in Hiberno-English. Recent research has shown that native Irish speakers who have become bilingual often retain Gaelic syntax when speaking English.\textsuperscript{76} This includes the use of the noun before a modifier, such as ‘roof galvanised’\textsuperscript{77} instead of the modifier-and-noun pattern normally found in Germanic languages (i.e. galvanised roof). Similarly, it has been suggested that a small number of English dialectal features could be the result of a Brythonic substratum.\textsuperscript{78} It is thus possible to suggest that the inversion compounds in the north-west of England were coined by a minority group of Gaelic-speaking bilinguals who travelled with the Scandinavian-speaking emigrants from the western seaboard of Scotland. It seems likely that they would have continued to speak Scandinavian, which would have been the primary language in the area, given the predominance of Norwegian and Danish settlers. Yet this form of Scandinavian would essentially have constituted a non-standard dialect, which retained some features of the Gaelic language. Also, it would have been in much more limited use than a Creole, and may well have been non-prestigious.

It is less clear what, if any, connection there is between the formation of these English inversion compounds and the kirk-compounds in southern Scotland. There is no real evidence to support the notion of a Scandinavian population with a Gaelic substrate in Dumfries and Galloway, and the


\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.

names appear to be restricted to essentially religious sites.\textsuperscript{79} In England, however, there are one or two possible correlations. For example, it is interesting that almost half of the core group of English inversion compounds contain Gaelic personal names. This is a high proportion, and it may be significant that many of the names of Gaelic origin include Gaelic diminutive forms, such as \textit{Corcan, Camban, *Dercan, Beghoc, Macog, *Lennoc} found in the names Mockerin, Gillcambon, Pool Darkin, \textit{Kirkebibecoch, Skalmallok} and \textit{Staynlenoc} respectively. This would apparently suggest that the diminutives were added by Gaelic speakers. Another construction which might indicate the influence of Gaelic speakers is the name Setmabanning in Cumberland, which appears to contain the Gaelic endearing prefix \textit{Ma, Mo-} (my).\textsuperscript{80} In the case of the diminutive formations, it is of course possible that Scandinavian speakers could have borrowed the names from Gaelic speakers with the diminutive suffixes in place, and continued to use them in this form. Yet if the Scandinavians were the dominant people, it seems rather incongruous that they would choose to adopt such a large number of personal names from a minority group. In post-Conquest England, where French was the prestige language, Cecily Clark notes that ‘almost all the distinctly insular names became rapidly discarded, by peasants almost as fast as by burgesses, in favour of those current among the Norman settlers’.\textsuperscript{81}

It is perhaps more likely that the mixture of Scandinavian and Gaelic personal names found in the inversion compounds represent the coinages of Gaelic bilinguals in a period of transition, in which some ‘prestigious’ Scandinavian names had been adopted, but in which a degree of the ‘native culture and personal names’\textsuperscript{82} still survived.

\textbf{Conclusion}

It has previously been considered unlikely that Gaelic speakers were

\textsuperscript{79} These Scottish \textit{kirk} names present their own difficulties, and it is by no means universally accepted that they represent genuine inversion compounds.

\textsuperscript{80} Armstrong \textit{et al, The Place-Names of Cumberland}, II, 313–14.


involved in the coining of the inversion compounds. This was due to the lack of Gaelic generics and the occurrence of around forty different Scandinavian generics, which seemed rather many to be loanwords. However, a minority group of Gaelic speakers who used Old Norse tinged with Gaelic word-order, personal names and diminutive name-suffixes to coin place-names would account for both these factors. It may also be significant that the English inversion compounds tend to be minor names, the majority of which are topographical. This pattern seems to correspond with the notion of a small, lower-status group which was not involved in the naming of important settlements. The existence of a group of *Ireby* names in the North-West may also be significant in this context, as they are indicative of isolated settlements of a minority group who are likely to have been either Goidelic speakers, or Norwegians with Goidelic affinities.

If substratum transfer was the cause of the English inversion compounds, then, in a sense, they would still have been coined by ‘Gaelic-influenced Scandinavian speakers’ as previously believed. Yet, rather than having been created by native Scandinavian speakers who borrowed Celtic word-order, they would instead be the product of native Gaelic speakers utilizing the culturally-dominant Scandinavian language into which they transferred some features of their native speech.

---

Appendix: The Inversion Compounds of North-West England

Notes
• All information on Cumberland and Westmorland inversion compounds is from the respective volumes of the English Place-Name Survey, except where stated otherwise.
• Information on the Lancashire inversion compounds is from Ekwall’s *Scandinavians and Celts in the North-West of England* unless otherwise stated.
• Dates in brackets refer to the earliest historical attestation of a name.
• Entries followed by an asterisk could be ordinary Celtic compounds, rather than genuine inversion compounds.

Abbreviations
f. = field-name
FJ = Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West*
(I have added information from this work wherever it differed from the English Place-Name Survey and Ekwall.)
Gael: This refers to the Goidelic language in general, without distinction between Irish and Scots Gaelic.
pers.n. = personal name

Westmorland

Beck Mouray: ON bekkr + pers.n.? (1847) f.

Becmelbrid: ON bekkr + Gael pers.n. Maelbrigde (1274) f.

Brigsteer: OE brycg [ON brygga FJ] + ON pers.n. Styrr or more probably, OE Steor perh. as pers.n. (1227–37)

Bryggrys: OE brycg + OE hris, ON hrís (1452) f.

Carhullan: W cer or OE carr or Gael carr + pers.n. Holland [byname from ON *Hollandr] (1420)


Crag Mollet: ME cragge + ME surn. Molet (1857)

Croft Aikin: OE craft + surn. Ai(t)ken (1839) f.

Croft Drinkle: OE craft + ? (1840) f.

Croftgrime: OE craft + ON pers.n. Grímr (1300)

Croifsneigrim: OE craft + ON pers.n. *Snegrímr (1179) f.

Crosscraike: OE cros [ON from Gael kross FJ] + ON pers.n. Kraki [or Krákr or fem Kráka FJ] (1275–79)

Cross Dormant: ON tros + ON pers.n. Pormódr (1202)
Dob Friear: perh. ME dodde + ME frere (1584) f.
Fitnenin: ON fit + ON pers.n. Nenninn [byname from ON nenninn] (1170–75)
Gillkieke: ON gil + perh. surn. Kick (1836) f.
Gill Mickle: ON gil + perh. pers.n. Michael [ON Mikiáll] (1836) f.
Gillthroten: ON gil + ME Trot(h)an perh. from Gael Treoddán (1690) f.
Gilshaughlin: ON gil + perh. Gael pers.n. Sochlachán or less likely, ME byname Scauhling or Shaffling (1523)
Glenamara: Brit glennos, W glyn + unidentified pers.n. (1588)*
Glencoyne: Brit glennos, W glyn + perh. ME –cone or W cawn (1212) *
Glen Dowlin: Gael glenn, W glyn + perh. Gael pers.n. Dubline (1843) *
Glenridding: Brit glennos, W glyn + W Rhedyn (1292) *
Glentreske: Gael glenn, W glyn + perh. M.Ir tresp (a.1184) f.*
Goodhamscales: ON skálar + OE pers.n. Godwine (1241–46 as Skailere-goodwine)
Halecat: OE halh or ON hali + ON pers.n. Káti [or Kátr or Kat FJ] or OE catt [or ON appel. Kttr FJ] (1256)
Holehird: OE, ON hol + surn. Hird, Hyrde (1865)
Holme Lyon: ON holmr + ME pers.n. Ligulf, Liolf [or ON *Liulfr FJ] (1349)
Hovedh Kellan: ON hfuð + Gael pers.n. Cellán, Ciallán (1175–84) f.
Howarcles: ON haugr + perh. ON pers.n. Arnketill or ME Arkil (1841)
Howe Carl: ON haugr + ON pers.n. Karl (no date)
Howe Renwick: ON haugr + surn. Renwick (1539)
Howe Robin: ON haugr + pers.n. Robin (1859)
Hustad Heylrig: ON *hús-staðr + perh. a mistake for surn. from Hazel Rigg (1235–68) f.
Keldekeran: ON kelda + Gael pers.n. Ciarán (a.1276) f.
Keldowansik: ON kelda + ME pers.n. Oweyn [from OW Ouein] (1202) f.
Knottkanan: ON knotttr + Gael pers.n. Canainn, Canáinn or Conán (1220–47)
Long-Adam: OE land, ON lond + pers.n. Adam (1366) f.
Merskenen: OE mersc + Gael pers.n. Cennán (1235) f.
Moor Divock: OE, ON mor + Celt pers.n. corresponding to W Dyfog (1278)
Pen Clarke: OW penn + perh. name Clarke (1578) f.
Powbrand Sike: Gael poll + ON pers.n. Brandr (no date)
Powdonnet: Gael poll + ME surn. Donat, or OW form Dunaut (1637)
Raiseherling: ON hreysi + ON pers.n. Erlingr (1220–46) f.
Rigg Brown: ON hryggr + perh. ON pers.n. Brúni (no date)
Rigg Brunild: ON hryggr + ON fem. pers.n. Brynhildr or ME Brunhild (1180–1200)
Rigmaden: ON hryggr + OE mægden (1255)
Rigrimmelsuthen: prob. ME rigging + Gael pers.n. Maelsuthan (1190–99) f.
Rokeraithe: perh. ME rokke + ON byname Reyðr or *Reiðr (reign of Henry III) f.
Rongainer: ON runnr + ME pers.n. Gainere (c.1240) f.
Rus Mickle: perh. OE risc or ON *rust + pers.n. Michael [ON Mikiáll] (1535)
Satearngrim: ON sætr + ON pers.n. Arngrímr (1180–1206) f.
Sattereven: ON sætr + perh. pers.n. (1859)
Scam Matthew: perh. ModÉ dial. Scam or an error for Scar + perh. surn. Mathew (1859)
Searthulfe: ON skarð + ON pers.n. Ulfr (c.1195) f.
Seat Robert: ON sæti + ME pers.n. Robert (1859)
Seat Sandal: ON sætr + ON pers.n. Sundulfr (1274)
Slack Randy: ON slakki + pers.n. or surn. Randy [pet form of Randolph] (1859)
Stangana: perh. ON stong + perh. pers.n. [maybe fem. pers.n. Anna] (1837)
Stone Arthur: perh. stone + pers.n. Arthur (no date)
Swarther: ON bud þ + ON svartr, hfuð, or perh. ON pers.n. Svarth fði (1200–46 as Bouthswardhout)
Sykewillans: OE sic, ON sik + ME pers.n. Willen, Wylyn [variants of William] (1839) f.
Tarn Tessick: perh. ON tjorn + perh. pers.n. (1836) f.
Thwaytlenkyld: ON þveit + pers.n. perh. from OE Leofcild (1256) f.
Trerankelborhan: perh. W tre(f) or ON tré + ON pers.n. Hrafnkell + OE burgæsn (1200–26) f.

Wath Sutton: ON vað + Gael pers.n. Suthán (1184–90)

Withecat: perh. ON viðr + ON pers.n. Káti (1179) f.

Cumberland

Aspatria: [OE æsc, sometimes replaced by ON askr FJ] + Gael pers.n. Patrick (c.1160)

Aykerist: ON eik + Christ (1375)

Aynthorfin: perh. ON eign + ON pers.n. Thorfin (c.1260)

Becblenekar: ON bekkr + W Blaen + W carn (1201)

Bechwythop: ON bekkr + OE wiðig + OE hop (1247)

Beckermet: ON bekkr + OE mot or ON maeti ? or ‘hermit’? (1130)

Beckfarlam: ON bekkr + perh. OE fearnleam or fearnleah-ham [or, less likely, ON pers.n. Faraldr or Farle + OE ham] (1387)

Beckfellican: ON bekkr + ? (1677)

Becksnowyte: ON bekkr + perh. seven + ON haugr + ? (1657)

Beckesnewell: ON bekkr + ? (1338)

Becksonen: ON bekkr + ? (1702) f.

Beccsnari: ON bekkr + ON pers.n. *Snarri [related to ON Snari + Snerrir] (c.1203)

Becestervild: ON bekkr + perh. ON pers.n. *Stjarf-Hildr (1210) f.

bek Troyte: ON bekkr + W pers.n. Troyte (11th c.)

Bewaldeth: ON bu + OE pers.n. Aldgyþ [or, less likely, Aldgifu] (1255)

Bocblencarn: ON bekkr + W Blaen + W carn (1228)

Bridge Petton: ON bryggja + ? (c.1285)

Briggethorfin: ON bryggja + ON pers.n. Thorfin (1260)

Brotherilkeld: ON buðir + perh. ON pers.n. Úlfkell [or ON pers.n. Úlfketill or Úlfkil FJ] (1210)

Burntippet: ME brenke, ON brinke + med. fem. pers.n. Ibbet [dimin. of Isabel] (1169)

Castelyadolfbek: OE castel + OE pers.n. Eadwulf [beck is prob. a later addition] (1278) f.

[Corkickle: Gael corr + ON stream-name Keekel (c.1210) FJ]

Crofbathioc: OE croft + perh. Gael pers.n. (c.1205)

Croftbladen: OE croft + ? (1646) f.

Croftmorris: OE croft + F pers.n. Maurice (1500)
Crosclin: \( \text{ON} \, krossi + \text{perh. Gael pers.n. } \text{Crin (c.1200)} \) f.
Crosslacon: cross + perh. Gael pers.n. Lochán (1777)
Dalemain: \( \text{ON} \, dálr + \text{pers.n. } \text{ON Máni [or Celt. Maine] (early 12th c.)} \)
\( \text{Dale Raggon beck: } \text{ON} \, \text{dálr} + \text{? [with addition of beck]} \) (1610)
Fitbrandan: \( \text{ON} \, \text{fit} + \text{Gael pers.n. } \text{Brandán (c.1250)} \)
Gillcambon: \( \text{ON} \, \text{gil} + \text{Gael pers.n. } \text{Cambáin [from cambo-] (1254)} \)
Gillefinchor: \( \text{ON} \, \text{gil} + \text{ON pers.n. } \text{Finnpórr (1230)} \)
Gilgarran: \( \text{ON} \, \text{gil} + \text{Gael pers.n. } \text{Gearrán [gearrán used as nickname] (a.1230)} \)
\( \text{Hou Groucok: } \text{ON} \, \text{haugr} + \text{perh. ME Grewcok [from Fr grue] (c.1225)} \) f.
How Michael: \( \text{ON} \, \text{haugr} + \text{pers.n. Michael (no date)} \)
Hobcarton: perh. OE *hobb, *hobbe or even OE hop + Gael pers.n. Cartán (1260)
\( \text{Hovedhgleuuerherhe: } \text{ON} \, \text{hfuð} + \text{perh. ON gliúfrum [erg was later added]} \) (1209–10)
Hovedscaldale: \( \text{ON} \, \text{hfuð} + \text{ON skalli [used as nickname]} + \text{ON dálr (c.1210–12)} \)
Holweri: \( \text{ON} \, \text{holmr} + \text{cont. pers.n. Werri (1201)} \)
Holle Camok: \( \text{ON} \, \text{holmr} + \text{? (1538)} \) f.
Keldhouse: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kelda} + \text{ON pers.n. Uspak (c.1242)} \)
Kirkandrews: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Saint’s name Andrew (p. 1165)} \)
Kirkandrews (Eden): \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Saint’s name Andrew (c.1200)} \)
Kirkandrews (Wood): \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Saint’s name Andrew (c.1158)} \)
Kirkbride: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Celtic Saint’s name Bride (1163)} \)
Kirkebribynnoc: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Celtic Saint’s name Brynach (1339)} \)
Kirkebibbeccoch: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkíubýr} + \text{Gael pers.n. Beghóc [dimin. of Irish Saint’s name Begu] (1308)} \)
Kirkeby Crossan: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkíubýr} + \text{Gael pers.n. Cros(s)an (mid 13th c.)} \)
Kirkoswald: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Saint’s name Oswald (1167)} \)
Kirksanton: \( \text{ON} \, \text{kirkja} + \text{Celtic Saint’s name Sanctán (1086)} \)
Mockerin: \( \text{ON} \, *\text{moldi} + \text{Gael pers.n. Corcán (1208)} \)
Polgaver: \( \text{W} \, \text{pwll} + \text{W gafr (1279)*} \)
Pol Waðæn: \( \text{Gael} \, \text{poll}, \text{W} \, \text{pwll} + \text{? (11th c.)} \)
Polneuton: \( \text{Gael} \, \text{poll}, \text{W} \, \text{pwll} + \text{OE neuton (1189)} \)
Poltross Burn: \( \text{W} \, \text{pwll, Cornish} \text{ poll} + \text{? (1169)*} \)
Powmaugham Beck: \( \text{W} \, \text{pwll} + \text{OW pers.n. Merchiaun (c.1415)*} \)
Satgodard: \( \text{ON} \, \text{sætr} + \text{cont. pers.n. Godard (c.1205)} \)
Scarrowsmanwick: \( \text{ON} \, \text{skálir [ON skálar FJ] + perh. pers.n. from OE} \)
mann or Gael pers.n Maenach or Gael manaich [gen. sing. of Manach] (c.1240)

Seatallan: ON sætr + Breton pers.n. Alein (1783)
Seatoller: ON sætr + OE alor (1563)
Seteknoc: ON sætr + Gael cnoic (c.1240) f.
Setforn: ON sætr + ON pers.n. Forni (1215) f.
Setmabanning: ON sætr + Gael pers.n. Banán [with prefix ma- or mo-] (1292)
Setmurthy: ON sætr + Gael pers.n. Muiredach (1195)
Skalmallock: ON skálir [ON skálar FJ] + Gael pers.n. Macóg
[ dimin. of Mac] (1292)
Snabmurriss: ME snabbi + F. pers.n. Maurice (1684)
Stanbrennan: ON steinn + Gael pers.n. Branán (c.1205)
Staynlenoc: ON steinn + Gael pers.n. *Lennóc [dimin. of Lend]
(1260–80)
Stibenet: OE stig, ON stígr + pers.n. Benedict (1278) f.
Stylelein: OE stig, ON stígr + Breton pers.n. Alein (1230)
Tarngunerigg: ON tiorn + ON pers.n. Gunnar + ON hryggr (1725) f.
Tarn Wadling: ON tiorn + OW pers.n. Gwyddelan (1285)
Ternmeran: ON tiorn + prob. W Meriaun (1230)
Thueitdounegaleg: ON þveit + Gael pers.n. Dungal + ME haye added later [or Gael pers.n. Dungalach FJ] (c.1235)
Warthcreggle: ON varði + ? (1263) f.
Watchcomon: ON varði [or ON vrðr FJ] + Gael pers.n. Colmán
(1169)

Lancashire

Halecath: OE halh + ON pers.n. Katr [see Halecote] (1212) [FJ]
Rigsumerild: ON hryggr, OE hrycg + ON pers.n. *Sumarhildr or
ON Sumarlíði or OE Sumarlíði (1246–67)
Rudswain: perh. ON ruð + ON pers.n. Sveinn (1268–79)
Scartherwlmer: ON skarð [pl.] + OE pers.n. Wulfmær (1190–1213)
Starhouraven: ON *storrhaugr + ON pers.n. Hrafn (1220–50)
Twaitkendenan: ON þveit + perh. pers.n. (1318)

Doubtful
Bryning: ON *Bjárstaðr + pers.n. *Bryning, or OE *Bryningas
(1200 as Birstaf Brinning)
Laithgryme: ON leið + ON pers.n. Grímur (1230–46)
Leagram: ON *hlaða* + ON pers.n. *Grímr* (1282) [or ON *leið-gríma* FJ]