

REVIEWS

ANITA ELDBLAD, CHRISTINA ALLARD, AGNETA SUNDSTRÖM and EVA BRYLLA, eds, *Sveriges medeltida personnamn, Häfte 15 Ingeborgh-logærth*. Institutet för Språk och Folkminnen: Uppsala, 2006. xxv + 78 pp., no price given. (ISBN 97891-7229-038-9)

From time to time we are sent for review one section or part of an ongoing series, frequently not at its outset. Some of these publications may stand alone as monographs, but others may simply be continuations, offering in-depth studies of some small area of the project. This particular fascicle is very much *in medias res*, plunging not only into the middle of a letter of the alphabet, but into a name; the first citations for *Ingeborgh* must be looked for in Häfte 14. This being so, the review may be best used as an opportunity to introduce the project as a whole.

This Dictionary of Swedish mediaeval personal names has about it a slight whiff of the past great days of onomastic compilation which produced many of the standards on our shelves, the era of Lind, Feilitzen, Förstemann and their peers. *Norsk-Isländska Dopnamn* and *Danmarks gamle Personnavne* have long been at our disposal, Lind indeed for over seventy years and the forename volumes of the Danish volume for almost as long. For Sweden a much slighter source was provided by Brate and Lundgren's *Svenska personnamn från medeltiden* of 1915. The project then fills a long-felt gap, and it is encouraging to see it going ahead in spite of its vicissitudes. Such projects have usually been more ambitious than the older single-author or partnership volumes, gathering more data and researching more intensely, and as a consequence have been slower in bringing out their results. Added to this, the academic optimism of the mid twentieth century has faltered in a more austere funding climate. First initiated in 1943, this dictionary has changed agencies many times, which would explain why publication has been sporadic. The first fascicle appeared in 1967; seven years elapsed between 8-9, six between 13-14.

The coverage is comprehensive, and the identification of the persons who bear the names will be invaluable to genealogists and social historians, just as the changing forms of the names and their distribution will be for language studies. Given the comparatively late advent of written documents in Sweden, there are few instances before the thirteenth century. The upper

terminus is 1520, the year of the coronation of Gustav Vasa, which is taken as ushering in the beginning of modern Sweden. Earlier runic occurrences are not systematically recorded, although the notes at the end of each article indicate (with one head-form and without dating) if the name is known from Swedish runic inscriptions. However, I am informed by Gillian Fellows-Jensen that a register of runic names is in preparation in Stockholm. Also included in the notes to each name is its occurrence in placenames, its origin (whether, for instance, it is a native Swedish name, a loan from West Scandinavian or German, or a Christian – Biblical or hagiological – name) and some general observations on its use, popularity, and any controversial discussion around it, with a brief citation of the literature. Each fascicle contains its own bibliography and abbreviation-list, with sources in bold type, which is welcome.

It is heartening to see this publication going ahead in print, and I for one hope it will continue in this form to completion, and not succumb to the temptation to abandon it in favour of an electronic database, as has happened in some similar projects. I must record my thanks to Gillian Fellows-Jensen, who has reviewed many of the previous parts of the dictionary in *Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica* over the years, and has sent me offprints and typescripts which have been invaluable in filling in the background to the project.

VERONICA SMART

SIMON TAYLOR with GILBERT MÁRKUS, *The Place-Names of Fife* volume 1 *West Fife between Leven and Forth*. Shaun Tyas: Donington, 2006. x + 623 pp. £24.00 (ISBN 1 900289 77 6)

Scotland has long lagged behind other parts of the British Isles with regard to the publication of an authoritative place-name survey. Its nearest neighbour, England, has been engaged since the 1920s in a systematic analysis of place-nomenclature which currently runs to more than eighty volumes. The Northern Ireland Place-Name Project has produced a steady stream of volumes since the late 1980s; the Place-Name Survey of Wales launched a database of historical place-name material at this Society's spring conference in 2005; and the survey of

the Isle of Man was completed between 1994 and 2005 (see review article, this volume). Nothing comparable, however, has as yet been available for Scotland. The book under review is therefore of particular significance, not only as a source of information on the toponymy of west Fife, but as the first volume of the Scottish Place-Name Survey. It has its inception in the author's Edinburgh PhD thesis, "Settlement-Names in Fife" (1995), but has been much expanded and revised for publication with support from the Anderson Research Fund at the University of St Andrews, and in collaboration with Taylor's research assistant Gilbert Márkus who is acknowledged on the title-page.

As with the post-war volumes of the English Place-Name Survey, coverage extends to part of a county, and the material is organised geographically by parish. The full survey of Fife is projected to extend to four volumes. The first three will cover about twenty parishes each, with the fourth containing an outline history of Fife, a discussion of the toponymic record as a whole, and a glossary of elements. The latter in particular will be eagerly awaited, as there are many references to the forthcoming analysis, without which the implications of gazetteer entries cannot always be fully weighed. Completion of the work is being funded by a grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, and may be expected by 2010.

The current volume offers etymologies for about 900 major and minor place-names, supported by comprehensive runs of early spellings and detailed discussions of alternative interpretations. The layout of entries is broadly traditional, but there are some novel and useful features, such as the inclusion of information on height and orientation, designed to facilitate the profiling of place-name elements that might be found characteristically to occur above or below a certain altitude, or on inclines facing in a certain direction. It is well worth reading the Introduction before starting to use the gazetteer, in order to extract the maximum information from the entries and in particular to decipher the first line of each. Two examples chosen at random from p. 380 are as follows:

NEWTON OF PITADRO # IKG S NT143840 2 25m NOF

NORTH QUEENSFERRY IKG, DFL S NT13 80 1 394 20m SOF

The headforms, taken from OS Pathfinder (1:25000), are followed by coded information informing us that the first is an obsolete name (#), and that both are now within the parish of Inverkeithing (IKG) although North Queensferry was formerly in the parish of Dunfermline (DFL). Both are classified as settlement-names (S). The National Grid Reference follows and is graded for accuracy: an assumed location has been assigned to Newton of Pitadro (2), but an accurate position is indicated for North Queensferry (1), found on sheet 394 of the OS Pathfinder map. The two places are respectively 25 and 20 metres high, and whereas Newton of Pitadro is north facing (NOF), North Queensferry is south facing (SOF).

The emphasis on topographical context reflected here is paralleled by an emphasis on historical context. This is particularly evident in the discursive introduction to each parish, which typically runs to two or more pages and is illustrated by two maps, showing respectively the main settlements and other features of the parish, and the relevant section from Ainslie's 1775 map of Fife and Kinross-shire. Gazetteer entries too contain a wealth of historical and geographical detail, showing how onomastics can work together with other disciplines to illuminate successive stages of settlement and development.

Alongside this goes a focus on contemporary forms of language—that is, those current when the place-names are likely to have been coined. The main languages represented in the toponymy of Fife are Pictish, Scottish Gaelic and Scots (Sc), with some input from French, Old Norse (ON) and Scottish Standard English (SSE). Whereas previous scholarship has often tended to assign place-name elements to their etymons in historical languages such as Old English, here a serious attempt is made to identify the linguistic context, with a high proportion of names being attributed partly or fully to Scots. The dividing line between Scots and Scottish Standard English is particularly hard to draw, and this leads to the analysis of many elements as “Sc or SSE *east*”, “Sc or SSE *north*”, “Sc or SSE *middle*” and so on. In other instances the determining factor appears to be the language of the other element(s) within the name. This is presumably why the generic of Sauchenbush (p. 498), recorded from 1828 and with all extant spellings in <bush>, is taken to be Sc *buss* subsequently replaced by SSE *bush*,

whereas Sinclairtown (p. 499), recorded in the 1790s as *Sinclairton*, is attributed to SSE *town* rather than to Sc *toun*. Similarly, Oneford Burn (p. 248) is analysed as “SSE *one* + SSE *ford* + SSE *burn*”, but Burnside (p. 517) as “Sc *burn* + Sc *side*”. Pending the appearance of the glossary in volume 4, it is not always evident whether any significance attaches to differences in the definitions of individual elements. Several occurrences of the place-name Milton are attributed to Sc *milntoun*, but it is unclear what if any distinction is being drawn between Milton in Ballingry ‘Mill farm’ (p. 151) and Milton in Saline ‘Mill settlement’ (p. 528), or which explanation applies to doublets elsewhere (pp. 339, 452, 489). Although the book is written in English, there is a tendency to assume a knowledge of Scots on the part of the reader, who will otherwise need recourse to a dictionary in order to work out the meaning of names such as Dun Moss (p. 521) and Gray Craigs (p. 551), attributed respectively to “? Sc *dun* + Sc *moss*” and “Sc *grey* + Sc *craig*” with no indication of how closely if at all the terms correspond to their English counterparts.

It will be particularly good to see the full discussion of Sc *hare* in the elements glossary in order to gauge the strength of support for the meaning ‘boundary’ given under Hare Law and Harestanes in Auchterderran (p. 106), Harelaw Island in Dalgety (p. 271) and Harlaw in Wemyss (p. 590). Citations provided by the *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, s.v. *hair* adj., v.² (<<http://www.dsl.ac.uk>>), may fall short of conclusive evidence for such a meaning although they demonstrate that some of the features so described were used as boundary markers; and the Scots material might usefully be reviewed in light of Kitson’s arguments against this interpretation of the Old English etymon *hār* ‘grey, hoar’—again, even where applied to boundary features.¹ Another element that may repay further attention is Sc *hall*. This is taken to refer to a high-status building, used ironically in names such as Gowkhal ‘cuckoo *hall*’ (p. 213) and possibly also Muircockhal ‘moorcock *hall*’ (p. 340), unless the latter represents a re-interpretation of Sc *haugh*. It may be more likely, however, that both belong to the ‘bird-hall’ name-

¹ P. Kitson, ‘Quantifying qualifiers in Anglo-Saxon charter boundaries’, *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 14 (1993), 29–82 (pp. 37–40).

type common in southern Scotland and northern England, with the second element meaning ‘farmstead’.² A similar interpretation might be considered for other occurrences of the same generic, as in Myrie Hall (p. 529), where the sense ‘high-status dwelling, hall’ is again so clearly inappropriate as to lead Taylor to suggest an ironic use or hypercorrection.

The standards of scholarship throughout the book are of the highest. Extensive collections of spellings are assembled and analysed, etymological discussions are thorough and judicious, and the proposed interpretations are based on sound methodological principles combined with detailed local knowledge. Presentational aspects are less well handled. The volume is illustrated with a total of forty-seven maps, but the contents list does not include page numbers to make it easy to find them. It is also sometimes difficult to follow up cross-references, and although the entry for Gedbys (p. 485) directs the reader to “see Introduction, this volume” for a discussion of place-names from ON *bý*, I have searched for it in vain. The bibliography is badly set out, with many inconsistencies in style, and it fails to include all publications mentioned within the gazetteer. It is a pity that it comes towards the beginning (pp. 21–36), as it gives a poor impression which fortunately is not borne out by the rest of the book.

In sum, the Fife Survey inaugurated by this volume represents a major step forward in Scottish place-name studies. It makes available new material, on which future research will be able to build. A striking example is the identification of additional names from Gaelic *sliabh*, as with *Scleofgarmunth* (pp. 114–15) and possibly also Bucklyvie (p. 61–63) and Silverbarton (pp. 201–02), forcing the re-evaluation of this much-discussed place-name element—an issue recently addressed both

² C. Hough, ‘Two “bird hall” names in Kirkpatrick Fleming’, *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 78 (2004), 125–30.

by Taylor himself and by W. F. H. Nicolaisen.³ At the same time, it places the understanding of existing material on a new footing, by presenting a rigorous and informed analysis of the historical and linguistic evidence. Perhaps most importantly of all, it serves as a flagship for surveys of other parts of Scotland, a country whose place-nomenclature has not yet received the sustained and thorough-going attention that it deserves. At the end of the Preface (p. x), the author writes:

I envisage the Fife volumes as being not only a valuable resource in itself for a wide range of audience both lay and academic, from a variety of disciplines, but also as stimulating similar studies in the other counties of Scotland, as well as presenting a model or template for them.

Amen to that.

CAROLE HOUGH

NORMAN SCARFE, *Suffolk in the Middle Ages*. The Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2007. 178 pp., 25 plates, 8 maps and plans, 1 page line drawings, no price given. (ISBN 978-1-84383-0689)

This is a book which was first published in 1986 and was reprinted in 2004 and 2007 without, as far as I can see, alterations or additions. It is a book which deserves to be kept in print, but readers should note that while it presents an interesting critical account of scholarship as it stood in the middle of the 1980s, nothing is said about numerous studies which have appeared in the last twenty years. This caveat is particularly applicable to the first two chapters, which deal with Suffolk place-names and the results of the excavation of Mound 1 at Sutton Hoo.

³ S. Taylor, 'Sliabh in Scottish place-names: its meaning and chronology', *Journal of Scottish Name Studies*, 1 (2007), 99–136; W. F. H. Nicolaisen, 'Gaelic sliabh revisited', in *Fil súil nglais. A Grey Eye Looks Back. A Festschrift in Honour of Colm Ó Baoill*, edited by S. Arbutnot and K. Hollo (Ceann Drochaid, 2007), pp. 175–86.

Place-name studies and work on Sutton Hoo have produced a large quantity of literature since 1985. That said, I must admit to being pleased that the reprint has drawn my attention to Mr Scarfe's detailed discussion of Suffolk place-names, of which I failed to take account when compiling a chapter for the collection of papers, *The Age of Sutton Hoo*, edited by Martin Carver, which appeared in 1992. Not all Mr Scarfe's conclusions will be accepted by place-name specialists, but they deserve careful consideration, rooted as they are in the detailed knowledge of the landscape, which cannot be attained by a scholar who is concerned with the place-names of the whole country. Two other chapters, 'The naming of Alpheton' and 'Labelling the Bradfields', also deal with place-names, and suggestions made in these, like those made in the first chapter, will need to be considered when the EPNS survey of Suffolk is compiled.

Other chapters, which deal with East Anglian saints and the monasteries of Suffolk, will be of less immediate interest to readers of *Nomina*, and are not within the critical competence of the present reviewer.

The book is very well illustrated, and the 25 plates are of outstanding quality.

MARGARET GELLING

CROSBY, ALAN G., ed, *Of names and Places: Selected Writings of Mary Higham*. English Place-name Society and the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland: Bristol, 2007. xii + 207 pp., no price given. (ISBN-10: 0-904889-77-7, ISBN-13: 978-0904889-77-2)

It was suggested at her funeral that a most valuable and useful memorial volume for Dr Mary Higham might well be a collection of her own papers many of which had appeared in a wide range of periodicals, and were not always easy to access. Dr Crosby, a personal friend and colleague, managed to produce this attractive soft-back volume with his own photograph of Mary's beloved Lancashire landscape adorning the cover in time to be available at the memorial conference held at Lancaster University some three months later, and it was received with

enthusiasm by the many friends and students who attended. This volume includes a warm appreciation of the place-name content of Mary's work by the leading place-name scholar, Dr Margaret Gelling. In his introduction to the volume Dr Crosby gives a short but heart-felt and perceptive appreciation of Mary and her work and explains any essential changes he has made in order to standardise papers written through a period of over twenty-five years for the present volume. The twenty-four papers on the contents page are numbered, and I have inserted these into the text below.

The collection of 24 papers represents over two-thirds of Mary's published papers and includes one previously unpublished. The papers are grouped into three sections: 'Place-names and the Landscape;' 'Medieval Landscape and Society;' and 'The Forest of Bowland and adjacent areas'.

Five from the first group on 'Place-names and the Landscape' first appeared in either the *Journal of the English Place-name Society* or in *Nomina*, the official organs on place-names, and cover topics as various as medieval harpers (9), bee keepers (8) and deer-leaps (3) made to allow deer to jump into a walled or fenced deer-park from the forest (the lord's medieval hunting ground). The first two papers, one on *erg* names (1), the other (2) on *aergi* names and transhumance (the seasonal movement of animals) are linked to her interest in medieval land use, and arose from research for her first postgraduate degree, an M.A. from the University of Hull. This examination of the medieval Forest of Rossendale gave rise to the paper on *shay* names (4) and incidentally produced more acceptable identifications than previously, of some of the places named in Domesday Book. Her papers about names of those hills which are simply known as 'Round Hill' (5) and also about names which occur on boundaries (7 and 20) developed from her PhD (University of Lancaster) study of the medieval Burton Chase (centred on Burton-in-Lonsdale, the capital manor) which ranged across Bowland Forest in Lancashire and the major peaks of the Craven district of Yorkshire and large numbers of villages. Close attention to the lie of the land, the evidence of features in the landscape and recognition of their value in local history, underlay all her work, and there is scarcely a paper in the book for which with her husband, Eric (and the dog!) she

did not carry out careful and discerning fieldwork coupled with examination of any relevant large-scale maps and careful analysis of very many medieval records.

Her papers on early church sites and place-names (10), and 'Place-names and local history' (6) are valuable examples of how to analyse a group of similar place-names in relation to their context in geography and history. She posited that places in north-west England with names ending in *-ham* might be indicative of the existence of a church there early in the Christian period and visited all the places to examine whether they had features deemed to be characteristic of early churches; their sites, architecture, associated archaeology and parochial position were considered in detail, her evidence set out in tabular form. With caution, she suggested that *-ham* names should indeed be considered as another piece of positive evidence for the existence of an early church. In her paper on place-names and local history (6) she examined names with the Anglo-Saxon dative ending *-um* (which has the meaning 'at the...'). Such names are fairly common in Northern England and her work provides an example of investigation in local history which could raise interesting questions and, possibly, could offer even more interesting results.

Dr Crosby's second group of Mary's papers appear under the heading 'Medieval Landscape and Society'. Here are seven papers whose topics again demonstrate Mary's amazing breadth of interests. Her researches were often instigated by a chance reference that she had come across when doing something else, or by a mild exasperation with national distribution maps showing studies of medieval features for which Lancashire remained blank. She made much use of the archives of Lancashire (and counties beyond) and several papers in this section exemplify how much her wide experience and interests (she had a good voice and could play the harp and had worked, in a secretarial capacity, in a cotton mill) could add detailed understanding to the records. Her own interest in gardening and in monastic gardens coupled with her search through the archives in north-west England for records of gardens, orchards, gardeners, and the plants that were grown, has produced a thoroughly detailed account and map of many well-worked gardens in medieval Lancashire. Other papers relate to demesial horse-

rearing in Lancashire (15), a short paper on Cockersand Abbey's tide mill (12), and the portrayal of Lancashire on the Gough Map of the mid-fourteenth century (17). There are many references to medieval musicians in the county (13) some of whom appear to have been on the wrong side of the law. Her eye for field archaeology had already recognised a series of mottes at intervals along the river Ribble. and in the forest areas of Lancashire and this field work was expanded to take in the valleys of the Lune and Kent (11). Detailed field work in conjunction with place-name and archival research is apparent in the essay on medieval textile production in north-west England (16).

Dr Crosby's third group of Mary's papers, 'The Forest of Bowland and adjacent areas' contains short papers on medieval rabbit warrens (21), the medieval borough of Hornby (22), and two papers relating to the largely disappointing efforts to exploit the lead and accompanying minerals of Bowland (23 and 24), but the section opens with two of Mary's most important papers drawn from work undertaken for her two postgraduate degrees. Place-name aspects of these two papers have already appeared in nos. 1, 2, 5 and 7, but here are the regional accounts first of Bowland Forest (18) and its vaccaries, and immediately following it, a short unpublished paper (19) which, with 25 years further experience, she reviews and summarises general points relating to upland farming of North West England in the medieval period.

The fascinating detective work on the boundary of Burton Chase was contributory to Mary's PhD thesis (20, and also papers 5 and 7). The huge area enclosed within the boundary contained eight townships and the highly significant hill-fort of Ingleborough at its centre. Her account conceals the real physical effort required to survey the long perimeter of the Chase. In a footnote Mary minimises to two weeks the walking (or a few days on horseback) required for a one-way medieval beating of the bounds of Burton Chase, but for Mary and Eric, both holding full-time jobs, it was a much more arduous business. Their survey was largely done weekend after weekend from a car parked at whatever was the nearest point to the next section of their exploration. This inevitably required a walk to reach the boundary, then along the boundary, and finally, a return to the car. Thus the whole boundary was covered at least twice. Mary acknowledges 'defeat-by-conifer-plantation' over one

relatively short section. but indeed they did penetrate some of it in order to find *Toghwoodshaw*.

The physical commitment and dedication needed to make this detailed survey of the boundary across its full distance of more than fifty miles, the larger part across rough or rocky ground and over three of the major hills of the Pennines, Whernside, Penyghent and Gragareth (and later they climbed over Ingleborough too) requires its own salutation, but the academic achievement was greater still, and those who were privileged to hear Mary's original lecture, and viewed the photographs (showing the views forward and back between adjacent points, and the evidences of terrain, rocks, vegetation, and archaeological features at each stage) and listened to her conclusions, were in no doubt of the huge historical significance of the work. In Mary's relatively brief summary of this paper, on page 182, it is apparent that she has pushed back our understanding of the history of this upland area of Northern England not just to the Dark Ages, but back beyond the Roman period. It stands as an epic piece of work in her memory.

Dr Crosby and the publishers have earned the gratitude of Mary's friends, and present and future students, for the speedy gathering and editing of so much of Mary's work into one attractively-produced volume.

MARY ATKIN

SONJA ENTZENBERG, "*Det får ju vara någon ordning på torpet!*". *Svenska personnamnsregler i ett historiskt perspektiv* ("We must have some (better) order in the croft". Swedish personal name regulations in an historical perspective). Språk- och Folkminnesinstitutet Småskrifter 2. SOFI: Uppsala, 2006. x + 82 pp. (ISSN 1652-0513. ISBN-10: 91-7229-037-4, ISBN-13: 978-91-7229-037-2)

This small booklet contains a sober and comprehensive account of the negotiations that have taken place in Sweden with respect to personal names from the end of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twenty-first, including the name decree promulgated in 1901 and the personal name legislation of 1963 and 1982. Sonja Entzenberg, an

archivist at the University of Uppsala, has had the dual aim of describing the development of Swedish family names and providing a basis for the revision of the name law of 1982 that has been requested by the Swedish Riksdag.

It is not easy to explain the situation with respect to surnames in Scandinavia to those readers of *Nomina* who have grown up in England, as I did, where surnames have been hereditary since by about 1400 at the latest and where it has been the normal practice for a woman to drop her maiden name on her marriage and replace it with her husband's surname, while the names of any children are recorded on their own birth certificates with the common surname of father and mother, generally with indication of the latter's maiden name. Most English surnames are not particularly common. I, for example, have never met an Englishman with the surname Fellows who was not related to me more or less closely, except in the Staffordshire area, where the surname seems to have ramified. It was therefore somewhat of a shock to me to acquire the Danish surname Jensen by marriage in 1961. In 1971 this was the commonest surname in Denmark and there were over 368,631 Jensens or almost 7.7% of the entire population. Some of my English friends thought optimistically that I must have married the heir to the silversmith Georg Jensen or the owner of the Jensen Motor Company, patronised by Prince Charles, while Blackwells Oxford bookshop wrote to me to suggest that I should amalgamate my account with that of another Danish customer called Jensen, as this would be more convenient for them! I had, of course, become aware of the frequency of occurrence of the name Jensen before my marriage and I opted on that occasion to retain my maiden name as a "middle name", which was duly recorded on my marriage certificate. In Scandinavia, where the frequency of occurrence of secondary (i.e. hereditary) patronymic surnames is well known, alphabetization of surnames is often done according to the author's middle name, if this is less common than the official surname. Since this sometimes causes confusion, I adopted the name Fellows-Jensen as a so-called married name, as soon as a new Danish law in 1982 made it possible for me to do so. This, however, only seemed to confuse my non-Scandinavian readers even further. The author of a book entitled *Yorkshire through Place Names*, published in

1982, includes references in the index to both G. F. Fellowes (who she?) on one page and Gillian F. Jensen on several others, in all cases to one and the same book, while in the same year the author of a book entitled *The Vikings* accorded me two entries for one book in his bibliography, one with, one without the hyphen, prompting Professor R. I. Page's ascerbic comment in a review in *Saga-Book* 21, 310, 'Gillian Fellows Jensen, poor lass, has been sliced in two (for the same book), half-hyphenated, half not. This is in (fe)male-chauvinist distinction to W. G. and R. G. Collingwood who have been conflated to one'.

I have admittedly spent far too much time on my own trivial onomastic problem but the confusions involved will perhaps help to explain two of the main problems discussed by Sonja Entzenberg. These are firstly the late date of establishment of hereditary surnames in rural Sweden, where primary patronymic surnames reflect the popularity of a comparatively limited range of masculine personal names in the nineteenth century, and secondly the comparatively early date of the emancipation of urban Swedish women, resulting in many women retaining their maiden name after marriage, a practice that was thought by some to threaten the stability of the marriage bond.

In Sweden surnames developed earliest among the nobility, namely before 1700 (p. 10), while at the end of the nineteenth century surnames were still by no means universal. In most rural areas the practice had been that both men and women had primary patronymic names that were not hereditary, e.g. *Lars Hansson* was the son of *Hans*, although there were some areas where it was common for distinctions to be drawn between one man and another with the same forename by adding a preposition and the name of his farm, e.g. *Petter i Sörgården* (p. 16). One of the reasons for encouraging the development of hereditary surnames was to ease the problem of identification for the authorities for such reasons as notifying changes of address or paying out social pensions. With the gradual success of the move to ensure that all Swedish citizens had a hereditary surname, it became clear that the large majority of the rural population had adopted so-called secondary patronymics, i.e. that the children of *Lars Hansson* were referred to as for example Hans and Karin *Hansson* rather than Hans Larsson and Karin *Larsdotter*. There were also some of the modern two-element

middle-class names of the type *Lindberg* that were no longer thought to be sufficiently distinctive (p. 25).

By 1915, with the growing mobility of the Swedish population, there was therefore an increased interest for attempting to encourage Swedes with very common surnames to adopt more unusual ones. There was, however, a tendency to feel that to enforce people to change their names would be too unwarranted an interference in their private lives (p.15). While everyone should have a right to bear a suitable name, however, it required both taste and knowledge to choose a satisfactory new surname (p. 15), while some of the old established hereditary surnames were thought to be deserving of protection (p. 21). New names were not to sound foreign or comical or be offensive and they should be functional, i.e. it should be possible both to spell and pronounce them without difficulty.

One suggestion was that a couple about to be married should be encouraged to adopt the more unusual of their two surnames as their common surname (p. 28). When a proposal for a new Swedish name law appeared in 1954, it was accompanied by a list of suitable names for adoption as surnames and an account of the linguistic principles that should be followed when applying for a new name, together with a list of suitable suffixes for new surnames, e.g. *-ell* and *-ander*, classical derivatives that had been frowned upon earlier (p. 29).

By the time of the appearance of the name law of 1982 the importance of personal names as a means of identification had been significantly reduced by the introduction of obligatory and unique registered personal numbers for the entire population in 1963. While the law of 1963 had been concerned to systematize rules for the adoption of personal names, the 1982 law acknowledged a need to liberalize the regulations and to emphasize that there should be equality between the sexes. Hitherto the starting point of all discussions had always been the patriarchal name-principle, i.e. the man was considered to be the breadwinner. The use of the husband's surname by a woman upon her marriage was a relatively young practice in Sweden that only spread to the middle-class strata of society in the nineteenth century (p. 47). Most women up to then retained their maiden surname, although it had been possible in Sweden for a woman to take her husband's name (p. 48). A

precondition for the acceptance by the wife of her husband's surname was that the name was hereditary and that the use of a common shared surname was accepted in all social groups, often under the influence of various official institutions, first and foremost the church (p. 65). The spread of shared surnames for married couples (normally the husband's name) was thought to be of greater significance for the stability of society than the idea that individual surnames gave the most secure means of identification (p. 66). In the 1963 law the wife could elect to preserve her maiden name as her surname after marriage, as long as she had notified her intention to do this beforehand. Children in the marriage could choose to bear the mother's name but there had to be some special reason for the husband to take his wife's name. The 1982 law, on the other hand, is extremely liberal with respect to changes of names. A couple about to be married can choose a completely 'new' common surname without having to explain why (p. 67).

While the 1963 law had aimed to restrict the frequency of name-changes, the 1983 law has practically no restrictions. The names *Petroleum* and *Twilight*, for example, have been approved by a local tax office and the Supreme Administrative Court respectively (p. 68). The objection has since been made that the most recent law did not have the benefit of help from any qualified philologists and the results certainly betray this. According to Sonja Entzenberg there would now seem to be two possible ways open to follow. Either all rules and regulations about both forenames and surnames can simply be dropped altogether (the radical solution) or some regulations could be enforced for surnames, following the lines employed by generations of philologists who have studied personal names and their regulations (pp. 75-76).

As a Scandinavian philologist it certainly seems to me advisable to follow Entzenberg's moderate solution involving linguistic expertise. One of the incidental pleasures of this booklet has been the numerous footnotes containing thumbnail portraits of the men and woman who have made their voices heard in the discussion of Swedish personal names during the last hundred years. Many of these are politicians or journalists but a number are Scandinavian philologists specialising in various different fields, all of whom have been willing to invest a good deal of hard work in discussions on the name question. Readers of

Nomina will probably be familiar with the names of Ivar Lundahl (1894-1975) in note 24, Carl Ivar Ståhle (1913-80) in note 28, Thorsten Andersson (born 1929) in note 34 and Jöran Sahlgren (1884-1971) in note 65. Sahlgren was perhaps particularly restrictive with respect to permitting new surnames. Sonja Entzenberg notes that an examination of applications for new names when he was consultant in the 1940s reveals that Sahlgren's point of view was never questioned (p. 74). He simply wrote on the submitted application form in his characteristic neat hand "Sahlgren avstyrker (disapproves)". Such despotism would never be permitted in the enlightened and multi-racial society that Sweden has become. There is, therefore, every reason to believe that philologists such as Thorsten Andersson, who acted as linguistic consultant to the Patent and Registration Office between 1977 and 1995, and Eva Brylla (born 1944), who has published widely on both old and modern personal names and been the research chief responsible for entrusting the present project to Sonja Entzenberg, would be able to exercise a reasonably moderating linguistic influence on name changes after a revision of the present law.

GILLIAN FELLOWS-JENSEN

JOHN M. ANDERSON, *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2007. xii + 375 pp. £60.00 (ISBN 978-0-19-929741-2)

This book takes an approach to names that will probably be unfamiliar to many readers of *Nomina*. Written by a leading linguist and drawing on the tradition of notional grammar set out in the same author's earlier book *A Notional Theory of Syntactic Categories* (Cambridge UP, 1997), it deals not with the history and development of names but with their role in contemporary language. The main focus is on categorial status, with the thrust of the argument being to challenge the view that names are a type of noun, and to suggest instead that they should be grouped with determinatives (pronouns and determiners).

Much of the discussion is devoted to a detailed examination of nominal structures and of the place of names within them. Avoiding an overtly Anglocentric approach, extensive use is made of cross-linguistic

comparisons to demonstrate parallels between the distributional patterns of names and of noun phrases (for which Anderson prefers the term ‘determinative phrases’) as opposed to those of nouns. The emphasis throughout is on the morphosyntax and lexical status of names, and in particular of personal names, which are taken to be more central to the category than other types such as family names and place-names. As regards semantics, Anderson adopts what he describes as a “‘modified Millian’ view” (p. 206), arguing that rather than involving reference only, names also carry a limited amount of sense. Thus, for instance, suffixes such as *-ton*, *-ham*, *-wick*, *-bridge* and *-ford* function as markers of settlement names (p. 116), a name such as *Edinburgh Castle* contains the sense information that it refers to a castle (p. 118), and a name such as *Mary* carries the sense of human and female (pp. 118–19). In this respect names are taken to resemble pronouns, which also have “minimal sense” (p. 136) but convey attributes such as male or female, singular or plural. Central to the overall argument is the semantic distinction between classes of entities denoted by nouns (*author*, *reviewer*, *journal*) and individuals denoted variously by noun phrases (*this author*, *the present reviewer*, *the journal of the Society for Name Studies*), pronouns (*he*, *she*, *it*), or names (*John Anderson*, *Carole Hough*, *Nomina*). From this it appears to follow that names belong categorially with pronouns rather than with nouns, or as Anderson puts it: “Names are, in principle, highly specific determinative identifiers” (p. 239).

The book is divided into three main parts, each containing two or more chapters. Part I: “Why Names?” provides an introduction to notional theories of grammar, and outlines a system of syntactic categories. This serves as a framework for the subsequent exploration of the place of names within the system, and the conclusion to Chapter 1 offers alternative routes through the rest of the book. Part II: “Approaches to the Study of Names” discusses previous name scholarship within the three overlapping disciplines of onomastics (mainly onomastic theory), philosophy and linguistics. Substantial overviews are presented of all three, with some scathing comments both on the work of individual name scholars (pp. 80, 109–10 n.5) and on the editing standards characteristic of the published proceedings of

International Congresses of Onomastic Sciences (p. 110 n.6). Part III: “Towards a Grammar of Names” comprises a sustained exposition of the grammatical status of names, focusing first on their roles as arguments, in nominations, and as vocatives, then on properties shared with other categories such as determiners and pronouns, and finally on issues relating to syntax and the lexicon. The concluding section argues strongly that the centrality of names to the linguistic system is evidenced both by their range of relationships to other categories and by their function as “referential utterances that do not have to depend on indefinitely recursive descriptions” (pp. 332–33).

The methodological focus throughout the book is on prototypical usages of names and other word classes. This results in some valuable insights, as for instance in helping to account for differences in grammatical behaviour between “core names” and name extensions (p. 184). It also strengthens the link between names and pronouns, as “the centrality of personal names in the class of names is parallel to the centrality of personal pronouns ... in the system of deictics” (p. 207). Some interesting comparisons are drawn between names and abstract mass terms, which are themselves sometimes used as a source of personal names such as *Patience*, *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity* (pp. 234–35), and between non-prototypical names of different types. An example of the latter is the use of the definite article with the names of ships (but not of boats), as well as with those of rivers, channels, seas, oceans and some buildings (pp. 184–85). It would have been good to see further discussion of the relative prototypicality of different classes of names, as outlined in the author’s 2003 article ‘On the structure of names’ (*Folia Linguistica* 37: 347–98). Perhaps worth considering, for instance, is whether the function of ships as temporary places of residence may bring them closer to the settlement names central to the class of place-names, with boat names more strongly exhibiting the anthropomorphization to which Anderson draws attention (p. 184).

On the periphery of the category, boundaries between names and non-names may not always accord with the expectations of most onomasts. Anderson refers disparagingly to the inclusion of bird-names within onomastic studies (pp. 5, 76–77, 99), apparently overlooking their relevance as components of early personal names and place-names

(despite noting on p. 96 that animal names are one of the most plentiful sources of nickname-type surnames). However, his own study includes several groups of ‘names’ that would probably be regarded as more dubious by members of this Society. Among them are nouns with a single referent such as *the Sun* (pp. 137–38, 142, 315) and *the King* (p. 315), professional terms such as *Nurse* (pp. 205, 221, 282), ‘kinship names’ such as *Mother*, *Mum* and *Mom* (p. 205), ‘nonce names’ such as *Waitress*, *Friend* and *Mate* (p. 282, where *Mother* is also included as a ‘nonce name’ although p. 205 appears to reject such a classification), ‘temporal names’ such as *today* (p. 314), ‘generic names’ such as *Man*, *Woman* (p. 309), *skat*, *tennis* and *physics* (p. 310), ‘numeral-based names’, i.e. numbers (pp. 206, 310–12), and ‘hour names’ based on numbers (p. 206). It is difficult to accept *town* as a type of “deictically restricted (‘situationally defined’)” place-name, and the statement that “Capitalization of *Yesterday* is also variable” does not accord with my experience (p. 205). The suggestion that ‘calendrical names’ such as *Monday* and *Easter* function as “temporary place names” (p. 204) is interesting in terms of recent work on the metaphorical relationship between time and space, but is far removed from the usual meaning of ‘place-name’ within this journal.

The book is impeccably written and produced. I noticed fewer than half-a-dozen typos in total, and a selection of references from the eighteen-page bibliography all proved accurate. Most are drawn from the linguistic rather than onomastic literature, although the discussion engages closely with work by leading name scholars such as Richard Coates, Fran Colman and Peter Kitson, and alludes more briefly to that of others such as Margaret Gelling, Bill Nicolaisen and Veronica Smart. The subject index appears to be fairly comprehensive, except that I was unable to find either boat names or ship names. A useful feature is a separate author index, making it easy to trace references to the publications of individual scholars. Anderson’s own work naturally features prominently, with twenty-four bibliography entries dating between 1971 and 2006, and more than a hundred individual citations within the author index. The present study draws heavily on his previous research, in particular the book and article mentioned above, and incorporates much material both from the latter and from its 2004

companion piece, 'On the grammatical status of names' (*Language* 80: 435–74). A minor irritation is a tendency to refer to his own publications in the third person as though they represent independent opinions. Examples include "Anderson (1997) suggests" (p. 26), "according to Anderson (1997)" (p. 137), "what Anderson (2004c) calls **primary identification**" (p. 139), "As Anderson (2004c) insists" (p. 176), "as Anderson (2004c) acknowledges" (p. 183), "Anderson (2003a) suggests" (p. 207), and even "Anderson ... concludes, rather weakly" (p. 255 n. 4)!

Finally, although the book deals primarily with contemporary rather than historical evidence, and is directed, as announced on the book jacket, towards "scholars and advanced students of linguistics and philosophy" rather than towards onomasts, it may offer an intriguing perspective on the perennial question of the stage at which a lexical description becomes a name. The traditional view is of course that this stage is reached when the original meaning of the description becomes irrelevant, so that the name functions as a lexically-meaningless label whether or not it remains semantically transparent. This view has always been problematic, not least because semantic meaning is arguably integral to certain types of name. As Anderson points out with regard to personal names, this applies both to earlier periods of English, when "Name-givers may wish to attribute qualities to the namees by their choice of name (*Modesty, Patience, Felicity, etc.*)" (p. 85), and to modern languages such as Mohawk and Sirionó, both of which make use of descriptive names (p. 100). So too in the case of place-names such as *Edinburgh Castle* mentioned above and Coates' example of *The Old Vicarage* (pp. 117–18), as well as phrasal names such as *The University of Glasgow* (pp. 107, 315–17), the semantic meanings of *castle*, *vicarage* and *university* are difficult to ignore. If the hypothesis presented in this book is accepted, it may be possible to identify the transition to a name on formal grounds as the stage at which the description—in English, usually based on a noun, although in other languages such as Mohawk, on a verb (p. 100)—ceases to function as a member of the original syntactic category, and begins to function as a determinative.

CAROLE HOUGH

NICK HIGHAM, ed, *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, Volume 7. The Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2007. xii + 253 pp. £50 Hardback (ISBN 978-1-84383-312-3)

For those interested in English place-names, the fact that the overwhelming majority of those names are of Anglo-Saxon origin, and formed from Old English elements, leads to the hope that their study will illuminate the history of the Anglo-Saxon settlements. The traditional narrative, derived from Gildas, Nennius and Bede, that the incoming settlers forcibly drove the British inhabitants into Wales, Cornwall and Brittany, resulted in a neglect of the possibility of a Celtic origin for English place-names. Recent work, culminating in *Celtic Voices, English Places* by Richard Coates and his collaborators¹ has yielded perhaps a ten-fold increase in the number of English place-names of Celtic origin. But this is ten times a very small number, and is itself comparatively insignificant, leaving the traditional narrative explanation largely untouched.

Unfortunately, trends in both history and archaeology have been leading in the opposite direction. In a reaction to the “Waves of Invaders” model lampooned in *1066 And All That*, historians have stressed continuity, where most of the population remained, and only the elites changed, bringing fashionable culture with them. Archaeologists too, have failed to find in the ground the destruction found in the historical sources, and failed to distinguish the material culture of the supposed Germanic immigrants from that of the supposed native population. Linguists, and especially place-name scholars, with Richard Coates as the standard bearer, have responded by pointing out that we speak English: we know roughly how many of the Norman elite arrived, and although they had an effect on the language (principally on the vocabulary) they failed to change it. Going back, we can estimate the size of the Danish invasions—or at least argue over the size—they had a permanent effect on the language, and on the place-names of the

¹ Richard Coates, Andrew Breeze and David Horovitz, *Celtic Voices English places: Studies of the Celtic impact on place-names in England* (Stamford, 2000).

Danelaw, but we still speak English. The encounter between the British and the Anglo-Saxons was of a completely different order: not only was there an almost complete replacement of place-names, but there was only a minimal transfer of words from Brittonic to Old English—and an even smaller traffic in the reverse direction. The two communities seem to have had almost no contact, something that is practically impossible if there was “continuity” rather than “change”. Expulsion rather than massacre or enslavement seems more likely, and the Latin verb *exterminare*, used by Gildas, does literally mean ‘expulsion’. At this point, we may turn to genetic scientists and DNA testing. The only investigative techniques available at present are the examination of the Y-chromosome (which gives a direct male lineage), and of mitochondrial DNA (for the direct female line). The first study of existing populations in England² seemed to support the traditional historical story, but this was swiftly followed by a second³ which, despite having two authors in common, represented a complete *volte face* by supporting the “continuity” model, and even suggesting that the Danes might have had a greater demographic impact than the Anglo-Saxons!

So what of the volume under review? This represents the proceedings of a conference held in Manchester in 2004, which brought together some of the main participants in the debates, from the fields of history, archaeology and linguistics. This has been eagerly awaited, to see how the final versions of those papers might throw light on the subject. The progress into print has clearly not been smooth: the volume is dedicated to one of the key contributors, Patrick Wormald, who tragically died not long after the conference, and whose contribution consequently does not appear in the volume. Of the two DNA scientists who took part, one of

² Michael E. Weale, Deborah A. Weiss, Rolf F. Jager, Neil Bradman and Mark G. Thomas, ‘Y Chromosome Evidence for Anglo-Saxon Mass Migration’, *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 19 (7), (2002), 1008–1021.

³ Cristian Capelli, Nicola Redhead, Julia K. Abernethy, Fiona Gratrix, James F. Wilson, Torolf Moen, Tor Hervig, Martin Richards, Michael P. H. Stumpf, Peter A. Underhill, Paul Bradshaw, Alom Shaha, Mark G. Thomas, Neal Bradman and David B. Goldstein, ‘A Y Chromosome Census of the British Isles’, *Current Biology*, 13 (2003), 979–984.

whom had been an author of both the papers cited above, “neither felt able to provide a contribution to this volume” (p. 13). This is a serious deficiency, and may well reduce the value of the book. The editor, Nick Higham (a prominent proponent of the “continuity” model), provides an introduction which sets the scene, and outlines the history of the controversy, highlighting some of the points made by the contributors. The book then has two parts: the first, with eleven papers (including one by the editor), is entitled “Archaeological and Historical Perspectives”; the second, with only five papers, “Linguistic Perspectives”.

It often sounds like a good idea to bring together the key participants in a controversy, but what happens if they have nothing new to say? At a conference, a number of approaches are possible. Catherine Hills (‘Anglo-Saxon Attitudes’) chose to present an ironic look at how the controversy had been presented in recent television programmes and books, alluding to Angus Wilson and Lewis Carroll. This was probably ideal as a conference presentation, but seems rather slight when embalmed for posterity. Heinrich Härke (‘Invisible Britons, Gallo-Romans and Russians: Perspectives on Culture Change’) decided to illuminate his subject by examining the fall of the Soviet Empire (two photographs). Richard Coates, in the ambitiously titled ‘Invisible Britons: The View from Linguistics’, chose to present a lengthy and probably definitive statement of his position. (The place-name evidence has been discussed in a companion paper⁴, published elsewhere.) Unfortunately for Coates, the linguists do not speak with one voice. Hildegard Tristram (‘Why Don’t the English Speak Welsh?’) proposes that the Britons stayed where they were, discarded their vocabulary, adopting Old English vocabulary into the phonology and syntax of Brittonic. Old English was purely a written language, and the spoken language emerged as Middle English. While we are puzzling over this, it takes a historian, Alex Woolf (‘Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England’), to point out (p. 126) that Tristram’s main object is to demonstrate that Modern English is actually a Celtic language, rather

⁴ Richard Coates, ‘Invisible Britons: The View from Toponomastics’, in *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland*, edited by Paul Cavill and George Broderick (Nottingham, 2007), pp. 43–55.

than to establish precisely how that might have occurred! This illustrates another feature of the volume: the contributors were clearly enjoined to engage with each other's work, but it rather seems that they did so on the basis of published work (presumably because the individual contributions were prepared separately in advance of the conference), and it is not obvious that they have taken into account what the others actually said at the conference. The result seems to give the impression that they are speaking past each other. This may particularly relate to the work of one of the other linguists, Peter Schrijver ('What Britons Spoke around 400 AD') who crams an awful lot into a mere six and a half pages. He may, however, have subtly adjusted his position without everyone actually noticing. Working from two words in a single Celtic Latin inscription on a pewter disc ("disk" on p. 168), he shows that they are closer to Gaulish than British. He seems to have adopted something of the "Atlantic Celts" theory—that the Celtic language in the "Highland Zone" or western fringe of both Britain and Gaul was always different from that of the "Lowland Zone", and that Lowland British was similar to Gaulish. While the similarity of Frisian to Old English suggests that the language of the Germanic settlers completely replaced the former language of the Low Countries, a Romance language persisted in Lowland Gaul, with Brittonic spoken only at the fringe, in Brittany. How would that work in England? One should expect Old English to be spoken in Kent and perhaps Essex, a Romance language in the rest of Lowland England, and Brittonic in Wales and Cornwall... No, I don't think that does work! In any case, it seems generally agreed that Brittonic was carried into Brittany by emigrants (or refugees) from South-Western Britain. But the question of to what extent Latin was ever generally spoken in Lowland Britain remains a conundrum.

The other "linguistic" papers are more low-key. O. J. Padel—"Oliver Padel" appears in the index—('Place-Names and the Saxon Conquest of Devon and Cornwall') discusses the distribution of Brittonic and Old English elements, principally *tre* and *tūn*, and concludes that there was a complete change in the linguistic and ethnic makeup of the settlements in Devon, linking this to known history. Duncan Probert ('Mapping Early Medieval Language Change in South-West England') looks at borrowings of Brittonic into Old English as preserved in place-names

from Wiltshire to Devon, but perhaps harbouring the ambition of pinpointing where Brittonic divided into Primitive Welsh and Primitive Cornish.

There is no bibliography, but there is an index. Footnotes are where they should be, at the foot of the page, but the somewhat archaic referencing system (a reference is given in full the first time in an individual paper, but subsequent references are shortened) means that without a bibliography time is wasted hunting for the full reference. There is a page of abbreviations, but that is at the beginning, before the editor's introduction (and there is some suspicion that it is for the editor's benefit—there are other frequently referenced works that could have been included.) The index, however, only indexes the main text, and not the footnotes. (I suspect that it was anticipated that the notes would be at the end of each paper, rather than as footnotes.) Now, as it is essentially only an index of names and places, whether a contemporary scholar is indexed depends on the vagaries of the citing conventions: at least one “(pers. comm.)” (on p. 121) remains in the main text rather than being banished to the footnotes. It is difficult to discern a pattern to county conventions: the index has Abingdon (Berkshire), but Frilford (Oxfordshire). Turning to the latter page, one spies the reference in the footnote: “Researches and Excavations carried on in an Ancient Cemetery at Frilford, near Abingdon, Berks ...”! Moreover, the index proves unreliable: Steven Bassett has entries for pages 93, 106 [where he doesn't appear] and 121, but not for page 97, where he appears as “Stephen Bassett”. At this point, one rather suspects that the copy-editor prepared the index, and a glance at the acknowledgements seems to confirm this. The authors' references seem often to have been painfully converted back from the Harvard system: a stray “White, 1988” appears in the caption to illustration 4.3. (Here's a tip for nitpicking reviewers: for technical reasons, figure captions receive less proof reading than the main text. Sure enough, “pennanular brooches” appear in the captions to illustrations 4.2 and 4.3.)

Two papers in the “Archaeological and Historical Perspectives” part should be mentioned: C. P. Lewis' (‘Welsh Territories and Welsh Identities in Late Anglo-Saxon England’) and David E. Thornton's (‘Some Welshmen in Domesday Book and Beyond: Aspects of Anglo-

Welsh Relations in the Eleventh Century’). They are interesting in their own right, but do not really belong in this volume—they are from the “wrong end” of the Anglo-Saxon period—they are about “Britons”, but the “wrong” Britons. I suppose this just illustrates the problem of keeping a tight control over the content of a conference, and of a conference publication. As for the form of the publication (criticised above) both the editor and the publisher should have had a tighter control over how it was produced, rather than leaving important issues to a hapless copy-editor.

What is the general conclusion about this volume? Despite its shortcomings—of which the lack of papers on DNA genetics is the most serious—it remains a valuable summary of the current state of research into the subject. How long it will retain that status will depend on progress in solving the pressing questions posed—I rather fear that it will be for rather a long time.

JOHN W. BRIGGS

JOHN T. KOCH in collaboration with Raimund Karl, Antone Minard, and Simon Ó Faoláin, *An Atlas for Celtic Studies: Archaeology and Names in Ancient Europe and Early Medieval Ireland, Britain, and Brittany*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007. viii + 215 pp. £50 Hardback (ISBN 978-1-84217-309-1) Available in North America from the David Brown Book Company, Oakville, Connecticut.

John Koch’s atlas is one of the most useful books on Celtic Studies ever published; every Celticist in the world should have a copy. It has three main parts, together with a full bibliography and index of names. The first thirty-nine pages discuss linguistic and archaeological evidence for the Celts. These are sharply written and have pointed remarks on those (British archaeologists, mainly) who think the Celts never existed. They also comment drily on Celtic Studies as (a) taught in universities and (b) purveyed by burgeoning popular scholarship. They close with further detached observations, this time on King Arthur. Then follow sixty-five pages of the main map sequence, showing toponyms and material

evidence for the Celts. Most of these deal with ancient Europe (including Britain and Ireland) and Asia Minor; the rest are concerned with early medieval Ireland, Britain, and Brittany.

After the maps follows more text in the third section, headed "Categories of Evidence". This begins with the ancient world, discussing material culture (earthworks, ritual sites, spears, horse-trappings, coins, battle-fields, and so on). Five pages provide information of exemplary fullness and concision on place- and group-names from ancient Europe, together with maps of the Lower Rhône and the Italian Lakes. (These are amongst many small maps within the text, complementing the main ones in part two.) This third section continues with similar treatment of archaeology and language in early medieval Ireland, Celtic Britain, and Brittany. It includes fifteen pages on linguistic evidence, most of them given over to the text of all 630 of the early Christian inscriptions from those lands. The book ends with a bibliography and index of the five thousand or so names plotted on the maps.

The volume is a masterly achievement. The clarity with which archaeological remains are surveyed and analysed comes as a revelation. However, readers of *Nomina* will be more interested in its comments on language. By providing and locating thousands of forms (with general commentary) from Britain, Gaul, Spain, the Balkans, Galatia, and the like, the author and his team do fundamental services for the study of ancient history, even when acknowledging the difficulties involved in writing it for the Celts. For anyone concerned with what Professor Koch almost calls a Continental Celtic Empire, *An Atlas for Celtic Studies* is the necessary guide. Equally helpful is its locating of medieval peoples, forts, towns, monasteries, battlefields, and so on. What might with difficulty be sought in many books and journals is brought together with admirable completeness. The maps are models in the presentation of complex data (contrasting with, say, their dismal equivalents in Patrick Sims-Williams's recent *Ancient Place-Names of Europe and Asia Minor*). In short, this work is a volume of wonderful comprehensiveness and accuracy, a tool essential for all researchers on this subject.

Its usefulness is proved by the way that it can be corrected and added to. Here is a sample of comments suggested by it. Dr Isaac's views (p. 21) on "non-Indo-European" river-names in eastern Scotland are a confession

of failure. *Boderia* (= the River Forth), which he thinks pre-Celtic, can without difficulty be shown as a corruption of Celtic *Bodra* 'defiled river' (the Forth was long notorious for morasses). *Vacomagi* (p. 21) is also corrupt and emendation to *Vocomiugi* 'firm comrades' makes better sense. *Arecluta* (p. 33) is poor evidence for early Scotland, as it surely refers not to Clydeside but to Arclid (near Chester), the likely birthplace of Gildas. As such it explains that writer's ignorance (p. 36) of the Roman walls, far to the north.

For the main maps these comments may be made. *Verubium* (15.1) for Noss Head, Caithness, is a corruption that should be read as *Verudium* 'very red (cape)'. The headland is of Old Red Sandstone. For *Taizalon* in Buchan read *Taixalon*, which can be shown as Celtic. For *Bodotria* (15.2) read *Bodra* 'defiled one', the River Forth. *Abravannus* 'very feeble (river)' (15.3) should be placed by Piltanton Burn (to which it refers), away from Water of Luce. *Corieltauvi* (15.5) is the aberrant spelling of a griffito: read *Corieltavi* 'warband of many rivers'. *Durotriges* (15.7) is also corrupt. Read *Durotrages* 'fortress hounds', as proved by inscriptions from Hadrian's Wall. For *Ardaoni* (= Portchester, Hampshire) read *Adiuni* 'beloved stream', as implied by ADIUNE in inscription 120 on p. 172.

Din Guairoi for Bamburgh (map 21.2) is Old Welsh for 'theatre fortress', as proposed by Ifor Williams. It was a mere book-name, alluding to an Anglo-Saxon auditorium like the one excavated at Yeavinger. On map 21.3, *Heavenfield* is correctly placed north of the Wall, but the battle of 633 was fought at Rowley Burn, three miles south of Hexham, itself referred to by another Old Welsh book-name, *Cantscaul* 'young warrior's enclosure'. The battlefield and form *Cantscaul* are thus here misplaced. Also misplaced is the battle of the *Unued* in 655. It should be relocated eastwards to where the old York-Doncaster road crosses the River Went. *Bannaventa* (map 23) as St Patrick's birthplace should be moved from the Midlands to Banwell (in Somerset/Avon), which in part preserves its name. Asser's *Ruim* (not *Historia Brittonum*'s corrupt 'Ruoihm') is shown correctly for Thanet in Kent. It means 'bond' and is yet another Old Welsh book-name without popular currency, like *Tigguocobauc* 'cavy house, house of caves' for Nottingham. Old Kea (map 25) in Cornwall is the 'Rosnat' of Irish hagiography and the 'Wincdi-lantquendi' (read *Lantocensi*) of Rhygyfarch's life of St David. In the sixth century it had a

famous monastic school, attracting students from Ireland and Wales. Finally, on the forts of the Saxon Shore (p. 107), *Gariannonor* (= Burgh Castle, near Yarmouth), should be emended to *Garannum* 'heron-river (fort)', and *Adurni* (= Portchester) should read *Adiuni*, as already noted for *Ardaoni*.

The above remarks, all restricted to Britain, point to the prodigious amount of information that can be extracted from this atlas. It covers lands from Donegal to Turkey; it contains work for the lifetimes of many scholars. It cannot fail to achieve its purpose. The benefits of using it will be immense. Linguists, historians, and archaeologists should press ahead to obtain copies with all possible speed.

ANDREW BREEZE