

THE JOURNAL OF SCOTTISH NAME STUDIES

THE FUTURE OF THE JOURNAL

PUBLISHER

From its inception in 2007, *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* has been published by Clann Tuirc. From next year (2020), it will be published by Celtic and Gaelic at the University of Glasgow.

EDITOR(S)

To date, the journal has been edited by Simon Taylor (Vols 1–3) and jointly by Simon Taylor and Richard A.V. Cox (Vols 4–13).

Vol. 14 is to be edited by guest editor Sarah Künzler, with Simon Taylor as consultant editor (Richard Cox has retired). It will contain articles resulting from a series of seminars led by Dr Künzler at the University of Glasgow on the overall theme of ‘Challenging perspectives: new approaches to the Scottish landscape through the study of place-names’.

SUBMISSIONS

Submissions are welcome as usual. However, while shorter varia will be considered for inclusion in Vol. 14, main articles will be held back and considered for inclusion in Vol. 15.

PICTISH *PONT 'BRIDGE' AS A PLACE-NAME ELEMENT:
PITPOINTIE IN ITS WIDER CONTEXTS

NICK AITCHISON

INTRODUCTION

The number of identified place-name elements in or derived from the Pictish language is still small but has increased exponentially, rising from only six in 1955 to fourteen by 1996, 32 by 2011 and 40 by 2012 (Jackson 1955, 146–49; Nicolaisen 1996; Taylor 2011, 83–108; *PNF* 5, 149–57, *infra*; see also Nicolaisen 2007; James 2009, 150–54). That so few Pictish place-name elements are known is hardly surprising given our very limited knowledge of the Pictish language and the small number and largely unintelligible character of surviving Pictish textual sources. As a result, place-names themselves provide the principal source of Pictish topographic terms. This is particularly apparent in the case of place-names incorporating the most commonly attested toponymic element of Pictish origin, *pett* (below).

Less frequently attested place-name elements derived from Pictish pose considerable challenges of identification and interpretation because of the paucity of evidence and difficulties in identifying meaningful comparisons or convincing cognate forms. Nevertheless, this may still be a rewarding endeavour because of their potential contribution to our knowledge of not only Pictish toponymy but also the Pictish language itself. Pictish toponymic elements and those of Pictish origin may potentially provide the largest single resource and best opportunity for adding to our knowledge of the Pictish lexicon.

Against this background, one Pictish place-name element deserves more detailed analysis than it has received previously. William J. Watson in his pioneering *The Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (1926, 348) was the first to note that 'Welsh [*sic*, i.e. Brittonic] *pont*, "bridge", from Latin *pons*, *pontis*, seems to appear in ... Pitpointie' (ANG). Despite this, both Pitpointie and the (possibly) Pictish place-name element **pont* have attracted surprisingly little attention, featuring only occasionally and peripherally in publications. More fundamentally, the interpretation of the toponymic term **pont* in Pitpointie has been challenged recently. As a result, the significance of Pitpointie and its wider implications, if any, remain unclear. This paper assesses the currency of **pont* 'bridge' as a place-name element in the area of historical Pictland during the early medieval period, analysing Pitpointie within its wider linguistic, toponymic and topographical contexts.

PITPOINTIE: SOURCES AND RECORDED FORMS

The four earliest forms of this place-name are recorded in three charters recording grants of land or pensions, preserved in the *St Andrews Liber*. A variety of later sources, textual and cartographic, also record variant forms of the same place-name:

- Petpuntin* 1 September 1196 × the early thirteenth-century *St Andrews Liber*, 325; Ash et al. 1999, no. 332
- Pethpo[n]tin* 1240 × 1250 *St Andrews Liber*, 284; Ash et al. 1999, no. 276
- Petpontin* 1240 × 1250 *St Andrews Liber*, 284; Ash et al. 1999, no. 276
- Petponti* after 1333 [from a reference to the Battle of Halidon Hill] *St Andrews Liber*, 399; Ash et al. 1999, no. 424
- Pratpouty* 1471 *RMS* ii no. 1039
- Petpoynt* 1493 *RMS* ii no. 2158
- Petpuinty* c.1583 × 1596 *Pont* 26
- Petpuinty* 1593 *RMS* v no. 2273
- Pitpoyntie* 1606 *RMS* vi no. 1768
- Pitpointie* 1678 Edward 1678
- Pitpointie* pre-1732 Moll 1745

The place-name survives as Pitpointie (NGR NO356374), Auchterhouse, 9 km north-east of Dundee city centre.

Toponymists have referred to this place-name as *Petponti* (Watson 1926, 348), *Petponti(n)* (Nicolaisen 1968, 147; 1995, 139; 1996, 7; 2001, 197; Rhys 2015, 339) and also by its modern form, Pitpointie (Nicolaisen 1996, 12; Cox 1997, 52; Rhys 2015, 240, n. 497). Confusion about the correct form and/or interpretation of this place-name is indicated by the rendering of *Petpuntin* as *Penpunt* (Ash et al. 1999, no. 332). However, there is no evidence to support this emendation. As no explanation is given, *Penpunt* appears to represent a typographical error for *Petpunt*, presumably influenced by Penpont (DMF) (below), rather than a deliberate emendation of *pet* for Pictish **pen* ‘head, end, promontory’ (on which see Taylor 2011, 93).

The following observations may be made on the variant forms recorded in the *St Andrews Liber*:

- The earliest attested form is *Petpuntin*, despite the wide possible date range of the charter in which it is recorded
- *Pethpo[n]tin* preserves *peth*, an orthographic variant of *pett* which is commonly attested in thirteenth-century records of other *pett* place-names, for example *Pethcorthin* 1266, Pitcorthie (FIF) (*PNF* 3, 173)
- The three earliest recorded forms – *Petpuntin*, *Pethpo[n]tin* and *Petponti* –

each preserve the distinctive locative terminal *-in*, a 'suffix used to indicate a place-name ... "place of" or "place at"' (*PNF* 5, 407).¹ This is found in other place-names and place-name elements within the area of historical Pictland, for example **login* (Clancy 2016, 27–8, 52–71). Although *-in* may have originated in Pictish, it is prominent in the coining and recording of Gaelic place-names (*PNF* 5, 407–11; see also Ó Maolalaigh 1998, 30–38)

- The development *Petpuntin*, *Pethpo[n]tin*, *Petpontin* > *Petponti*, *Pitpyontie*, *Pitpointie* attests the loss of the terminal *-in* and its replacement by *-ie*, which is widespread in (particularly) north-east Scotland and also occurs in, for example, **login* > *logie* (Clancy 2016, 27–28, 52–71)

The first element of Pitpointie is unambiguously *pett*, the most commonly-attested place-name element of Pictish origin. This survives in Pit- place-names, over 300 of which are recorded in eastern Scotland (Jackson 1955, 146–48; Nicolaisen 1996, 6; 2001, 195, 198, Fig. 17), although it is claimed that 'There may be up to 1000 place-names in Scotland with *pett* as their generic' (Rhys 2015, 338–39, citing Simon Taylor pers. comm.; see also Taylor 2011, 105). The meaning of *pett* is widely thought to originate in a 'piece', 'portion' or 'share' of land (Watson 1926, 407–14; Jackson 1955, 146–48; Nicolaisen 1996, 6–17; 2001, 195–98, 200–04). By around the ninth century, *pett* had become a generic word for an estate dependent on a shire or thanage centre (Barrow 1973 [2003, 49–50]; Taylor 1997, 10). Although 'dependent estate', referring to 'a piece of land within a larger administrative unit', helpfully conveys the meaning of *pett* (Taylor 1997, 10), it is now interpreted as referring to a 'land-holding, unit of land' (Taylor 2011, 103) or 'land-holding, farm' (*PNF* 5, 468). There is no absolute chronology for *pett* place-names and their dating is difficult. Nevertheless, *pett* place-names are thought to have been in use by the ninth century (Taylor 1997, 10), although most were probably coined during the eleventh and twelfth centuries (*PNF* 5, 222).

Place-names in *pett* are almost always compounded with Gaelic place-name elements rather than ones of Pictish origin (Cox 1997, 47–53; Nicolaisen 2001, 197, 200–01; Taylor 2011, 77–79; *PNF* 5, 217–25; Rhys 2015, 338–43). This reveals that *pett* place-names do not provide direct evidence of Pictish settlement because the *pett* element was borrowed into Gaelic. Simon Taylor (2011, 103) places *pett* in Category 3, the third highest, of his four 'degrees of Pictishness', consisting of 'P-Celtic loan words attested as common nouns in Scottish Gaelic'. By contrast, W.F.H. Nicolaisen ruled out a Gaelic coining for Pitpointie. According to Nicolaisen (2001, 197, 200), Pitpointie 'is the only [*pett* place-]name in which the second element can definitely be said to be of non-Gaelic Celtic origin, as it

1. Thomas Owen Clancy (2016, 28) expresses 'some doubt that this is quite the correct interpretation' but concedes that he 'lack[s] a convincing alternative'.

has obviously to be compared with Welsh *pont* ‘bridge’.² Although Nicolaisen does not state so explicitly, he clearly implies that **pont* is a place-name element of Pictish origin. If so, this makes Pitpointie very unusual and deserving more detailed analysis.

However, Nicolaisen’s confidence appears to have been misplaced. Nicolaisen may have based his identification of Pitpointie as a wholly Pictish place-name on the absence of evidence that **pont* was loaned into Gaelic and, therefore, that the specific was not a Gaelic word. Alternatively, his belief that Pitpointie comprises two diagnostically Brittonic elements may reflect the traditional belief that the phoneme /p/ is not native to the Goidelic languages (e.g. Mackinnon 1887, 98; Macbain 1922, 137), thereby implying that the **pont* place-name element is, or at least originates in, Pictish. Although Latin /p/ appears as Irish /c/ in the earliest stratum of Latin loanwords in Irish (e.g. Latin *Patricius* > Primitive Irish **Q^uatricius* > **Q^uotricius* > Old Irish *Cothriche*), words containing /p/ were being adopted into Old Irish by as early as the sixth century (e.g. Latin *Patricius* > British Latin **Padrigius* > Old Irish *Pádraig*) (Jackson 1953, 126–28, 610). In addition, the presence of words with /p/ in early Scottish Gaelic may be inferred from their currency in Middle Irish (below). As a result, claims that Pitpointie is not a Gaelic place-name have no sustainable linguistic basis. Even if both its elements originated in Pictish, Pitpointie, like other *pett*- place-names, nevertheless represents a Gaelic coining.

Despite the fact that Pictish **pont* ‘bridge’ must have been loaned into early Gaelic to form the place-name Pitpointie, there appears to be no evidence for **pont* ‘bridge’ in Gaelic, either as a lexical item or in a place-name, other than the two or possibly three place-names discussed in this paper. Although this might appear problematic, it may be relevant that there is very limited evidence for the adoption of *pett* into Gaelic. Despite *pett* being such a common place-name element in the area of historical Pictland, *peit* is only attested twice in Gaelic literature, both in the sense ‘croft’ (Watson 1926, 408), while *peite* ‘patch of land’ is attested only in Lewis Gaelic (Cox 1997, 50). (Early) Gaelic *pont* 1 ‘fierce, vehement’ 2 ‘cruel’ (Dwelly 2001, 732) carries an entirely unrelated meaning, which is unattested in place-names. If anything, the absence of Gaelic **pont* as a lexical item may support its Pictish origin, perhaps suggesting a specialised meaning confined to a very limited number of surviving place-names.

2. Although it has been suggested that two other *pett* place-names, *Pitbladdo* (FIF) and *Pitfour* (PER), may also contain two non-Gaelic elements (Cox 1997, 52; Nicolaisen 2001, 197, 200), these can be interpreted as Gaelic place-names (Watson 1926, 377, 407, 411; *PNF* 4, 304–05; 5, 299).

PREVIOUS INTERPRETATIONS AND THEIR ASSESSMENT

Following Watson's lead (above), Nicolaisen (1968, 147; 1995, 139; 2001, 197) – the other leading toponymist of Scotland during the twentieth century – repeatedly noted the non-Gaelic character of Pitpointie and continued to compare it with Welsh *pont*. Welsh *pont* 'bridge' is a common toponymic element, often applied to a town or village that has developed at one end of a bridge (Owen and Morgan 2007, lxiii, 89, 99, 318, 362, 371, 381, 386–95, 454–55). As a result of this close similarity in form, Nicolaisen (1996, 12) interpreted Pitpointie as meaning 'bridge portion'. More specifically, the presence of the locative suffix *-in* 'at' in its earliest recorded forms and current interpretations of *pett* (above) suggest that Pitpointie may be translated as 'place of/at bridge landholding or farm'. This indicates that the farm or landholding concerned was situated at a bridge, from which it derived its name.

The endorsement by both Watson and Nicolaisen of Pictish **pont* 'bridge' in Pitpointie might have ensured that the issue remained closed. But does the comparison of the element **pont* in Pitpointie with Welsh *pont* 'bridge' stand up to critical analysis? Simon Taylor (2011, 83–108) does not include **pont* in his glossary of Pictish place-name elements, although it does appear in his *The Place-Names of Fife* (PNF 4, 185–86; 5, 472). More recently, the interpretation of Pictish **pont* 'bridge' has been challenged by Guto Rhys (2015, 240, n.497) on the grounds that Pitpointie 'is not situated near any waterway that would require a bridge'. Rhys (2015, 340, n.698; my emphasis) later appears to relax his position slightly, stating that 'the location offers no watercourses which would require a bridge of any significant size', but his point is clear. Does this apparent discrepancy between toponymy and topography expose **pont* as either a corruption or a false friend? In the apparent absence of a requirement for a bridge, Rhys advances an alternative interpretation. Claiming that Pitpointie is located 'in the bottom of a depression' and comparing **pont* with Welsh *pant* 'hollow, depression, valley' (GPC, s.v. *pant*), Rhys (2015, 240, n.497; see also 340, n.698) finds the derivation of **pont* from Pictish **pant*, a cognate of Welsh *pant*, 'very appealing'. As a result, the former consensus in favour of **pont* 'bridge' as a place-name element of Pictish origin appears to have evaporated, leaving its currency as controversial at best.

Although Rhys's argument is initially persuasive, there are three possible objections to it. Firstly and most fundamentally, all the recorded forms of this place-name consistently give the element concerned as *-pont*, or its variant forms *-point* or *-punt*, from its earliest attestation (above). This is still preserved in its current form, Pitpointie. There is simply no evidence that Pitpointie was ever a place-name in **pant*.

Secondly, Rhys is mistaken about the topographical context of this place-name. Pitpointie does not sit in a 'depression' but occupies a gently sloping and sheltered location on good-quality and well-drained agricultural land with a southward-facing aspect. These are all common characteristics of the location of *pett* place-names (Whittington and Soulsby 1968; Whittington 1974, 100–04; Nicolaisen 2001, 203–04). Indeed, these qualities are expressed in the most commonly surviving *pett* place-name, Pittendreich (and variant forms), 'landholding or farm of the (good) aspect' (Watson 1926, 413–14; Nicolaisen 1996, 10; *PNF* 2, 99–100; 3, 252). At least thirteen examples of this place-name are recorded in eastern Scotland, all of which are located on gentle, east- or south-facing slopes. Pitpointie is not marginal land. The farm of Pitpointie was valued at £133 6s 8d in 1802, out of a total valuation for the parish of Tealing of £1886 3s 4d (Land tax rolls, Angus, Vol. 6, 53; E106/16/6/53), and is recorded as 'A two storey house with good stading & offices and arable farm' in 1860 (*OSNB*, Forfarshire, OS1/14/84/3). One would not normally expect to find an apparently thriving arable farm located in a 'depression', which implies poorer-quality and damp or even waterlogged soil, making it both more difficult to work and less productive in its yields. Instead, Rhys appears to be referring to the hollow through which the western arm of the Fallaws Burn flows, located immediately to the south-east of Pitpointie, although this is (now) a minor feature.

Thirdly, although it appears to undermine fatally the (possible) identification of **pont* 'bridge' in Pitpointie, the absence of a watercourse requiring a bridge at Pitpointie may be explained in one of two ways. The first concerns possible changes in the landscape of Pitpointie since the early medieval period. The hollow through which the upper reaches of the Fallaws Burn flows is boggy, with a couple of pools of standing water. This watercourse was probably more prominent and its environs were probably even boggier in earlier periods. This may be supported by early maps (Pont 26; Edward 1678; Moll 1745), which depict Pitpointie as being located on or near a watercourse. The place-name either straddles or is beside the (unnamed) Fallaws Burn on all three maps, although both Moll and Edward mistakenly place the symbol denoting the location of the settlement closer to the upper reaches of the Fithie Burn. The impact of agricultural improvement, particularly field drainage schemes and the canalisation of watercourses, on the modern landscape and its hydrography, including at Pitpointie, should not be underestimated. A common theme in historical sources is that even what would now be considered as minor streams could formerly pose formidable barriers, prompting Geoffrey Barrow's (1984 [1992, 213]) observation of 'the wellnigh obsessive interest which our ancestors took in fords, many of them marking... what seem to us to be quite inconsiderable watercourses'. This 'obsessive interest' may also have been manifested in the

construction of bridges, particularly on watercourses where there were no convenient fords.

The second possible explanation for the apparent absence of a watercourse requiring a bridge at Pitpointie rests on the interpretation of the *pett*- place-name element and may now be considered.

*PETT AND *PONT: PITPOINTIE AS A PETT PLACE-NAME*

Pitpointie's status as a *pett*- place-name is also of potential relevance to the possible location of a bridge there. Rhys assumes that a place-name in **pont* acquired its toponym because it was the location of a bridge. Similarly, Nicolaisen (1996, 12) categorises the place-name Pitpointie 'bridge portion' as referring to its 'surroundings'. This is understandable, particularly given the close relationship between bridges and settlements attested in Welsh place-names in *pont* (above). However, a different relationship between Pitpointie and the bridge this toponym possibly refers to may be suggested by its status as a *pett*-place-name. *Pett* refers to an independent, directly-taxable landholding unit within a larger lordship, at least when the place-name Pitpointie was coined in Gaelic. As a result, it is possible that the place-name Pitpointie 'place of/at bridge land-holding or farm' may have referred not to a location at a bridge but to a landholding whose profits were reserved to fund the construction, repair and/or maintenance of a bridge or bridges, reflecting its status as productive agricultural land. As a result, the relationship between the bridge (**pont*) and land-holding or farm (*pett*) apparently attested in Pitpointie may have been fiscal rather than physical. If so, **pont* may still refer to a bridge without having to propose that there was formerly a watercourse at or near Pitpointie which required bridging. This possibility deserves more detailed consideration.

A *pett* was part of a larger administrative unit, an estate dependent on a shire or thanage centre (above). As a result, the bridge or bridges possibly referred to in the place-name Pitpointie may have been located elsewhere within the territory administered from that centre (below). Pitpointie, therefore, may denote a dependent landholding or farm whose revenues, presumably in the form of dues paid in agricultural produce, were dedicated to bridgework, reflecting the onerous costs incurred by those (presumably lords or kings) responsible for constructing and maintaining bridges. The extent and productivity of this early medieval *pett* is unknown but, if the value of Pitpointie in 1802 (above) is anything to go by, this appears to imply a major commitment to funding bridgework, with possible implications for the number and/or size of the bridges involved (below).

It may be tempting to draw an analogy between this hypothetical model for financing bridgework and better-documented practices in Anglo-Saxon

England and on the Continent (see Brooks 1971; 1995, 15; Cooper 2006, 8–65; Harrison 2007 vii, 35–43, 186–90). This may imply that, as the Pictish kingdom(s) developed, regulations or laws were introduced to direct the labour and raw materials required for building and maintaining bridges. However, Anglo-Saxon and continental analogies indicate that it is anachronistic to assume that the direct conscription of labour was commuted to the payment of renders and that specific landholdings were earmarked for the funding of bridgework before the tenth century, i.e. while the Pictish language was still extant. On the other hand, a possible scenario may be envisaged which saves the hypothesis of a landholding reserved for the funding of bridgework from anachronism. If Pictish **pont* ‘bridge’, like *pett*, was adopted into early Gaelic and both elements were still current in the Gaelic place-naming vocabulary of the region when such fiscal arrangements were introduced, then *Petpuntin* could have been coined during a period when these linguistic, toponymic and fiscal processes coincided.

If Pitpointie did acquire its name because it generated income which was used to fund bridgework then it is unclear why this place-name is unique. Given that over 300 *pett*- place-names are recorded (above), other examples of **pett-pont* place-names might be expected to have survived, although very few Pit- names occur more than once. Of greater concern, there do not appear to be any Gaelic place-names that could be interpreted as referring to fiscally-reserved landholdings referring to bridges. Such place-names are also unattested in early medieval England. Despite detailed discussion of English *brycg* and Scandinavian *bryggja* (Parsons and Styles 2000, 51–61), none of the examples cited refer to landholdings devoted to financing bridgework and the possibility of this is not even mentioned. Similarly in Scotland, place-names such as Drumnadrochit pertain to bridges but not to a landholding devoted to funding. Although the English place-name Brigham ‘homestead at the bridge’ (Cumberland, East Yorkshire), may appear to be the closest in form to **pett-pont*, these ‘may be particularly early’ formations, ‘perhaps denoting Roman bridges’ (Parsons and Styles 2000, 52). More fundamentally, it is unclear whether any Celtic or Germanic place-names in Britain refer to properties or landholdings whose income was reserved for secular purposes. Although firm conclusions cannot be drawn from the absence of evidence, this lack of parallels weakens the proposal that Pitpointie may refer to a landholding whose profits were used to fund bridgework. This, coupled with the possibly anachronistic nature of this interpretation (above), means that it should probably be rejected.

Despite these difficulties, the possible link proposed between Pitpointie and bridgework may have wider implications for the interpretation of *pett* place-names and the study of the landscapes in which they are located. *Pett* place-names with ecclesiastical associations, of which around fourteen are recorded

(Watson 1926, 267–68; Nicolaisen 1996, 11–12; *PNF* 5, 221), illustrate this point. For example, *Pittentagart* (ABD), from Gaelic **Pett an t-Sagairt* ‘the priest’s share, priest’s portion’ (Watson 1926, 267; Nicolaisen 1996, 12), may not refer literally to a land-holding or farm occupied, owned or worked by a priest. Instead, the land-holding concerned or the income it generated may have been used to support a priest and would have been granted by a secular patron for this purpose, presumably in return for the priest concerned offering prayers for the souls of his patron and his family. This type of relationship is alluded to in a discussion of *Pitenchagal* (FIF), from Gaelic *Pett na h-Eaglaise* ‘land-holding or farm of the church’, which notes that this place-name refers to either ‘the eponymous church of Pitenchagal’ or ‘simply ... church-land’ (*PNF* 2, 451). A *pett* place-name referring to a church need not denote the site of an early ecclesiastical foundation, although there may have been one nearby, but may instead refer to an ecclesiastical landholding or farm or, more specifically, an area of land, the dues or revenues from which were granted to a church. Possibly supporting this, of the eight *pett* place-names with actual or possible ecclesiastical associations recorded in Fife, six have tenurial connections with churches dating to before c.1200 (*PNF* 5, 221).

This interpretation of the function of *pett* land-holdings is consistent with records concerning Pitpointie, at least by the time of the earliest recorded references to this landholding. The charters preserved in the *St Andrews Liber* reveal that the land of Pitpointie was granted to the priory of St Andrews between the late twelfth and mid-fourteenth centuries, on one occasion as a pension (*St Andrews Liber*, 399–400; Ash et al. 1999, no. 424). However, such arrangements are characteristic of the high Middle Ages and it is unclear how far back into the early medieval period they may be projected, if at all.

ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATIONS

In the absence of more persuasive evidence that Pitpointie refers to a landholding reserved for the funding of bridgework, it is tempting to revert to the interpretation that the bridge (possibly) referred to in the place-name was located at or near this location all along. But, rather than accepting the interpretation of Pitpointie as preserving Pictish **pont* ‘bridge’, borrowed into Gaelic, other options should be explored to see if they offer more plausible explanations. Three possibilities are worth considering: whether the element *-pointie* could have a Gaelic origin, is onomastic or hydronymic in origin. These are considered in turn.

Discussion of raising revenues from landholdings (above) may suggest an alternative interpretation of Pitpointie. In particular, it may be possible that *-pointie* is derived from an early Scottish Gaelic equivalent of Middle Irish

punt or its variant form *pont* (*eDIL*, s.v. *punt*, *pont*), Modern Gaelic *punnd* ‘a pound weight’ and, by the time the monetary assessment of land values was introduced, a unit of currency. If so, then Pitpointie may mean ‘portion [of land] worth/yielding a pound [in weight or value]’.

Another possibility is that the place-name element **pont* may be a personal name. Neither Pont nor Pontin, Pontyn are recorded in Black’s *Surnames of Scotland* (1946). Despite this, Pont is familiar to toponymists as a Scottish surname from the work of the pioneering cartographer Timothy Pont (c.1565–1614). However, Pont ‘dweller by the bridge’ is identified as Old French in origin and is described as ‘A scarce surname mainly found in Sussex’ (Titford 2009, 366). A more plausible origin for the Scottish surname Pont may be as a contraction of a place-name in *-pont*. Supporting this, the surname of Timothy’s father, Robert Pont (c.1524–1606), was recorded as Kylpont when he attended St Leonard’s College, St Andrews, in 1554 and also as Kynpont at the first and subsequent General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, from 1560 (Lee 1860 Vol. 1, 230; Marwick 1911, 87). Although Robert Pont was born in Culross (now FIF, then PER), his surname presumably originated in the place-name Kilpunt, *Kilpont* 1467 (WLO) (see below) or another, unidentified, place with the same or a similar place-name.

Other surnames may suggest an alternative interpretation of the place-name element *pontin*, interpreted above as **pont* + the locational suffix *-in*. Of possible relevance here are the surnames Panton, Ponton and Punton (see Black 1946, 646, 668, 675). Ponton, in particular, is well-documented as a medieval surname in southern Scotland. Black (1946, 668) derives all three surnames as probably from Ponton – *Pamptune*, *Pamtone* 1086, *Pantone* 1135–1154, *Panton* 1194, *Pontoune*, *Puntoune* 1541 – near Grantham (Lincolnshire) (see also Titford 2009, 347, 366; Hanks et al. 2016 Vol. 3, 2038, 2040). This origin is both phonologically and historically plausible because Ponton was near estates belonging to David I’s earldom of Huntingdon and this region was a rich source of noble and knightly settlers in the feudalisation of Scotland (Ritchie 1954, 214; Barrow 1980, 97–101). However, the surnames Panton and Ponton may have different etymologies, the former possibly derived from Old English **pamp* ‘hill’ or *panne* ‘pan’, in a transferred topographical sense ‘depression, hollow’ + *tūn* ‘farmstead, estate’ (Hanks et al. 2016 Vol. 3, 2038). Although similar in form to *-pontin*, *-puntin*, these surnames are not identical and there is no evidence to indicate that Pitpointie is derived from a surname. Moreover, there are no *pett-* place-names to parallel the proposed derivation of Pitpointie from a surname. Although several place-names combine *pett-* with a personal name, for example Pitcarmick (PER) ‘Cormac’s share’ (Nicolaisen 2001, 196–97), these are not surnames of Anglo-Norman origin but Gaelic first names in every case.

Another possible etymology is that **pont* may be derived from a hydronym. *Pont* occurs as a hydronym in the River Pont – from which Ponteland (Northumberland) ‘island formed by the River Pont’ (Mawer 1920, 159), ‘Pont island’ (Watts 2004, 477) derives its name – Pont Burn (Co. Durham), Pont Gallan Burn (Northumberland) and the lost river *Pont*, *Ponte* 1268 (Northumberland). These examples demonstrate that, at least in north-east England, *Pont* can be a hydronym. Ekwall (1928, 332; see also Watts 2002, 96–97; 2004, 477) equates these hydronyms with that of the River Pant (Essex), deriving them from Brittonic *pant* ‘hollow, valley’. Similarly, Alan James (2009, 152–53; BLITON Vol. 2, 301) derives the *Pont* hydronym, presumably by metonymy, from Brittonic *pant*. Given its etymological obscurity, Pictish **pant*, or a different word emerging as **pont/pant*, may conceivably have referred to a watercourse in earlier times, possibly an earlier name for the Fallaws Burn in the case of Pitpointie. This leaves open the possibility that **pontin* originated as a stream-name with a suffixed form of **pont-*. But although the status of **pont* as a hydronym may appear to be strengthened by the Pointack Burn, this is a secondary hydronym, derived from the adjacent place-name (below). In addition, *pont* hydronyms appear to be specific to north-east England, a region which underwent very different linguistic developments and cultural influences from north-east Scotland. Although the evidence from north-east England is suggestive, there are no unambiguously attested examples of *pont* as a hydronym in Scotland. Moreover, the construction of *pett* + hydronym is unattested. Emphasising the wider complexity of the *pont* place-name element, the etymology of place-names in *pont* elsewhere in England – including Pontesbury (Shropshire), (Great and Little) Ponton (Lincolnshire) and Pontshill (Herefordshire) – remains uncertain (Watts 2004, 477).

Possible alternative explanations of **pont*, as being derived from either a surname or a hydronym, are both problematic. In particular, the absence of parallels appears to weaken the case that Pitpointie and Pointack derive their names from those of watercourses. In addition, the compounding of the *pett-* place-name element with a hydronym is also unparalleled. While these alternatives may appear to be plausible interpretations for **pont* in isolation, they begin to look less convincing when the place-name Pitpointie is considered as a whole.

PICTISH **PONT* IN OTHER PLACE-NAMES

Despite the weakness of alternative interpretations, it is difficult to make a convincing case for the Pictish place-name element **pont* ‘bridge’ from a single instance. The focus shifts, therefore, from Pitpointie to other place-names incorporating the element **pont* in an attempt to seek supporting parallels.

Only one other place-name in **pont* in the area of historical Pictland has been identified previously. *Poyntok* 1546 × ?1607 (Campbell 1899, 404), *Pointok* 1601 (*RMS* vi no. 1267), now Pointack (FIF) (NO352239) is interpreted as ‘? Pictish **pont* + ? -ōc’ ‘place at a bridge’, where -ōc can represent either ‘place of’ or denote a hydronym (*PNF* 4, 185–86; see also *PNF* 5, 472). Although Pointack is compared with Pitpointie (*PNF* 4, 186), the tentative identification of this place-name as Pictish is understandable, given the limited number of attestations of **pont*. By contrast, Rhys disputes the interpretation of Pointack as originating in Pictish **pont* ‘bridge’ on topographic grounds. Echoing his argument on Pitpointie, Rhys (2015, 240, n.497) claims that there are ‘only minor streamlets in the vicinity [of Pointack], certainly nothing that would have required a bridge’, adding that ‘there are several features in the vicinity which could be classed as *pant*’ ‘hollow, depression, valley’.

Rhys’s objection may also be dismissed in this case. Pointack is located on the Pointack Burn or the Burn of Pointack, the hydronym possibly representing a secondary formation derived from a settlement and lands beside it (*PNF* 4, 186). This watercourse was significant enough to mark the boundary between the estates of Balmerino and Birkhill (Campbell 1899, 377) and, in 1601, to define the east march of Balmerino wood ‘as it flows into the Tay’ (*RMS* vi no. 1267; transl. *PNF* 4, 185). The requirement for a bridge may not always be evident from the size of a watercourse as it appears today (above) but was presumably dependent on a combination of factors, including the location of settlements, patterns of land-holding, transport routes, resources available and, of course, the hydrography of the watercourse concerned during the early medieval period. In the absence of any evidence, there are no grounds for rejecting the (former) presence of a bridge when a bridge appears to be clearly attested in a place-name.

Both Pitpointie and Pointack attest a similar development from *-u/o-* to *-oi/oy-* (*PNF* 4, 186). This suggests that other place-names in *point* may be derived from Pictish **pont*. Unfortunately for this line of enquiry, this is identical in form to Scots *point* ‘anything salient or tapering, as a pointed hill or tapering piece of land ...; a promontory or cape’ (*DSL*, s.v. *point* n.² 2), a common place-name element, while place-names in *point* could also be derived from Gaelic *punc* ‘point’ instead. Notwithstanding the examples of Pitpointie and Pointack, the potential for confusion with SSE *point* suggests that the quest for further attestations of Pictish **pont* should focus on names in *pont* rather than *point*. This narrows the field considerably, as this place-name element is very rare in Scotland north of the Forth. Four recorded examples, all in Aberdeenshire, stand out:

*Pontalond*³ 1600 *RMS* vi no. 1050; transl. Robertson 1862, 665, n.1

Pontalbon 1618 *RMS* viii no. 1927

Pontellewen 1664 *RMS* xii no. 647

Pontlowin 1688 Aberdeen Sasines in Register House, cited in Alexander 1952, 347

Panty Land 1807–09 RHP3897/14

Pantyland 1832 Thomson 1832

Pantilands 1868 Ordnance Survey six-inch map, Aberdeenshire, Sheet LXX, surveyed 1868, published 1870

Pantieland 'now extinct' Alexander 1952, 347

Despite the different second elements in the seventeenth-century attestations, these may be identified as either variant forms of the same place-name or alternative names for the same place from their contexts, confirmations of grants of the same lands in the Barony of Kinaldie, part of the Invercauld estate at Logie-Coldstone, Strathdon (NGR NJ 41771077).

Both elements of this place-name present challenges of interpretation. *Pontalond*/*Panty Land* raises the by now familiar dilemma of whether the first element is *pont 'bridge' or *pant 'hollow, depression, valley', although forms in *Pant-* are actually attested on this occasion. Both are plausible, given the location of this place-name near the confluence of the Tomdubh Burn with the Deskry Water, a short distance upstream from the bridge over the latter at Rippachie. In addition, this may be another possible example of *pont as a hydronym, perhaps an earlier name for either the Tomdubh Burn or the Deskry Water.

The only published interpretation of this place-name suggests that it is 'Perhaps a form of Punder-land, Pund-land, a place for the impounding of strayed cattle' (Alexander 1952, 347). No evidence is cited in support of this and all the recorded examples of *Punderland* appear to be located south of the Forth.⁴ If *Pontalond* represents *Pundland* then yet another interpretation is possible, that it refers to 'A piece of land orig[inally] assessed at the annual value of one pound ... fixed as equivalent to half a *ploughgate* or four *Oxgangs* in 1585' (*DSL*, s.v. *pundland*). However, while *Pundland* is recorded as a place-name

3. Alexander (1952, 347) gives this as *Pontaland* but the form recorded in *RMS* is *Pontalond*.

4. For example, *Ponderlandis* 1565 (*STL*) (*RMS* iv, no. 1662 (p.400)), *Punderlandis* 1580, 1603, *Pounderland* 1591 (*ELO*) (*RMS* iv, no. 3037 (p.834); v, no. 1863 (p.631); vi, no 1418 (p.506)).

in south-west Scotland, where it survives as *Poundland*,⁵ it does not appear to be attested elsewhere. Moreover, the forms *Pontalond*, *Pontalbon*, *Pontellewen*, *Pontlowin* are sufficient to reject the ‘pound’ derivation.

A more plausible alternative may be to seek a Gaelic origin for this element, perhaps an early Scottish Gaelic equivalent of Middle Irish *punt*, *pont*, Modern Gaelic *punnd* ‘a pound weight’ and, by the time of monetary assessment of land-values, a unit of currency. Indeed, this may even suggest an alternative interpretation of the *-pointie* element in Pitpointie, although no other Pit-place-names include references to the fiscal value of land. Ultimately, the suggested identification of *Pontalond* with *Punderland* or *Pundland*, regardless of its meaning, is unconvincing because the elements *Pund-*, *Punder-* contrast with the *Ponta-*, *Panti-* and *Panty-* of recorded forms. A better comparison may be *-pontie*, as in Pitpointie, possibly suggesting that *Pontalond*, *Panty Land* also originated in a place-name in **pont*.

The earliest recorded forms indicate that the first place-name element in *Pontalond* is *pont-*. *Pont-* appears in three seventeenth-century attestations, pre-dating records of the *Pant-* form by over two centuries. The considerable variation in attestations of the second element – *-albon*, *-alond*, *-ellewen* and *-lowin* – does not instil confidence and may be interpreted in various ways. For example, *-lowin* and *-ellewen* may be compared with Northern Brittonic **loβ* and **le:β*, perhaps suggesting a hydronym belonging to the ‘Leven’ family (BLITON Vol. 2, 171–73, 185). This would be consistent with the interpretation of the *Pont-* element in these place-names as ‘bridge’, suggesting that these may be variant forms of a place-name in the ‘bridge of hydronym’ format. Alternatively, *Pontalond* implies that the second element is Scots *lond*, a variant of ‘land’ (*DSL*, s.v. *lond*), while SSE *land(s)* is clearly attested in the later forms *Panty Land*, *Pantyland*, *Pantilands*. If so, this may cast doubt on the interpretation of the first element as Pictish **pont* ‘bridge’, because a Pictish generic, borrowed into Gaelic, with a Scots specific makes an impossible formation. More plausibly, however, Scots *lond*, SSE *land(s)* represents a phonological adaptation of an element, the original significance of which had become lost.

Pett- place-names demonstrate that what originated as Pictish toponymic terms only survive in Gaelic formations and, therefore, are likely to be paired with Gaelic specifics. Consistent with this, the element concerned may be derived from Gaelic *lann* ‘field, land, enclosure’ (Simon Taylor, pers. comm.; see *PNF* 5, 419–20). If Pictish **pont* was adopted into Gaelic, then **pont na*

5. For example, *Pundland* (DMF) 1589, 1592, 1631, 1643 (*RMS* v, no. 1683 (p. 578), no. 2032 (p. 689); viii, no. 1745 (p. 593); ix, no. 1427 (p. 537)). Surviving examples of *Poundland* include those near Dailly and Pinwherry (both AYR), near Dunscore and Moniaive (both DMF) and near Parton (KCB).

lanna, *lainn* or even *loinne* may be a possible place-name referring to a bridge, with *Pontalond* possibly representing **pont na loinne*. However, in the case of *Pontalond*, it seems unlikely that the middle syllable would then reflect a definite article, whatever that was in Pictish, because very few place-names in the form noun + article + noun are recorded in any of the Celtic languages before the tenth century (see Toner 1999). Although located near watercourses, *Pontalond* is of uncertain significance. The late and varied attestations and the availability of alternative interpretations make *Pontalond* a possible, but perhaps more realistically a doubtful, example of Pictish **pont*. Pantilands and its earlier forms require more detailed analysis, although a definitive derivation seems likely to remain elusive.

This brief search for other place-names derived from Pictish **pont* has achieved mixed results. *Pontalond*, although of intrinsic interest, is of ambiguous significance and meaning. On the other hand, although its attestation is relatively late, Pointack may corroborate the presence of **pont* as a place-name element within the area of historical Pictland. Despite the limited and challenging evidence, the identification of the Pictish place-name element **pont* 'bridge' does not rest on a single attestation. Even so, it is difficult to explain why this is such a rarely-surviving toponymic element within the area of historical Pictland.

PICTISH BRIDGES?

Another possible objection to the interpretation of Pictish **pont* 'bridge' concerns the presence of bridges in Pictland. Did the Picts even have bridges? On the one hand, this may seem an unnecessary question, given the barriers to travel and trade presented by the many watercourses of Pictland. On the other hand, it might be assumed that the Picts had no bridge-building tradition because their territory lay beyond the frontier of the Roman Empire, where such technology is less likely to have been encountered, although this contrasts with the evidence for bridges in Ireland (below). Curiously, despite their many implications – technological and socio-political as well as linguistic and toponymic – the issue of Pictish bridges has not been considered before. Despite a plethora of publications on early medieval Scotland in general, and the Picts in particular, in recent decades, none discuss or even refer to bridges. Is there any evidence for Pictish bridges?

The earliest references to bridges in Scotland do not occur until the twelfth century, when bridges at St Andrews and over the River Leven are recorded (Barrow 1984 [1992, 212]). However, this probably reflects the greater availability and survival of textual records from this period, rather than (necessarily) the absence of bridges before the twelfth century. This is supported by a mid-eleventh-century reference to bridgework (below). On the other hand, it is

interesting that the Gaelic place-name *Chendrohedalian* (Kindrochit-Alian, now Braemar) (ABD) is recorded in the longer version of St Andrews foundation account, dating from the 1140s, together with its earlier, presumably Pictish, name *Doldauha* (FAB, §4, in *PNF* 3, 571, 578, 591–92). The medial component of *Chendrohedalian* may be identified as Gaelic *drochaid* ‘bridge’, presumably referring to a structure crossing the River Clunie. However, it is difficult to know if anything can be inferred from the absence of a reference to a bridge in the Pictish place-name for the same location, given that this is only a single example.

Bridges and fortresses were the largest secular structures in early medieval Europe. Fortifications in Pictland are amply attested in the archaeological record (for different perspectives see, most recently, Ralston 2004; Konstam 2010; Foster 2014, 44–52; Noble 2016). By contrast, no archaeological evidence of Pictish bridges has been discovered and their sites, if there were any, remain unidentified. Unless and until their sites are located and investigated, the only evidence for Pictish bridges lies not in the structures themselves but in what may be inferred from limited textual references and perhaps place-names.

Alongside military service and constructing fortifications, building, maintaining and repairing bridges for kings were the most onerous obligations in early medieval societies and are well-attested in, for example, Anglo-Saxon England from the eighth century onwards (Brooks 1971; 1995, 15; Cooper 2006, 8–65; Harrison 2007, vii, 35–43, 186–90). The situation is less clear among the Celtic-speaking peoples of early medieval Britain and Ireland. When Unuist son of Uurguist, king of the Picts (AD 820–834), granted *Kilrymont* (St Andrews) to God and St Andrew, he exempted its inhabitants from all secular exactions, including hosting, castle and bridgework (*de exercitu et de operibus castellarum et pontium*), according to the St Andrews foundation legend (FAB, §5; eds and trans *PNF* 3, 573, 579). Although this initially appears to record the existence of similar burdens among the Picts, this text dates from 1140 × 1152 (Taylor 2000). Moreover, the details of this exemption ‘are almost certainly spurious’, revealing more about labour services during the mid-twelfth century than the ninth (Taylor 2016, 95) and suggesting that it was added by the compiler of the text. In support of this later date, this exemption may be compared to others dating from the mid-eleventh to twelfth centuries. For example, similar exemptions were granted to the vill of Kirkness, Lochleven, by Macbeth in 1040 × 1057 (*St Andrews Liber*, 114; eds and trans Taylor et al. 2017, 568, 575–76), although this is recorded in a charter translated from Gaelic into Latin in probably the late thirteenth century (Taylor et al. 2017, 566), and by Dunfermline Abbey in 1161 × 1164 (*RRS* i no. 213 (p.243) [= *Dunf. Reg.*, no. 49 (p.27)]). Despite the limited textual evidence, the apparently formulaic nature of these exemptions may imply that bridge-building burdens were more widespread and already well-established in

Scotland during this period. Such obligations may have provided the labour for bridgework which may have been financed by the income received from grants of land such as that at Pitpointie.

Other sources are no earlier and less reliable. The flooding of the *Pons Servani* 'Bridge of St Serf' is related in Jocelyn's *Life* of St Kentigern (ed. and transl. Forbes 1874, 49, 176; on which see Forbes 1874, 328; Jackson 1958, 307–09). This is explicitly described as being located on the north side of the *Frisicum Litus*, the Firth of Forth, although the geographical context – west of Culross – may place it in Clackmannanshire, which is usually considered to have belonged to the northern British territory of Manau, rather than to have been part of Pictland (e.g. Jackson 1969, 69–75). Although compiled c.1185, the presence of early features in the text, including Northern Brittonic (or 'Cumbric') personal names (Jackson 1958, 300–01, 310–11; Breeze 2008), indicates that the *Life* of St Kentigern is based on early medieval traditions, although their dating is contentious (MacQueen 1956; Jackson 1958; Clancy 2003; Irvin 2010).

In the only explicit reference to a Pictish bridge, Hector Boece records that the Picts constructed a wooden bridge 'not far from Stirling' (*Historia Gentis Scottorum* X, 66; ed. and transl. Sutton 2010). Although its location suggests that this bridge may have crossed the River Forth, the major watercourse at Stirling, Boece gives no more information. However, Boece's *History* is a much later (1527) and notoriously unreliable source. As there is no reliable evidence for a bridge at Stirling until the thirteenth century (Page 2010), Boece may have been projecting the presence of this strategically important crossing, the lowest bridge on the River Forth, back into the distant past. By contrast, genuinely early sources record the presence of fords across the Forth, which were probably upstream from Stirling. For example, the *Chronicle of the Kings of Alba* records that Cináed son of Máel Coluim (971–995) *uallauit ripas uadorum Forthín* 'fortified the banks of the fords of the Forth' (ed. and transl. Hudson 1998, 151, 161). The Fords of Frew is usually assumed to have been the principal early crossing point on the Forth, although other fords were available further downstream, depending on river levels.

The existence of bridges in Pictland is otherwise unattested. It has been suggested that a bridge is depicted in the battle scene on Sueno's Stone (MOR) (Duncan 1984, 140), a massive Pictish cross-slab dating to the ninth century (Henderson and Henderson 2004, 135–36; on Sueno's Stone generally, see Sellar 1993). However, as several other interpretations have been proposed for the same feature, little reliance can be placed on this.

The textual evidence for Pictish bridges is extremely limited in both quantity and quality. All that can be inferred from Boece and the *Life* of St Kentigern is that they attest the existence of later traditions concerning the presence of bridges in

early medieval eastern Scotland north of the Forth. The St Andrews foundation legend presumably claimed that an exemption from secular exactions, including bridgework, existed from the reign of Unuist son of Uurguist in order to provide a precedent rooted in the power of a distant past. As a result, no reliability can be placed on this source as evidence for a bridge-building tradition among the Picts. However, a record originating during the reign of Macbeth (above) reveals that obligations concerning bridgework existed in Scotland by the mid-eleventh century. This may reflect earlier practises and be paralleled by secular exactions in Anglo-Saxon England, although the absence of surviving Scottish charters from before the twelfth century makes definitive conclusions impossible. The paucity of relevant textual sources underlines the importance of toponymy in this debate.

The evidence from Ireland may be relevant here. Bridges are referred to in at least three early Irish legal texts, including a seventh-century law tract on watermills, which records the regulations relating to a bridge (*cáin droichet*) (Kelly 1997, 393). That jurists felt the need to legislate for bridges implies that they were a common feature in the early Irish landscape, although Old Irish *drochet* could also refer to a 'causeway (over [a] marsh, etc.)' (*eDIL*, s.v. *drochet*). Similarly, OE *brycg*, preserved in the place-name Birgham (Berwickshire) (BPNR, s.v. Birgham), means not only 'bridge' but also 'causeway' (Parsons and Styles 2000, 51). These examples suggest that there may not have been a well-defined distinction between bridges and causeways in an early medieval context. However, the existence of a 'proper' bridge is demonstrated by the wooden remains discovered in the River Shannon at Clonmacnoise (Co. Offaly), its construction dated by dendrochronology to c.804 (Moore 1996; O'Sullivan and Boland 2000). The Picts were as equally accomplished as their Irish neighbours in a range of engineering and practical skills, as their fortifications (above), metalwork and sculpture (Henderson and Henderson 2004) amply attest. This suggests that the Picts were just as capable of constructing bridges, although there is no evidence to confirm that they did so.

PICTISH **PONT* AS A LATIN LOAN-WORD

Another potential, but apparently previously unexpressed, objection to the interpretation of Pitpointie as 'place of/at bridge land-holding or farm' concerns the presence of Latin loan-words in the Pictish language in general and the use of a Latin loan-word for 'bridge' in particular. Even if the Picts did possess bridges, is there any evidence that they would have referred to these by a Latin loan-word? Two arguments may be cited in support of the possibility of Pictish **pont* 'bridge' as a Latin loan-word.

The first rests on analogy with cognate terms in other Insular Celtic languages. The Common Brittonic language, spoken by the Celtic peoples of Britain, is said to have been 'packed with Latin loanwords' (Schrijver 2002, 87; see also Schrijver 2007; 2013, 29–33), the result of Latin being spoken within the Roman province of Britain for almost 400 years. More than 800 of these Latin loan-words are estimated to have survived in Brittonic (Jackson 1953, 76–121). According to Kenneth Jackson, this occurred principally in the 'Lowland Zone' of Britain, comprising roughly the southern and eastern half of England, but that these loan-words were later absorbed into the Brittonic spoken in the 'Highland Zone' of western and northern Britain, particularly during the fifth and sixth centuries. Schrijver (2007, 167) places this earlier, noting that 'Highland British Celtic borrowed masses of Latin loanwords during the [Roman] Empire as Latin was at that time a prestige language', a status which it lost after the collapse of Roman power in Britain in the early fifth century. Nevertheless, the currency of vernacular Latin in Roman Britain and its possible influence on Brittonic in general, and Schrijver's 'maximalist' assessment in particular, are still hotly-debated (e.g. Coates 2007; Parsons 2011; Russell 2011). Even here, however, Coates (2007, 172–73) acknowledges that the Brittonic languages are basically deeply latinised British Celtic.

Given the limited evidence relating to the Picts, it is easy to fall into the trap of assuming that linguistic processes attested in Britain south of Hadrian's Wall will also have had a significant impact, whether directly or indirectly, north of the Antonine Wall. However, of the 31 potentially Pictish place-name elements discussed by Taylor, only one, **eclēs*, is of Latin origin (Taylor 2011, 88). Moreover, James (2014, 42) discusses many possible loan-words but concludes that 'the toponymic evidence for introductions from Latin in the Brittonic of the north seems pretty thin. The number of such elements whose presence in P-Celtic place-names is reasonably secure amounts to no more than 10'. Although its interpretation is debatable, it cannot be inferred realistically from this limited toponymic evidence that Latin vocabulary was in widespread use in northern Britain. Nevertheless, some Latin words may have been borrowed into northern Brittonic as specialised terms, referring to concepts or things which were originally associated with or derived from Roman Britain. Significantly, this includes words referring to the built environment. James (2014, 7) notes that 'Roman building and engineering, mainly military in the north, undoubtedly made an impression on Celtic-speaking people' and, consistent with this, accepts not only **pont* but also **mūr* 'wall' as loan-words from Latin into Northern Brittonic (James 2014, 7–8). Latin *pont-*, in oblique forms of *pons* 'bridge', was adopted as Brittonic **pontā-* (James 2014, 9; BLITON Vol. 2, 321), becoming Welsh *pont* (*GPC*, s.v. *pont*), Cornish *pons* (George 2009, 531) and Breton *pont*

(Deshayes 2003, 591). As the Pictish language is now widely thought to belong to the Brittonic branch of the Insular Celtic languages (Nicolaisen 1996; 2001, 192–204; 2006; Forsyth 1997; 2006; James 2013; Rhys 2015),⁶ it may also contain Latin loan-words.

James (2014, 9; BLITON Vol. 2, 321) suggests that, perhaps initially, Brittonic **pont* may have referred specifically to a masonry bridge in the Roman style but that it was subsequently adopted as the generic term for 'bridge' in all the Brittonic languages. The borrowing of Latin *pons*, *pontis* 'bridge' into Northern Brittonic and Pictish, or a language ancestral to them, seems plausible, given that both the northern Britons and the Picts probably acquired their awareness of masonry bridges from Roman examples. The bridges concerned may have been in northern Britain or, if the borrowing occurred at a later date, may have been encountered by pilgrims in or on their way to Rome. Although the earliest Pictish presence in Rome is not recorded until 721, this presumably reflects the status of *Fergustus Pictus* as a bishop and his attendance at a synod (see Hefele and Clark 1896 Vol. 5, 257). Less senior Pictish pilgrims, clerics and lay persons alike, may have made the pilgrimage to Rome long before this.

NORTHERN BRITTONIC **PONT*

The clearest evidence for the borrowing of Latin *pons*, *pontis* 'bridge' is in *pont* place-names, primarily in Welsh (above), but also Cornish (Padel 1985, 190) and Northern Brittonic. The northern Britons, speakers of Northern Brittonic, were near neighbours of the Picts, making Northern Brittonic place-names in *pont* of particular relevance to this debate. *Pont* is an uncommon place-name element in Scotland but is attested south of the Forth. In particular, its combination with *penn* 'end, head' in Penpont (DMF), a combination of elements familiar in Cornwall and Wales (see Padel 1985, 180; Owen and Morgan 2007, 371), attests the Northern Brittonic origin of this place-name (Watson 1926, 180, 348, 356; Johnson-Ferguson 1935, 107–08; Barrow 1984 [1992, 214]; Nicolaisen 2001, 212; Anderson 2010, 106; BLITON Vol. 2, 311, 321; Vol. 3, 29). Kilpunt, *Kenpunt* 1208 × 1211 (RRS ii no. 486), *Kenpvnt* 1296, *Kenpont* 1307–20, *Kilpont* 1467 'Head of the Bridge' (WLO) (MacDonald 1941, 43), presumably also originated in Northern Brittonic **Penpont*, by way of the partially gaelicised **Cennpont* (Watson 1926, 348; Wilkinson 1992, 26; James 2014, 9; BLITON Vol. 2, 321). In addition, Pinkie

6. Although lack of evidence makes it impossible to demonstrate that Pictish was Celtic at its core and some scholars still maintain that at least some Picts may have spoken a non-Indo-European language (e.g. Isaac 2003, 155; 2005). For the latest thoughts on this, based on an analysis of Pictish ogam inscriptions, see now Rodway 2020.

(ELO) was known as *Pontekyn*⁷ during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Dixon 1947, 207). No other place-names in *pont* appear to be reliably attested in Scotland south of the Forth.⁸

As with Pitpointie, opinion has been split on the presence of Brittonic **pont* 'bridge' in these place-names. Nevertheless, *Penpont* is a strong candidate for the site of a bridge. Its location on an old route which joins a probable Roman road indicates that, 'whether Roman or not, a bridge existed near Penpont from early times ... perhaps as far back as Roman times' (Anderson 2010, 106–07). While Watson (1926, 348) accepted Kilpunt and Penpont as *pont* place-names, Dixon (1947, 249, 456–57) and Nicolaisen (2001, 24) believed *Pontekyn* to be a compound of *pant* 'valley' and *cyn* 'wedge'. However, this is not supported by any of the early forms, all of which record the element concerned as *pont*, not *pant*. Moreover, the *-yn* suffix of *Pontekyn* appears to be the *-in* locational suffix (above), which generally appears latterly as *-ie/-y*, which is exactly what it does in Pinkie. This undermines the interpretation *cyn* 'wedge'. Indeed, the form *Pontekyn* suggests its origin in a formation something like **pont-ōg-in* 'place of a bridge (or bridges)', the first two elements of which may be equated with Pointack (above).

'Place of a bridge' fits the topographic context of *Pontekyn*. Pinkie is located on the east bank of the River Esk, which is joined to Musselburgh by the Old Bridge, popularly known as 'the Roman Bridge' (NT34077254). Although the surviving structure is thought to date to the mid-sixteenth century (Canmore ID 53885), it probably stands on the site of a Roman bridge which carried the Roman road between the forts at Inveresk and Cramond and on to the Antonine Wall (Dennison and Coleman 1996, 85). Both toponymy and topography point to *Pontekyn* as a plausible place-name in Northern Brittonic **pont* 'bridge'.

A topographic objection has been raised to the interpretation of Kilpunt as a place-name in Northern Brittonic **pont*. Kilpunt appears to be the direct equivalent of Northern Brittonic and Welsh *Penpont* 'bridge-end'. However, noting that 'the existing settlement is ... not near any known ancient bridge or any substantial watercourse', James (2014, 10; see also MacDonald 1941, 43;

7. *Pontekyn* pre-1198 (*Dunf. Reg.*, no. 301 (p.191)), early undated charter (*Neubottle Reg.*, nos 65–66 (p.53)); *Pontekin* pre-1198 c.1300 (*Dunf. Reg.*, no. 301 (p.191)); *Ponttekyn* early undated charter (*Neubottle Reg.*, no. 64 (p.52)); *Pontkyn* 1200–1240 (*Soltre Reg.*, no. 14 (p.13)); *Pinckin* 1531 (*Dunf. Reg.*, no. 464 (p.362)); *Pincking* 1531 (*Dunf. Reg.*, no. 464 (p.362)).

8. Although its form is suggestive, *Ponpens* (STL) 1666 (*RMS* xi, no. 885 (p.445)) may be rejected as a transcription error for *Powpenis* 1539 (*RMS* iii no. 1964), *Powpen* 1665 (RS59/2 f.163v; Reid 2009, 170), *Powpone* 1678 (RS59/5 f.416v). Similarly, *Pontheugh* 1698 (*Retours*, BWK no.474), cited by both Watson (1926, 348) and James (2014, 10), appears to be a transcription or editorial error for *Peilheuch* 1624 (*RMS* viii no. 625).

BLITON Vol. 2, 321) suggests that an origin in ‘Brittonic *pant-* “hollow, valley-bottom” is ... not impossible at Kilpunt’. As at Pitpointie, the presence of a ‘substantial watercourse’ may not have been a necessary prerequisite for the construction of a bridge. Indeed, because bridging rivers presents greater engineering challenges, with implications for the expertise and resources required, minor watercourses were perhaps more likely to have been bridged at an early date. Although no early bridges or their sites have been identified in this area, the Brox Burn, a tributary of the River Almond, provides a plausible requirement for bridging. Indeed, there are no fewer than three bridges within the vicinity of Kilpunt. The farmstead of Kilpunt, now converted into dwellings and known as Kilpunt Steadings (NT09827177), lies only 350m south-south-east of a bridge across the Brox Burn. Moreover, Kilpunt gives its name to two other nearby bridges, both dating to the nineteenth century. Kilpunt Bridge No. 21 (NT092711), on the Union Canal, and Kilpunt Railway Bridge (NT093710) are located approximately 850m south-south-west of Kilpunt. If Kilpunt can give its name to these bridges, then the converse may also be plausible. Kilpunt may have derived its place-name from a bridge over the Brox Burn, which lies even closer to Kilpunt than the Union Canal.

More significantly still, the place-name Kilpunt appears to have moved over time: ‘the original Kilpunt stood to the north-west [of Kilpunt Steadings], in the croft now called Kilpunt Garden, and near the Broxburn’ (Primrose 1898, 112). An Ordnance Survey map of 1898⁹ shows Kilpunt Gardens as a small building at the south-west corner of a rectilinear enclosure, which earlier Ordnance Survey maps¹⁰ depict as partially occupied by what appears to be an orchard (NT094719). This enclosure may be identified with ‘the wall of stone and lime that formerly bounded the policies’ of ‘the mansion of Kilpunt’, which was located ‘to the east of this ancient site’ (Primrose 1898, 112). The former location of Kilpunt may be indicated on nineteenth-century maps by what appears to be a driveway leading from Kilpunt Gardens to a site beside the confluence of the Brox Burn and the Caw Burn. This is consistent with Roy’s map of 1752–1755 (Sheet 7/6d), which depicts *Killpunt* at the centre of an estate with an unnamed building, possibly ‘Old Kilpunt’, at the edge of an enclosure to the north-west. Kilpunt appears to have been relocated from beside or near the Brox Burn into more open land a short distance to the south-east, presumably to place it at the centre of the extensive landscaped policies depicted on Roy’s map, sometime before the mid-

9. Ordnance Survey six inch map, 2nd edition, Linlithgowshire, Sheet VI.SE, revised 1895, published 1898.

10. Ordnance Survey 25 inch : 1 mile map, 1st edition, Linlithgowshire VI.15, surveyed 1854, published 1855, where the enclosure is numbered 627; six inch, 1st edition map, Linlithgowshire Sheet 6, surveyed 1854–56, published 1856.

eighteenth century. Although its origins are unclear, 'Old Kilpunt' may have been the location of a medieval baronial *caput* – the administrative seat, often a castle or manor house, of a medieval barony – perhaps occupying an even earlier site. The granting of the lands of *Kenpunt* to William Noble by Henry de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, was confirmed by William the Lion in 1208 × 1211 (RRS ii no. 486).

Claims that the place-name Kilpunt cannot mean 'bridge' because it is not associated with a watercourse do not withstand detailed analysis. In addition, the proximity of a watercourse to Kilpunt is indicated by the (now lost) place-name *Kinpunt-myln* 1608 (*Retours*, Linlithgow no. 58). This mill would have required a source of power, which is most likely to have been provided by running water, probably either the Brox Burn or the Caw Burn. Whether there was an early bridge over the Brox Burn and/or Caw Burn at 'Old Kilpunt' is of course another matter. However, the identification of an earlier and much closer relationship between Kilpunt and local watercourses implies that there was a requirement for a bridge. Moreover, the **pont* place-name element not only indicates that there was a bridge at 'Old Kilpunt' but that this may have been a defining feature of this location, important enough for it to be named Kilpunt 'bridge end/head'.

As with Pitpointie and Pointack (above), more detailed investigation reveals that the topographic contexts of *pont* place-names in southern Scotland are more plausible locations for bridges than previous commentators have recognised. This supports the case for the existence of the Latin loan-word **pont* 'bridge' in Northern Brittonic and the word is included among Northern Brittonic place-name elements (BLITON Vol. 2, 321). *Pont* belongs to a wider linguistic process, one of 42 Latin loan-words (not including ethnic names) identified or inferred in Northern Brittonic (James 2014). Moreover, Nicolaisen (2001, 192–221, esp. 220–21; see also Forsyth 1997, 27; Rhys 2015, 346–49) demonstrates that there is little to distinguish Pictish from Northern Brittonic linguistically and perhaps that Pictish should be regarded as a dialect of Northern Brittonic. If **pont* 'bridge' is accepted as a Latin loanword in Northern Brittonic, then there appears to be no reason, in principle, why it may not also occur in Pictish.

Unusually, a Pictish source may provide additional and independent support for the existence of Pictish **pont* 'bridge'. The Brude list, a short text traditionally known as the 'Thirty Brudes', occurs in the longer version of the Pictish regnal list, the best preserved text of which is in the Poppleton MS (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Latin 4126; ed. Anderson 1980, 245). According to its Latin introduction, *Brude Bont* was the first of thirty kings named Brude who held the kingship of Pictland and Alba for a total of 150 years. Previously unintelligible, a case has recently been made for the interpretation of the Brude list as a poem praising a Pictish king named Brude, the gaelicised form of the

Pictish personal name *Bredei*, *Bridei*, listing his many praiseworthy attributes or epithets (Aitchison 2019). *Bont* may be compared with the mutated form of Welsh *pont* 'bridge' (*GPC*, s.v. *pont*), a common place-name element in Wales and which also occurs as the simplex *Y Bont* 'the bridge' (Monmouthshire) (Owen and Morgan 2007, 40–41, 89, 128, 244, 362, 381, 454–55). As Welsh *pont* becomes *bont* in the genitive case after a personal name, this suggests the epithet *Brude Bont* 'Brude of (the) Bridge', reflecting the status of the bridge as a metaphor of physical strength and/or royal authority (Aitchison 2019, 30–31). This may be paralleled by the well-known episode in the tale of 'Branwen' in *Y Mabinogi* in which Bendigeidfran ('Bran the Blessed') enables his army to escape by making a bridge with his outstretched body over a river, uttering the words *A uo penn bit pont. Mi a uydaf pont* 'He who is a leader, let him be a bridge. I will be a bridge' (ed. Williams 1930, 40–41; transl. Davies 2007, 30; see Aitchison 2020; compare Zimmer 2003).

The Brude list is of added interest to the debate surrounding Pictish **pont* because its heroic attributes or epithets include *Leo* and *Pant*.¹¹ *Leo* 'lion', figuratively 'hero, warrior', may be identified as a Pictish loan-word from Latin (Aitchison 2019, 28–29), cognate with Old Welsh *leu*, Middle Welsh *lew*, Modern Welsh *llew* (*GPC*, s.v. *llew* 1, 2a) and Old Irish *léo* (*eDIL*, s.v. *léo*). This supports the case for the presence of Latin loan-words, possibly including **pont*, in the Pictish language. *Pant* elsewhere in the Brude list suggests the currency of both **pant* and **pont* as discrete words in the Pictish lexicon and as toponymic terms, furthering weakening Rhys's attempt to interpret the place-name element **pont* as **pant* (above).

BRIDGING POINTS: THE WIDER LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

The wider topographic context of Pitpointie invites an alternative location for the bridge apparently referred to in its place-name, particularly if the upper reaches of the Fallaws Burn was too minor a watercourse to require a bridge. If the hypothetical interpretation of Pitpointie as referring to an area of land used to fund bridgework, rather than the location of a bridge, is accepted (but see above), then this may make it more difficult to identify the site of the bridge concerned. In addition, it is unclear whether only a single bridge or more than

11. Admittedly, the apparent absence of mutation in *Pant*, in contrast to the apparently mutated *Bont*, may appear to be an inconsistency in the Brude list. However, given how little is known about the Pictish language and in view of the long and complex textual history which is evident in the Brude list, too much significance should not be attached to this. It may be significant that *Bont* is recorded in its radical (unmutated) form *Pont* in most Irish texts of the Brude list (ed. Calise 2002, 153–59), although these are later in date and generally less reliable. For different interpretations of the significance of *Pant* in the Brude list, see Taylor 2017, 46–47; Aitchison 2019, 31.

one may have been financed by this land. The identification of the site(s) concerned is exacerbated by the fact that Pitpointie is located within the heart of historical Pictland. However, this need not sever the topographical relationship between Pitpointie and the bridge(s) it funded entirely. Knowledge of the socio-economic basis of Pictish society is, like so many other aspects of the Picts, very limited. Nevertheless, on the basis of analogy with later pre-feudal society in eastern Scotland, it may be inferred that labour was raised and deployed locally, based on a local administrative unit akin to, and perhaps the Pictish predecessor of, the shire or thanage (on which see Barrow 1973 [2003, 7–56]). This, combined with the logistical difficulties and additional costs incurred by transport, probably ensured that dues and labour raised for bridgework were deployed nearby. In practice, this may be interpreted as ‘within walking distance’, which may enable the possible location of the bridge concerned to be narrowed down and perhaps even inferred.

Although Pitpointie is not located on a river, it is near one. The Dighty Water, a tributary of the Firth of Tay, flows 2km south of Pitpointie at its closest. Formerly used extensively for powering mills, the Dighty Water was grandly described as ‘the most considerable stream of water in the vicinity of Dundee’¹² (*NSA* Vol. 11 (1845), 55). The historic crossing point of the Dighty in this area is at Bridgefoot (NO37683538), formerly known as Kirkton of Strathmartine, 3.3km south-east of Pitpointie. Early maps depict a bridge at (Edward 1678, Moll 1745), or a short distance upstream from (Pont 26), Kirkton of Strathmartine, although its antiquity is unknown. Kirkton of Strathmartine was a parochial centre until the parishes of Mains and Strathmartine were united in 1799 (*NSA* Vol. 11 (1845), 56). That this was an important ecclesiastical centre under powerful secular patronage during the early medieval period is apparent from what must once have been an impressive collection of Pictish sculpture from the churchyard there (NO37843525), but is now mostly fragmentary and/or lost. This assemblage includes ten cross-slabs (Strathmartine nos 3–7, 9–13), a free-standing ringed cross (Strathmartine nos. 8, 8a) and a complete recumbent gravestone (Strathmartine no. 2) (Stuart 1856, 24, pl. 77, 41, pl. 132, 44, pl. 138; 1867, 58, pl. 101; *ECMS*, vol. 2, 230–34, 266–67; Canmore IDs 31879–85, 319756–60). Another two items of Pictish sculpture within a short distance of Pitpointie emphasise the importance of this area during the early medieval period. St Martin’s Stone, the lower part of a Class II cross-slab stands, apparently in situ, at Balluderon (NO37483758) (*ECMS* Vol. 2, 215–16; Mack 1997, 62; Canmore ID 31864), 2.1km east of Pitpointie. In addition, a Class I symbol stone (Strathmartine no. 1) was formerly incorporated in a wall near Strathmartine Castle (at NO36923024) (*ECMS* Vol. 2, 208–09; Mack 1997, 59; Fraser, 2008, 60, no. 68; Canmore ID 31886).

12. After the Firth of Tay, presumably.

2.2km south-east of Pitpointie, but is now in Dundee Museum (accession number 1969–269).

In addition to its apparent status as a Pictish ecclesiastical site, Bridgefoot may be a candidate for the location of an early administrative centre from which the collection of tribute and renders was organised on behalf of the king or lord. Pitpointie is even closer to, and is overlooked by, a multivallate hillfort on Auchterhouse Hill (NO35433975) (Canmore ID 31874), 1.2km to the north. Although undated, this may be a fortified secular power centre. Perhaps significantly, the most direct route between Auchterhouse Hill and Dundee Law, the location of another hillfort (Canmore ID 31936), crosses the Dighty Water at Bridgefoot. Although the hillfort on Dundee Law is dated to the Iron Age (Driscoll 1995), this site is heavily disturbed and the only archaeological excavations conducted to date were on a small scale. As a result, a previously undetected phase of early medieval occupation and/or fortification may await discovery there. Although neither a chronological nor a functional relationship between these diverse elements – a *pett*-place-name, Pictish sculpture, an early ecclesiastical site and possible administrative centre, fortresses, routeways, a river crossing and possible bridging point – can be proven, their physical relationship is at least suggestive and worth investigating in more detail. In particular, their close proximity may imply that the lands of Pitpointie financed the construction, repair and/or maintenance of a bridge over the Dighty Water at Bridgefoot.

Clearly, much further work is required before Pictish routeways and river crossings can be identified with any confidence. Nevertheless, Pitpointie illustrates the potential role of toponymy in identifying possible relationships between previously isolated elements within the wider landscape and society of the Picts.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has sought to overcome previous confusion surrounding the interpretation of **pont* ‘bridge’ as a place-name element of Pictish origin by studying the place-names concerned within their wider toponymic, topographic and linguistic contexts. Although hindered by the small number of recorded examples and their late attestations, this study has at least considered the evidence and issues involved. Moreover, it has attempted to advance the debate by dispelling some unwarranted doubts about the relationship between **pont* place-names and watercourses and, therefore, plausible requirements and locations for bridges. In particular, Rhys’s claim that **pont* should be interpreted as *pant* ‘hollow, depression, valley’ on the grounds that there are no watercourses requiring a bridge at Pitpointie and Pointack may be demonstrated

to be unfounded. *Poyntok* gives its name to the Pointack Burn, while Pitpointie is located on the upper reaches of the Fallaws Burn and near a historic crossing on the Dighty Water. On both linguistic and topographic grounds, Pitpointie and Pointack are therefore plausible attestations of **pont* 'bridge'. Although Pitpointie and Pointack are Gaelic place-names, the absence of (other) attestations in Gaelic implies that **pont* 'bridge' must have been borrowed from Pictish. The possibility that Gaelic **pont* was borrowed directly from Latin *pons* to make these place-names seems less likely, not least because this would be expected to be an early loan and therefore borrowed as **cont* or similar. Moreover, there appears to be no evidence to support alternative interpretations, primarily that **pont* is derived from either a hydronym or a surname.

In the quest for wider linguistic parallels, possible cognates in other Brittonic languages have also been sought. This has focussed on **pont* in Northern Brittonic, the language most closely related to Pictish. Pitpointie and Pointack belong to a wider geographical distribution of place-names in **pont* which also includes three examples south of the Forth, Kilpunt, Penpont and Pinkie. As with Pitpointie and Pointack, previous concerns about the proximity of the place-name Kilpunt to a watercourse may also be shown to be misplaced. These examples emphasise the importance of conducting detailed analyses of place-names within their historical and topographic contexts before drawing any conclusions about the interpretation of topographic elements, as the relationship between a place-name and the feature within the landscape it refers to may have altered over time. This is more likely to be the case with early names, where the landscape may have changed and/or the place-name may have moved since it was originally coined, adding to the complexity of their analysis and interpretation.

Given that there is no evidence for the derivation of the place-name element **pont* from a surname or any unambiguous examples of **pont* as a hydronym in Scotland, the most likely interpretation appears, on balance, to have been that **pont* is indeed a Brittonic and Pictish place-name element meaning 'bridge'. Contrary to previous claims, this fits the topographic contexts of those place-names in **pont*. Fundamentally, analysis of the **pont* place-name element in Scotland can no longer continue to deny its historical association with watercourses.

The very small number of place-names incorporating **pont* within the area of historical Pictland contrasts with the large number of Pit- place-names. But here it is *pett*, not **pont*, which is unusual as a result of being such a productive and commonly-surviving place-name element. Other place-name elements of Pictish origin also survive only in small numbers, such as **cupar* '?confluence' and the hydronymic element **pevr* 'beautiful, shining', with only three examples

of each attested (Taylor 2011, 85, 96). Pitpointie and Pointack appear to be the only surviving examples of the loan of Pictish **pont* 'bridge' into Gaelic. In addition, the two examples from the area of historical Pictland may be compared with the three from Scotland south of the Forth.

A case may therefore be made for including **pont* in Taylor's Category 2 of 'Pictishness', comprising 'P-Celtic words borrowed into Gaelic but attested only in place-names' (Taylor 2011, 72, with examples at pp.100–03). Moreover, the presence of what appears to be its mutated form, *Bont*, in the Brude list, may strengthen the case for the presence of **pont* in the Pictish lexicon. Indeed, *Bont* /**pont* appear to belong to a wider range of (presumably) Pictish topographic terms which are not only attested in place-names but also occur in the Brude list (Aitchison 2019, 30–31, 33–34, 38), thereby comprising a category of Pictish place-name elements for which there is lexical evidence. Recognising a closely related form and meaning within two very different contexts, toponymic and textual, not only provides new insights into the interpretation of both sources but also has wider potential implications for the study of Pictish culture, language and toponymy, although these lie beyond the scope of this study.

Although the evidence is limited and late in date, these examples suggest that Northern Brittonic and Pictish **pont* 'bridge' was an early toponymic element and, therefore, that there were at least some bridges in early medieval northern Britain. The study of bridges and their role in the landscape, society and symbolism of the Picts and northern Britons deserves more attention than they have received previously. Place-name evidence should assist this. In addition, the identification of possible bridge sites at Pitpointie or Bridgefoot, Pinkie, Pointack and Kilpunt provides some pointers to the location and, hopefully, archaeological investigation of early bridges, or at least bridging sites, and their associated routeways within the wider landscape.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful to Dr Simon Taylor and the anonymous reviewers of this paper for their very generous, detailed and patient help. Their comments, sources and references have improved this paper considerably and saved me from numerous pitfalls (and a few *pett*-falls). Any remaining errors, interpretations or misunderstandings are, of course, my responsibility alone. I would also like to thank Dr Simon Rodway for providing a copy of his paper in advance of publication.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, N., 2019, 'The Brude list. A panegyric to a Pictish king', *North American Journal of Celtic Studies* 3(1) (Spring 2019), 18–46.

- Aitchison, N., 2020, 'The king/hero as bridge in Insular Celtic symbolism', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 79 (Summer 2020) (forthcoming).
- Alexander, W.M., 1952, *The Place-Names of Aberdeenshire* (Aberdeen: Third Spalding Club).
- Anderson, A.D., 2010, 'The "Old Edinburgh Road" in Dumfriesshire and Galloway', *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society* 84, 101–19.
- Anderson, M.O., 1980, *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press; 2nd edn; 1st pub. 1973; repr. 2011, Edinburgh: John Donald).
- Ash, M., I.C. Cunningham and W.W. Scott, 1999, *Syllabus of Scottish Cartularies: St Andrews* (n.p.) [unpaginated]: <<https://scottishmedievalcharters.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/st-andrews.pdf>>.
- Barrow, G.W.S., 1973, *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold; 2nd edn, 2003, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Barrow, G.W.S., 1980, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Barrow, G.W.S., 1984, 'Land routes: the medieval evidence', in A. Fenton and G. Stell, eds, *Loads and Roads in Scotland and Beyond: Land Transport over Six Thousand Years* (Edinburgh: John Donald), 49–66; reprinted as 'Land routes', in G. W.S. Barrow, 1992, *Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London: Hambledon Press), 201–16.
- Black, G.F., 1946, *The Surnames of Scotland: their Origin, Meaning and History* (New York: New York Public Library; repr. 1999, Edinburgh: Birlinn).
- BLITON = James, A.G., 2014, *The Brittonic Language in the Old North: a Guide to the Place-Name Evidence*, 3 vols (np: Scottish Place-Name Society): <<http://spns.org.uk/bliton>>.
- Boece, see Sutton (ed. and transl.), 2010.
- BPNR = The Berwickshire Place-Name Resource: <<https://berwickshire-placenames.glasgow.ac.uk>>.
- Breeze, A., 2008, 'Telleyr, Anguen, Gulath, and the Life of St Kentigern', *Scottish Language* 27, 71–79.
- Brooks, N., 1971, 'The development of military obligations in eighth- and ninth-century England', in P. Clemoes and K. Hughes, eds, *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 69–84.
- Brooks, N., 1995, 'Medieval bridges: a window onto changing concepts of state power', *Haskins Society Journal* 7, 11–29.
- Calise, J.M.P., 2002, *Pictish Sourcebook: Documents of Medieval Legend and Dark Age History*, Documentary Reference Collections (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press).
- Campbell, J., 1899, *Balmerino and its Abbey: a Parish History with Notes of the Adjacent District* (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons; 2nd edn).

- Canmore = Historic Environment Scotland, Canmore database: <<https://canmore.org.uk>>.
- Clancy, T.O., 2003, 'Magpie hagiography in twelfth-century Scotland: the case of *Libellus de nativitate Sancti Cuthberti*', in J. Cartwright, ed., *Celtic Hagiography and Saints' Cults* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press), 216–31.
- Clancy, T.O., 2016, 'Logie: an ecclesiastical place-name element in eastern Scotland', *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 10, 25–88.
- Coates, R., 2007, 'Invisible Britons: the view from linguistics', in Higham, ed., 2007, 172–91.
- Cooper, A., 2006, *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700–1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell).
- Cox, R.A.V., 1997, 'Modern Scottish Gaelic reflexes of two Pictish words: **pett* and **lannerc*', *Nomina: Journal of the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland* 20, 47–58.
- Davies, S., transl., 2007, *The Mabinogion*, Oxford's World Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Dennison, E.P. and Coleman, R., 1996, *Historic Musselburgh: the Archaeological Implications of Development*, Scottish Burgh Survey (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland/Scottish Cultural Press).
- Deshayes, A., 2003, *Dictionnaire étymologique du breton* (Douarnenez: Le Chasse-Marée).
- Dixon, N., 1947, *The Place-Names of Midlothian*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh (published by The Scottish Place-name Society, 2011).
- Driscoll, S.T., 1995, 'Excavations on Dundee Law, 1993', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 125, 1091–1108.
- DSL = *Dictionary of the Scots Language*: <<http://www.dsl.ac.uk>>.
- Duncan, A.A.M., 1984, 'The Kingdom of the Scots', in L.M. Smith, ed., *The Making of Britain: the Dark Ages* (London: Macmillan), 131–45.
- Dunf. Reg.* = Innes, C., ed., 1842, *Registrum de Dunfermelyn: Liber Cartarum Abbatie Benedictine S.S. Trinitatis et B. Margarete Regine de Dunfermelyn* (Edinburgi: Bannatyne Club).
- Dwelly, E., 2001, *A Gaelic Dictionary, Specially Designed for Beginners and for Use in Schools* (Edinburgh: Birlinn; 1st pub. 1911).
- ECMS = Allen, J.R. and J. Anderson, 1903, *The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland; repr. 1993, Balgavies, Angus: Pinkfoot Press).
- eDIL = *Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language*: <<http://www.dil.ie>>.
- Edward, R., 1678, [Map of] *Angusia Provincia Scotiae sive the Shire of Angus*; EMS.s.35: <<http://maps.nls.uk/view/00000652>>.
- Ekwall, E. 1928, *English River-Names* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Forbes, A.P., ed. and transl., 1874, *Lives of S Ninian and S Kentigern, Compiled in the Twelfth Century*, *Historians of Scotland* Vol. 5 (Edinburgh: Edmonston &

Douglas).

- Forsyth, K., 1997, *Language in Pictland: the Case Against 'Non-Indo-European Pictish'*, *Studia Hameliana* 2 (Utrecht: de Keltische Draak).
- Forsyth, K., 2006, 'Pictish language and documents', in J.T. Koch, ed., *Celtic Culture: a Historical Encyclopedia*, 5 vols (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO), Vol. 4, 1444–46.
- Foster, S.M., 2014, *Picts, Gaels and Scots: Early Historic Scotland* (Edinburgh: Birlinn; 3rd edn; 1st pub. 1996, London: Batsford/Historic Scotland).
- Fraser, I., 2008, *The Pictish Symbol Stones of Scotland* (Edinburgh: RCAHMS).
- George, K., ed., 2009, *An Gerlyver Meur: Kernewek-Sowsnek, Sowsnek-Kernewek/ Cornish-English, English-Cornish Dictionary* ([Hayle]: Kesva an Taves Kernewek/Cornish Language Board).
- GPC = *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru/A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*: <www.aber.ac.uk/~gpcwww/gpc_pdfs.htm#>.
- Hanks, P., R. Coates and P. McClure, 2016, *The Oxford Dictionary of Family Names in Britain and Ireland*, 4 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Harrison, D., 2007, *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hefele, C.J. and W.R. Clark, 1883–96, *A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents*, 5 vols (2nd, rev. edn, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
- Henderson, G. and I. Henderson, 2004, *The Art of the Picts: Sculpture and Metalwork in Early Medieval Scotland* (London: Thames & Hudson).
- Higham, N.J. (ed.), 2007, *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Vol. 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press).
- Hudson, B.T., ed. and transl., 1998, "The Scottish Chronicle", *Scottish Historical Review* 77, 129–61.
- Irvin, L.M., 2010, 'Building a British identity: Jocelin of Furness's use of sources in *Vita Kentigerni*', in A. Marinković and T. Vedriš, eds, *Identity and Alterity in Hagiography and the Cult of Saints*, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica, Series Colloquia* 1 (Zagreb: Hagiographica), 103–17.
- Isaac, G.R., 2003, 'Varia I. Some Old Irish etymologies, and some conclusions drawn from them', *Ériu* 53, 151–55.
- Isaac, G.R., 2005, 'Scotland', in J. de Hoz, E.R. Luján & P. Sims-Williams, eds, *New Approaches to Celtic place-names in Ptolemy's Geography* (Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas), 189–214.
- Jackson, K.H., 1953, *Language and History in Early Britain, a Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages, First to Twelfth Century AD* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Jackson, K.H., 1955, 'The Pictish language', in F.T. Wainwright, ed., *The Problem of the Picts* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson; repr. 1980, Perth: Melven Press), 129–66.
- Jackson, K.H., 1958, 'The sources for the Life of St Kentigern', in N.K. Chadwick,

- ed., *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 273–357.
- Jackson, K.[H.], 1969, *The Gododdin: the Oldest Scottish Poem* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- James, A.G. 2009, 'Review article: Paul Cavill and George Broderick, *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland*', *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 3, 135–58.
- James, A.G., 2013, 'P-Celtic in southern Scotland and Cumbria: a review of the place-name evidence for possible Pictish phonology', *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 7, 29–78.
- James, A.G., 2014, 'Elements of Latin origin in P-Celtic place-names between the Walls', *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 8, 1–50.
- Johnson-Ferguson, E., 1935, *The Place-Names of Dumfriesshire* (Dumfries: Courier Press).
- Kelly, F., 1997, *Early Irish Farming: a Study Based Mainly on the Law-Texts of the 7th and 8th Centuries AD*, Early Irish Law Series 4 (Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies).
- Konstam, A., 2010, *Strongholds of the Picts: the Fortifications of Dark Age Scotland*, Fortress series no. 92 (Oxford: Osprey).
- Land tax rolls, Angus, Vol. 6, E106/16/6/53: <<https://scotlandspplaces.gov.uk/digital-volumes/historical-tax-rolls/land-tax-rolls-1645-1831/land-tax-rolls-angus-forfarshire-volume-06/27>>.
- Lee, W., 1860, *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution Settlement*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood).
- Macbain, A., 1922, *Place Names [of the] Highlands & Islands of Scotland* (Stirling: Eneas Mackay).
- MacDonald, A., 1941, *The Place-Names of West Lothian* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd).
- Mack, A., 1997, *Field Guide to the Pictish Symbol Stones* (Balgavies: Pinkfoot Press).
- Mackinnon, [D.], 1887, 'Loan-words in Gaelic', *Celtic Magazine* 12, 49–56, 97–105, 168–75.
- MacQueen, J., 1956, 'Yvain, Ewen, and Owein ap Urien', *Transactions of the Dumfries-shire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society* 33 (1954–5), 107–31.
- Marwick, J.D., 1911, *The History of the Collegiate Church and Hospital of the Holy Trinity and the Trinity Hospital, Edinburgh, 1460–1661*, Scottish Burgh Records Society Vol. 25 (Edinburgh).
- Mawer, A., 1920, *The Place-Names of Northumberland and Durham*, Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Moll, H., 1745, [Map of] The Shire of Angus or Forfar (London: Bowles and Bowles), National Library of Scotland, EMS.b.2.1(23): <<http://maps.nls.uk/counties/rec/232>>.

- Moore, F., 1996, 'Ireland's oldest bridge – at Clonmacnoise', *Archaeology Ireland* 10(4), 24–27.
- Neubotle Reg.* = Innes, C., ed., 1849, *Registrum S. Marie de Neubotle: Abbatie Cisterciensis Beate Virginis de Neubotle Chartarium Vetus, Accedit Appendix Cartarum Originalium 1140–1528* (Edinburgi: Bannatyne Club).
- Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 1968, 'Place-names of the Dundee region', in S.J. Jones, ed., *Dundee and District* (Dundee: Dundee Local Executive Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science), 144–52.
- Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 1995, 'Something old, something new from the land of the Picts', in M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko, eds, *Studia Onomastica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Fritz Lochner von Hüttenbach zum 65 Geburtstag*, Arbeiten aus der Abteilung 'Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft' Graz, 9 (Graz: Leykam), 137–42.
- Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 1996, *The Picts and their Place Names*, Groam House Lecture Series (Rosemarkie: Groam House Museum Trust).
- Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 2001, *Scottish Place-Names: their Study and Significance* (rev. edn, Edinburgh: John Donald; 1st pub 1976, London: Batsford).
- Nicolaisen, W.[F.H.], 2006, 'Pictish', in K. Brown and S. Ogilvie, eds, *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World* (Oxford: Elsevier), 855–57.
- Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 2007, 'The change from Pictish to Gaelic in Scotland', in P. Cavill and G. Broderick, eds, *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland* (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society), 11–22.
- Noble, G., 2016, 'Fortified settlement and the emergence of kingdoms in northern Scotland in the first millennium AD', in H. Herold and N. Christie, eds, *Fortified Settlements in Early Medieval Europe: Defended Communities of the 8th–10th Centuries* (Oxford: Oxbow Books), 26–36.
- NSA = *The New Statistical Account of Scotland* Vol. 11, *Forfar, Kincardine*, 1845 (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons).
- Ó Maolalaigh, R., 1998, 'Place-names as a resource for the historical linguist', in S. Taylor, ed., *The Uses of Place-Names*, St John's House Papers no. 7, St Andrews (Edinburgh: Scottish Cultural Press), 12–53.
- O'Sullivan, A., and D. Boland, 2000, *The Clonmacnoise Bridge: an Early Medieval River Crossing in County Offaly*, Archaeology Heritage Guide no. 11 (Bray, Co. Wicklow: Wordwell).
- OSNB = Ordnance Survey Name Books: <<http://www.scotlandsplaces.gov.uk/digital-volumes/ordnance-survey-name-books>>.
- Owen, H.W., and R. Morgan, 2007, *Dictionary of the Place-Names of Wales* (Llandysul: Gomer Press).
- Padel, O.J., 1985, *Cornish Place-Name Elements* (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society Vols 56/57).
- Page, R., 2010, 'The ancient bridge of Stirling: investigations 1988–2000', *Scottish Archaeological Journal* 23(2), 141–65.
- Parsons, D.N., 2011, 'Sabrina in the thorns: place-names as evidence for British

- and Latin in Roman Britain', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109(2) (thematic issue: *Languages of Early Britain*): 113–37.
- Parsons, D.N. and T. Styles, 2000, *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names* Vol. 2: (*Brace – Cæster*) (Nottingham: Centre for English Name-Studies).
- PNF 2 = Taylor, S., with G. Márkus, 2008, *The Place-Names of Fife* Vol. 2, *Central Fife between the Rivers Leven and Eden* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- PNF 3 = Taylor, S., with G. Márkus, 2009, *The Place-Names of Fife* Vol. 3, *St Andrews and the East Neuk* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- PNF 4 = Taylor, S., with G. Márkus, 2010, *The Place-Names of Fife* Vol. 4, *North Fife between Eden and Tay* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- PNF 5 = Taylor, S., with G. Márkus, 2012, *The Place-Names of Fife* Vol. 5, *Discussion, Glossaries and Edited Texts* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- Pont 26 = Pont, T. c.1583–96. [Map of] Lower Angus and Perthshire East of the Tay, NLS Adv.MS.70.2.9: <<http://maps.nls.uk/view/00002323>>.
- Primrose, J., 1898, *Strathbrock; or, the History and Antiquities of the Parish of Uphall* (Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot).
- Ralston, I., 2004, *The Hill-Forts of Pictland since 'The Problem of the Picts'*, Groam House Lecture 1999 (Rosemarkie: Groam House Museum).
- Reid, J., 2009, *The Place Names of Falkirk and East Stirlingshire* (Falkirk: Falkirk Local History Society).
- Retours* = Thomson, T., ed., 1811–16, *Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis Retornatarum quae in Publicis Archivis Scotiae adhuc Servantur, Abbreviatio*, 4 vols (London: Commissioners on the Public Records).
- RHP3897/14, National Records of Scotland, Register House Plans Series, Plan of Panty Land and Bolting Stone, Logie-Coldstone, Aberdeenshire, 1807–09.
- Rhys, G., 2015, *Approaching the Pictish Language: Historiography, Early Evidence and the Question of Pritrenic* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Glasgow): <<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/6285/7/2015RhysPhD.pdf>>.
- Ritchie, R.L.G., 1954, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- RMS* = *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum: The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland, AD 1306–1668*, eds J.M. Thomson et al., 11 vols, 1882–1914 (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House; repr. 1984, Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society/Clark Constable).
- Robertson, J., 1862, *Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff* Vol. 4 (Aberdeen: Spalding Club).
- Rodway, S., 2020, 'The ogham inscriptions of Scotland and Brittonic Pictish', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 21, 173–234.
- Roy, W., 1752–55, *The Military Survey of Scotland* (Lowland), BL Maps C.9.b: <<https://maps.nls.uk/roy/index.html>>.
- RRS* i = Barrow, G.W.S., ed., 1960, *The Acts of Malcolm IV, King of Scots, 1153–1165*, *Regesta Regum Scotorum* Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- RRS* ii = Barrow, G.W.S., with W.W. Scott, eds, 1971, *The Acts of William I, King*

- of Scots, 1165–1214, Regesta Regum Scottorum Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- RS59 = The Particular Register of Sasines etc. for the Shires of Stirling and Clackmannan and Stewartry of Menteith, second series, 1661–1871 (cited in Reid 2009).
- Russell, P., 2011, 'Latin and British in Roman and post-Roman Britain: methodology and morphology', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109(2) (thematic issue: *Languages of Early Britain*), 138–57.
- St Andrews Liber = Thomson, T., ed., 1841, *Liber Cartarum Prioratus Sancti Andree in Scotia* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club).
- Schrijver, P., 2002, 'The rise and fall of British Latin: evidence from English and Brittonic', in M. Filppula, J. Klemola and H. Pitkänen, eds, *The Celtic Roots of English*, Studies in Languages 37 (Joensuu: University of Joensuu), 87–110.
- Schrijver, P., 2007, 'What Britons spoke around 400 AD', in Higham, ed., 2007, 165–71.
- Schrijver, P., 2013, *Language Contact and the Origins of the Germanic Languages*, Routledge Studies in Linguistics Vol. 13 (London: Routledge).
- Sellar, D., 1993, 'Sueno's stone and its interpreters', in W.D.H. Sellar, ed., *Moray: Province and People* (Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies), 97–116.
- Soltre Reg. = Laing, D., ed., 1861, *Registrum Domus de Soltre: necnon Ecclesie Collegiate S. Trinitatis prope Edinburgh, etc: Charters of the Hospital of Soltre, of Trinity College, Edinburgh, and other Collegiate Churches in Mid-Lothian* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club).
- Stuart, J., 1856, *Sculptured Stones of Scotland* Vol. 1 (Aberdeen: Spalding Club).
- Stuart, J., 1867, *Sculptured Stones of Scotland* Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Spalding Club).
- Sutton, D.F., ed. and transl., 2010, *Hector Boethius, Scotorum Historia (1575 Version): a Hypertext Critical Edition* (Birmingham: The Philological Museum, The Shakespeare Institute, University of Birmingham; rev. edn, 1st pub. 2003): <<http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/boece>>.
- Taylor, A., 2016, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124–1290*, Oxford Studies in Medieval European History (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Taylor, S., 1997, 'Generic-element variation, with special reference to eastern Scotland', *Nomina: Journal of the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland* 20, 5–22.
- Taylor, S., 2000, 'The coming of the Augustinians to St Andrews and version B of the St Andrews foundation legend', in S. Taylor, ed., *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland, 500–1297: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the Occasion of her Ninetieth Birthday* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), 115–23.
- Taylor, S., 2011, 'Pictish place-names revisited', in S.T. Driscoll, J. Geddes and M.A. Hall, eds, *Pictish Progress: New Studies on Northern Britain in the Early Middle Ages*, The Northern World 50 (Leiden: Brill), 67–118.
- Taylor, S., 2017, 'St Vigean: place, place-names and saints', in J. Geddes et al., *Hunting Picts: Medieval Sculpture at St Vigean, Angus*, 2 vols (Edinburgh:

- Historic Scotland), Vol. 1, 38–51.
- Taylor, S., with P. McNiven and E. Williamson, 2017, *The Place-Names of Kinross-shire* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- Thomson, J., 1832, [Map of] Southern Part of Aberdeen & Banff Shires (west section) (Edinburgh: J. Thomson & Co.), NLS EMS.s.712(22): <<http://maps.nls.uk/view/74400158>>.
- Titford, J., 2009, *The Penguin Dictionary of British Surnames* (London: Penguin Books).
- Toner, G., 1999, 'The definite article in Irish place-names', *Nomina* 22, 5–23.
- Watson, W.J., 1926, *The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons; repr., with an introduction by S. Taylor, Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2011).
- Watts, V., 2002, *A Dictionary of County Durham Place-Names*, EPNS Popular Series 3 (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society).
- Watts, V., ed., 2004, *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names: Based on the Collections of the English Place-Name Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Whittington, G., and J.A. Soulsby, 1968, 'A preliminary report on an investigation into *pit* place-names', *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 84(2), 117–25.
- Whittington, G., 1974, 'Placenames and the settlement pattern of Dark-Age Scotland', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 106 (1974–75), 99–110.
- Wilkinson, J.G., 1992, *West Lothian Place Names* (Harburn: Torphin House): <http://johngarthwilkinson.com/wp-content/uploads/West_Lothian_Place_Names_1992.pdf>.
- Williams, I., ed., 1930, *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi: allan o Lyfr Gwyn Rhydderch* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
- Zimmer, S., 2003, 'A *uo penn bit pont*: aspects of leadership in Celtic and Indo-European', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53, 202–29.