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‘Charge of the Temporalittie of Kirk Landis’ and the parish of Lesmahagow, Lanarkshire

Robin Campbell
Nedd, Drumbeg

This paper introduces a little noticed late 16th-century place-name and local history resource. A large Exchequer compilation was completed towards the end of the century, in which may be found the names of thousands of tenements or land-holdings in areas where the church had owned land for its returns in produce or money. It relates to the ‘temporality’ of the Scottish church, which can be defined as rental income in money and kind from the tenants of church-lands, as opposed to the ‘spirituality’, which consisted mainly of teinds.¹ Many of these lands had been feued or leased by the church around the time of the Reformation, i.e. the religious settlement marked by the enactments in 1560 of the Reformation Parliament. The evident purpose of the compilation was to produce a comprehensive record with up-to-date particulars of what was receivable by every church body or other benefice holder from their lands throughout Scotland. For that body or person was obliged to make over one third of those revenues to the crown, pursuant to the agreement hammered out at the Convention in 1561. These ‘thirds’, with the teinds, which were the subject of the ‘Books of Assumption of the Thirds of Benefices’ (see Assumption, Introduction), had been accepted as being the means by which the crown would fund the reformed ministry and the proposed plans for improvement of the nation’s education; but the process of assessment had been slow and halting.

This major administrative record is found among the Exchequer documents held by the National Archives of Scotland. It comprises under the above title (reference NAS E49/2/1 and 2) two bound volumes of folios, readily accessible and neatly written. It is to be hoped that a printed transcription of the whole may become possible, as it is a valuable resource for those working in economic and social studies, and for those interested in local and family history, as well as in place-names.

The entries in each volume are assembled sheriffdom by sheriffdom. The table below, derived from the volumes’ index pages, gives the starting

¹ ‘Church-lands might be set feu; these being accounted but the temporality and the teinds the spirituality’; James Dalrymple, Viscount of Stair, The Institutions of the Law of Scotland ii viii §8 (1681) (cited in Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue under temporalité).
The typical 16th-century Scot, if there was such a person, was not a townsman but a countryman, a tenant-farmer. If he was lucky enough to live in good agricultural country it was highly likely that he would be a church tenant (Sanderson 1982, 103).

This is found in E49/2/1 at fos 254r–255v.

The wide extent of the church’s ‘temporality’, covering the whole of Scotland, should not surprise us given the amount of land which the church held before the Reformation for the sake of the yields from agricultural units, with here and there the sites of other economic activity from which produce or rental income could be expected in country areas, e.g. fisheries and coal-extraction.

Transcribed below, as illustrating the potential interest of the record, is the entire section dealing with the kirklands in a single sizeable parish, Lesmahagow.3

2 “The typical 16th-century Scot, if there was such a person, was not a townsman but a countryman, a tenant-farmer. If he was lucky enough to live in good agricultural country it was highly likely that he would be a church tenant’ (Sanderson 1982, 103).

3 This is found in E49/2/1 at fos 254r–255v.
'Charge of the Temporalitie of Kirk Landis' & the parish of Lesmahagow

The whole of this parish was once owned by the church, as granted in 1144 by David I to the abbey of Kelso. The relevant charter (David I Chrs. no. 130) states that the king had granted to his foundation of Kelso Abbey ‘the church of Lesmahagow and all Lesmahagow’ (ecclesiam de Lesmahagu et totam Lesmahagu), that the church was to be a cell of Kelso, and that the abbot and monks of Kelso were to establish there a prior and monks of their order.4

After acquiring the land in the 12th century the Abbey feued certain lands to vassals, who did not occupy the individual farms and were largely of Flemish origin.5 There was another period in the 16th century when feu-fermes were granted to non-resident occupiers, in particular the House of Hamilton6 from 1532. The rest of the parish’s farming land, once cultivated by or under the direction of lay brethren, became leased for the most part to local farming tenant occupiers, particularly in the central demesne area which was long to remain known as the Mains.7 As was happening with church lands elsewhere in Scotland,8 feu-ferme was extended by charter to leading tenants who could afford the expenses connected with such grants. This, encouraged by royal policy, gave the farmer heritable security. The church’s feu duty income might lessen with inflation but its coffers had an immediate boost by the premium or capital payment which was negotiated with the would-be feuar. A notable extension of feu-ferme by this abbey was the granting of feus on 31

---

4 This same charter records that the king ‘out of reverence for God and St Machutus’ (ob reverenciam Dei et Sancti Machuti) had granted the right of sanctuary to the church at Lesmahagow ‘within the four crosses which stand around it’ (infra quatuor cruces circumstantes). The existence of these crosses suggests that he was confirming an older sanctuary, rather than creating a new one. For more on these crosses, see Taylor, this volume.

5 For a good summary and analysis of the abbey’s strategy of granting land in feu-ferme to important local gentry (mainly Flemish in origin or descent) whose standing in the wider area was seen as potentially important to the abbey, see Smith 2008a and 2008b. This strategy was pursued to such an extent that ‘by 1203 only a fraction of the original royal grant was being exploited directly by the priory itself. The remainder was held in feu-ferme’, defined as ‘a heritable grant of land conferred upon a family for an annual cash render’ (Smith 2008a, 31).

6 The story of this family, down to the second Earl of Arran, Duke of Chatelherault (1522–74), relating land holding and management to the local farming community, has been studied in Richens 1997, I and II.

7 See the two larger ‘Abbey Lands’ in the map from Richens 1992, reproduced in Taylor, this volume, p. 70.

8 The background in other areas is described in Sanderson 1982 and 1987.
October 1565 to no less than fourteen Lesmahagow tenements’ farmers. 9

A charter of kirklands granted by any church body had to be confirmed by the sovereign, whether the grant was to a lord or to an ordinary farmer who had formerly been the tenant. Considerable delays could occur before confirmation. A grant to an occupying farmer might have been to him for life and then in perpetuity to his son, or to the feuar, or, in the event of his having no lawful issue, to his sister. For some families the expense of obtaining a confirmation might contribute to long postponement of the necessary payment.

Compilation of information to enable collection of the thirds had commenced by 1562. The thirds were required to be ‘assumed’ (i.e. collected) from the holders of the ‘benefices of kirklands’ (eventually by the King’s Collector General as Treasurer of the New Augmentation). The processes of the ‘collectors’ appear to have been controlled by decisions in the Privy Council of Scotland long before they were affected by any Acts of the Scottish Parliament. 10 Many years passed before there was a full picture throughout the country of what fell to be collected from the beneficed clergy, or before general legislation in connection with the religious settlement could be seen as complete.

A report in 1574 (RPC iv 744–45) indicates the difficulties which had resulted from the crown’s early and unrealistic expectation that the beneficed clergy or their officers would readily bring forward fully detailed ‘rentals’ or accounts of their revenues for this assessment. But although the Books of Assumption contain countless examples of the lateness of returns or submissions (see Assumption, Introduction, xvi–xxvi), from 1573/4 benefice holders were coming under firm threats of sequestration of the entirety, not just enforced collection of a third, if there was non-disclosure of a benefice, and the collectors would have been scrutinising records of pre-Reformation taxes paid by the church and other evidence obtained, which might include a holder’s own accounts of some earlier date. The information concerning Kelso Abbey’s holdings in the parish of Lesmahagow is to be looked for among five documents

9 The charter of novodamus (‘we grant anew’) or confirmation granted in 1580 by James VI gives the date 1565 for the original grant made by the Abbey’s lay Commendator, acting with its Convent (RMS v no. 15).

10 For a detailed study concerning the assessment and the thirds generally, see John Kirk’s Introduction to his 1995 edition of The Books of Assumption (Assumption) and Donaldson 1949. For such parliamentary background as may assist from for example 1560–61, 1567–69, 1573–74 and 1587, one may turn to RPS.
‘Charge of the Temporalitie of Kirk Landis’ & the parish of Lesmahagow

found in *Assumption*, 222–45. The first submission seen there is a ‘rentall of the Kelso [sic]’ given in on 1 March 1574 (modern calendar) which was obviously inadequate, mentioning in this parish only some teinds and ‘pension’ claims, and the next two returns supply in respect of the parish a proper rental itemising ‘the mails of Lesmahagow’ by place and amount (with a fuller teinds list) and a calculation of ‘the third of the abbacy of Kelso and Lesmahagow’ (total £560 15 s. 2 d.). Apart from the first document there is no direct evidence of when these submissions reached the collectors, but the foliation of the series does not suggest the passing of much time. It has therefore appeared reasonable to date *Assumption* information on the tenements in this parish to ‘c. 1575’, apart from those in the last (fifth) document, which is a 1556 account prepared by the chamberlain of Lesmahagow. It is not known when or how the collectors obtained this earlier paper, but it was the kind of evidence discovery of which could have ended any silence or prevarication on Kelso Abbey’s part about its cell’s revenues, and which would have been likely to ‘have survived, tucked within the folios’; see *Assumption*, Introduction, xx and 243–45.\footnote{A date ‘c. 1592’ has been ascribed to the extant Charge of Temporalitie as a whole, which brought to a final up-to-date form what may be called the credit side account of the crown’s ‘temporality’ revenues – the debit side dealing with collection costs, arrears, payments out for stipends for ministers and other expenses would go in a Discharge. But such a date is not necessarily to be treated as the date of a name’s spelling seen in it, for work would have gone into it over an extended period. Officers, moreover, preparing it in Edinburgh would have been generally unfamiliar with the tenements’ names; draftsmen and others concerned with the charters would have tended to reproduce the spelling found in the original instrument as they drew up procedural documents (precepts, signatures etc.) and finally confirmation. A charter or lease by a church body was commonly entered into many years before the Charge. So the name-forms are often appreciably older than they might be thought from reading a mention in the Charge. Confirmation charters can be found in Latin summary in the printed and indexed volumes of *RMS*. The inclusion of dates and references helps}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{11} A much fuller though less reliable transcription of this 1556 document can be found in Greenshields 1864, 16–22.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{12} See *Guide* (dating accepted here subject to the doubt in footnote to Steill entry in line 9 of Charge, below).}
It was noted that confirmation charters could as readily be found in the NAS for the relatively modest owner-occupiers in, say, the entries in lines 1–64 as for the titled or major landholders. These original instruments commonly added information, such as a choice made by the feuar of his or her successor, or the recitation of a renunciation in favour of a son who had attained mature years.

Three volumes of the latter’s original six are missing, believed to have been lost when one of the ships carrying the records of Scotland (sent south by Cromwell) back to Edinburgh on Charles II’s orders went down in heavy winter seas off Great Yarmouth.

The printed Kelso Liber (Kel. Lib.) with charters dating back to the 12th century and some abbacy or priory rentals have provided many of the earlier names to be compared with those in the Charge, and a selection of documents from the Hamilton Estate muniments (Ham. M.) has provided a number of others from around the same date (see Taylor, this volume). About two thirds of the place-names in the Charge have their counterparts in a comprehensive later record, the (now lost) Poll Tax records for 1695 for the parish (with the exception of one of its fifteen ‘Quarters’, Blackwood); these have fortunately survived in a published local history work (Greenshields 1864), in a format showing close attention to the orthography of the original.

Most of the places mentioned in the Charge can be located on the modern OS Explorer 1:25000 maps 335 and 343 or the 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edition Lanarkshire sheets XXIV, XXXI and XXXVII. For many of the others the earlier maps of Pont, Blaeu, Roy, Ross, Forrest or Thompson can be consulted, now online on the National Library of Scotland’s website. Richens 1992 (whose map is reproduced in Taylor, this volume, p. 70) map is useful for an understanding of the medieval administrative topography of the parish. A late 18th-century map in the NAS is RHP195. Details of the place-names mentioned in the Charge can be found in Simon Taylor’s toponymic survey of the parish of Lesmahagow, for which see this volume.
Editorial conventions used for the transcription

Place-names have been rendered as found in the manuscript. Their orthography in the original was free of any contraction or abbreviation.

Contractions and abbreviations such as superscript r and t, contracted forms in persons’ first names, and the thorn (the symbol for th as in the or thorn), have been silently expanded (but Viz for Videlicet has been retained). <Angled brackets> are used in cases in which the expansion is uncertain.

Latin words are italicised (with the exception of monetary abbreviations).

The sidenotes (including the rentbook references evidently added after completion of the record, at first on left and then on right) have been placed on the right. The crown’s or collectors’ rental or rentbook references have been shown as they appear (as Rent. or Rent) in the original.

Sums of money are rendered as li’ (for the notation for librae or pounds Scots), s. (for solidi or shillings) and d. (denarii or pence), with ob. (obolus, commonly a halfpenny) denoting a third of a penny in the few instances of use in this transcript.

Original capitalisation has been retained.

At word-breaks at the end of a line the symbol ~ has been inserted to show that the word continues on the next line.

Editorial observations and insertions are in [square brackets].

The lines in the original carry no numberings.

For the identification and discussion of all the place-names, see Taylor, this volume.

---

15 The transcription is a fully revised version of that included in a contribution of mine to The Scottish Genealogist 53, no. 4, 166–74 (December 2006). A debt of gratitude is owed to Simon Taylor for his checking of the transcription and for his general encouragement.
Charge

/fo 254r/

Lanerl

Abby of Kelso
or cell of Lesmahago

Item the comptar charges him with the feuferme of the Landis of Falkerton with the manis placis orchardis yairdis thereof liand in the baronie of Lesmahago and sherefdome foirsaid Set in feu to Johnne Menzeis of 5 Castlehill Extending yeirlie to xxvj s. viij d.

Inde the yeir comptit __ xxvj s. viij d.

and with the feuferme of the merkland of Skellihill liand in the baronie of Lesmahago and sherefdome foirsaid Set in feu to Thomas Steill Extending yeirlie to in maill compositioun

10 and soume to xxiiiij s. Inde the yeir comptit __ xxiiiij s.

A merkland was a division of land originally worth one mark (an old coin equated to 13 s. 4 d. Scots).

This entry differs in wording from the others. Thomas Steill, known from the ensuing confirmation charter (NAS C2/41/73) to have been a nepos (meaning grandson, sometimes nephew) of the original feuar (John Blyth, who renounced in his favour), did not in fact obtain his charter on skin from James VI until mid-June 1596 (delay probably largely due to a desire to postpone expense; his composition, £13 6 s. 8 d., was not paid until at the earliest 1595; ER xxiii, 147). Either he was considered fully entitled on the evidence of a recent ‘Signature’ for the charter contemplated (note 19 below), which would suggest a date not earlier than 1595 for this part of the Charge, or about 1592 he was regarded as liable because paying a rent based composition.

The confirmation charter (NAS C2/38/344) to John Menzies for Folkerton, first entry above, in liferent and in feu to ‘son and apparent heir’ William Menzies, was dated 17 November 1592.

Recent proceedings on these may explain their being on top of a pile and recorded first for the parish.

Composition was a payment agreed for a lease or charter, here apparently in the nature of rent (maill).

Regr. (with contraction tittle) in the sidenote signifies Register. Three volumes (including no. 4 which spanned 1595–96) of six of the (Temporality) Register of Signatures for such crown charters are lost.

Sum accurately broken down in the charter (13 s. 4 d. ancient rent, 4 s. premiums, 4 s. 6 d. dues, 2 s. 2 d. increase in rent).
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and with the feuferme of the one half of the [word deleted] Landis follow-

ing liand within the said Sherefdome Set in feu in maner underwritten Viz.

15 To John Vicaris of 1 half merkland of the manis of Lesmahago callit Cleuchheid Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit with the xij d. Land of Bent to __ Rent. 4. 36 xj s. vj d.

To Williame Pait of the viij s. land of the manis of Lesmahago callit Foulfurde Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ Rent 4. 37 xij s.

To Richart Ker of x s. land there Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xv s.

To Rolland Portar of ane merkland of Skellihill Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xxiiiij s.

To Adame Blyth of ane merkland of Skellihill Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xxiiiij s.

To John Mathew of ane merkland of the manis of Lesmahago callit the Trowis Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xx s.

To Robert Tweddall of ane merkland there callit Monkis-stable Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xx s. Rent. 4. 120

To Robert Pait of v s. Land there callit Bankhous Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xij s. vj d. Rent. 4. 36

35 To Thomas Thomsoun of 1 merkland there callit Letham Extending yeirlie & the yeir comptit to __ xx s.

/fo 254v/

To John Roger of xvij s. iiiij d. land there Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xxvij s. vj d. Rent. 4. 37

---

21 The limit of half continues to line 64, on the evidence of the folios' layout here; there is a change of writer at line 65 and some noticeable difference in the character of the tenements listed thereafter.

22 The writing struck through in lines 11–12 appears to be 'pland [for pennyland] Callis and Wistoun liand as said is'.
To John Leyn of 1 merkland there callit Blarechney Extending yeirlie & the yeir comptit to __ Rent. 4. 36
Actuell [sic] __
Augmentatioun26 __

To John Watsoun of 1 merkland there callit Ardoch Extending yeirlie & the yeir comptit to __ Rent 4. 37

45 To Elizabeth Hodgeoun of 1 merkland there callit Pethheid Extending yeirlie & the yeir comptit to __ x s.

To Cuthbert Smith of 1 merkland there callit Carngour Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ Rent 4. 36

To Rolland Baird of x s. land there callit Utter Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ Rent 4. 36

50 Carngour Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xv s.

To Robert Broun of 1 half merkland there Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ x s.

To Rauff Weir of the xxvj s. land of Calsayfute with pasturage in the comonntie27 of Gleschelyis & Dunsyde Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xxxv s. viiij d.

To Thomas Wod of 1 merkland and 1 half callit the Braidmedw Extending the yeir comptit to __ xxvij s.

To Robert Wilsoun of 1 half merkland there callit Gray-Stanis and thridp<ar>t of ane merkland of Ardoch Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ xvij s. j.d. ob.

To Nicoll Forsyth of the thridp<ar>t of ane merkland there callit Ardoch Extending the yeir comptit to __ x s. j.d. ob.

To John Portar of ane half merkland there callit Braidmedw Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __ x s.

23 Beir was the variety of barley then usually grown.
24 Corrected from viii.
25 A boll was a dry measure for grain, about 64 kilos in weight. Bolls were abbreviated as b. What Leyn had to pay under the Abbey’s grant dating from 1565 of feufermes to him and others as confirmed was indeed 6 bolls of oatmeal and 2 of beir plus a monetary augmentation of 8 pence. This was an unusual payment by way of feu duty in this locality at this period but it continued into the next century on this farm.
26 This means the increase in rent as a result of feuing, a separate component of feu duty.
27 A commonty (here written comonntie) was a common, or sometimes a right of pasture on a common.
28 Sic, the omission of the usual yeirlie and after Extending might show scribal tiredness or slackness; this omission is found in several other places, e.g. lines 62, 71, 78.
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65 To James Lokhart fear of Ley\textsuperscript{29} of the Landis of Stane-  
   biris, Gillbank, Auchinleksis, Grenerig, Tethis and Landis  
of Kerss with toun fortalice Lyand in the parochin of  
Lesmahago haldand waerd and releif.

To William Weir of Stanebyris of the Landis of Over Auchinleck,  
Rent 3. 148

70 Taithis and Grenerig estimat to vj li’ vij s. viij d. Land Lyand in the  
baronie of Lesmahago\textsuperscript{31} Extending yeirlie to __  
  viij li’ xviij s. iv d.

To Alexander Broun of viij s. Land of the maynis of Lesma-  
hago callit Foulfurd Extending yeirlie & the yeir comptit to __ xij s.  
Rent 4. 37

To William Porter of the v s. Land there callit Brigholme  
Rent 4. 37

75 Extending yeirlie and the yeir comptit to __  
Rent 4. 37

To Elizabeth Hammiltoun in Lyfrent and Thomas Weir her  
sone herietablie\textsuperscript{32} of the xxxv s. Land of Kirkton Lyand in the  
baronie of Mauldisle\textsuperscript{33} Extending yeirlie to __  
iij li’ vij s. ij d.  
Rent 4. 77

/fo 255r/  

To Johne Tueddall in Lyfrent and to Robert Tueddall  
80 heritablie of the xx s. Land of Bankheid occupiet be  
the said Johne with the pertinentis\textsuperscript{34} Lyand in the baronie of  
Lesmahago and shirefdome forsaid Extending yeirlie  
and the yeir comptit to __ xxxvij s. iiiij d.  
Rent. 4. 121

To Alexander Weir of the Landis of Auchtifardill alias  
85 Glenpediaith\textsuperscript{35} with the pertinentis The Landis of Huddis-  
  hill with the pertinentis lyand in the baronie of Lesmahago  
  and shirefdome forsaid Payand yeirlie service uset & wount\textsuperscript{36}  
  Nota allainerlie\textsuperscript{37}  
Rent. 4. 161

\textsuperscript{29} Ley is not a Lesmahagow place-name, although there is a Leelaw and associated farm (LEW NS85 40) having similar probable derivation (‘meadow or other land uncultivated or lying fallow’); Sir James Lockart or Lockhart (family descended from the Flemish Loccards) was the Laird of (Lie or) Lee in the parish of Lanark and had his seat at Lee there.

\textsuperscript{30} Ward is an incidental ‘casualty’, the superior’s annual right to income while the vassal’s heir is a minor. Relief (to use the modern spelling) was another ‘casualty’ which this superior would be holding (‘haldand’ in line 68), a payment on the heir taking up inheritance.

\textsuperscript{31} Extent deleted.

\textsuperscript{32} This seems to read ‘herilie’, with no mark of abbreviation. Compare line 80, below.

\textsuperscript{33} Mauldisle, long associated with the Maxwells, is in the adjoining parish of Carluke.

\textsuperscript{34} Pertinents are interests belonging or going with a piece of land; ‘appurtenances’ has the same root.

\textsuperscript{35} There is a conspicuous flourish on the d, possibly for dd.

\textsuperscript{36} Used and wont denotes what has been usual and customary, in service, work or money.

\textsuperscript{37} ‘only’.
To Williame Weir of Auchrifardill of the iiiij li’ Land Rent. 4. 161
90 of [Auchtifardill deleted] Rogerhill Payand yeirlie service Nota
uset & wount allainerlie

To Adame Quhyte38 of the x s. Land of the maynis of
Leasmahago with the pertinents and of the half of ane
merkland of the saidis maynis callit Murthirgill ly-
95 and in the baronie of Leasmahago and shirefdomd foirsaid Set
in few to Adame Quhyte Extending yeirlie the yeir
comptit to __ xxvj s.

To James Hammiltoun Lau<chfu>ll sone to James erle39
of Arrane Of the castill of Nathan40 with the
100 Landis of Draffane, Southfeild, Threipwod, Croce-
furd41 Under the Bank, Blairbank, Halhill, Auchneth,
Achnawtro, Auchtigemmill, Stanecroft, Slaboddome,
Garrelwod, Murisland, Wailburne, Naviland &
Cummir, The Landis of Scorryholme, Stokbriggis, Lo-
105 gane, Auchlochan with the office of Balliarie42 of the
saidis Landis Lyand in the barony of Leasmahago Ex-
tending yeirlie to __ lxxvij li’ ij s.

To James Hammiltoun master of Arrane Of the Landis
of Richartholme, Quhytsyde, Middilholme, Achochan,
110 Over Acherne, Altoun, Balgray, Brodland, Dowan,
Gallowhill, Gallowrig, Blaikwod, Priorhill alias Prior-
croftis, Mylntoun, Clenoch, Auchinhecht, with pendicles43
and pertinents Lyand in the Lordship of Leasmahago
Extending yeirlie to __ xliij li’ vj s. viij d.

/fo 255v/

115 To Williame Weir in Scorieholme Of the landis
of Dumbrexhill, extending to xvj s. Land of auld extent Rent. 5. 16

38 Whyte or White.
39 The third earl (1537–1609), uncle of the fourth earl and first marquis of Hamilton.
40 Now Craignethan Castle at NS81 46.
41 A comma should have been inserted here, between Crossford and Underbank.
42 The office of Bailie, able to enforce in his courts collection for superiors.
43 Small pieces of ground or other adjuncts going with the property on a disposition; cf. the
Scots legal phrase ‘parts, pendicles and pertinents’ used as early as this time in charters (e.g.
that to Steill, line 9 above).
'Charge of the Temporalitie of Kirk Landis' & the parish of Lesmahagow

Lyand in the baronie of Lesmahago and shirefdome forsaide Extending yeirlie the yeir comptit to ___ xxviiij s. iiiij d. ob.

To David Collace\textsuperscript{44} sone to Robert Collace of Balnamone\textsuperscript{45}

120 Of the Landis, mylnis & utheris underwrittin Viz. Ane merklund of Blairrauchning, Ane merklund of Woedheid, The xx s. Land of Carngour The vj s. viij d. Land callit Cattlasar, The vj s. viij d. Land of the maynis The iiiij s. v d. land there, The myln of Lesmahago,

125 myln of Miltoun, mylandis astrict and utheris multur<is> and suckin\textsuperscript{46} thairof, Ane perte land callit Steppis, Ane perte Land callit Arberbray and Lintrig extending to ij aikeris, Ane yaird conteinand ane half aiker, The yaird under the barne of the said Abbey The barne

130 & barnyaired of Lesmahago Ane yaird of half ane aiker, Ane yaird conteinand ane aiker Ane yaird callit Kailyaird, The grene\textsuperscript{47} of Lesmahago with housis and Yairdis extending to thrie aikeris of Land or thairby And of ane aiker of Land Extending yeirlie

135 and the yeir comptit in the hail\textsuperscript{48} to ___ lj li’ viij s.

References


\textsuperscript{44} He as the immediate superior of these tenements (including Blairrauchning which is the same as Blarechny in line 39) had an intermediate interest as feuar confirmed by a royal confirmation charter in 1576 (C2/33/133; RMS iv no. 2652) but seems to have resigned some (for payments by occupiers) by 1580.

\textsuperscript{45} Balnamoon, Menmuir ANG (NO55 63); Robert Cullace of Balnomone is mentioned in Assumption, 374.

\textsuperscript{46} The interests referred to in lines 125–26 are associated with grain mills, including tolls or dues for their monopoly rights.

\textsuperscript{47} The ‘grene’ denotes the village of Lesmahagow, long known only as Abbey Green or Abbeygreen.

\textsuperscript{48} ‘total’ (literally ‘whole’).
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Towards a Taxonomy of Contact Onomastics: 
Norse place-names in Scottish Gaelic

Richard A.V. Cox

§1 Introduction

After the traditionally-dated, fifth-century Irish settlement of Argyllshire and the later, 10th-century settlement of Dumfries and Galloway, the use of the Gaelic language in Scotland spread gradually throughout most of the country, so that by the 11th century significant Gaelic settlement was only absent from the Northern Isles, the northern part of Caithness and the south-eastern part of the Borders. Meanwhile, from the eighth century, principal Norse settlement took in the Northern Isles, mainland Scotland from Caithness down to Moray on the east, the northern and western littorals down to Kintyre and all of the Hebrides.

The area of concern, then, lies between Caithness in the north and Kintyre in the south: it is here, for the most part, that one can expect to find Norse place-names in Scottish Gaelic, i.e. place-names created in Old Norse that survive, or survived until recently, within a Scottish Gaelic nomenclature. Ideally, however, one should no longer talk of Old Norse place-names, as all of them have long since become part of the Scottish Gaelic onomasticon – just as Glaschu (Glasgow) and Lunnainn (London) have – and, although they may remain more or less recognisable as being of Norse linguistic origin, they have long been adapted to the phonological system of Gaelic.

What, then, is the relationship between the extant Gaelicised forms and the historical Old Norse place-names and, since the one is borrowed from the other, what was involved in the borrowing process? These questions can be approached from two points of view. On the one hand, there is in the context of the borrowing process (§2); on the other, the form of the borrowed items themselves (§3).

---

1 A version of this paper was read at the ‘Earliest Strata of Place-names in Ireland and Scotland’ conference hosted by the Irish and Celtic Studies Department, Queen’s University, Belfast, 5–6 September 2008.
2 I.e. Old West Scandinavian.
4 The nomenclature in the west of Scotland, while not without innovation, appears to be predominantly conservative by nature (see, for example, Cox 2000, also 1994, 2007b).
§2 Context
Context may refer to the socio-political environment; for example, what circumstances or pressures existed that encouraged or ensured the migration of name-forms from the Old Norse to Gaelic nomenclatures? Present knowledge, such as it is, of the wider historical context in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland can be applied to the situation – and the name-forms themselves will no doubt help put a socio-economic face upon the situation – but this is not within the remit of this article.

Context may also refer to the socio-linguistic environment. Because levels of bilingualism present will have had an effect on the borrowing process, it would be useful to know when and where and to what extent people were bilingual across the Highlands and Islands, and no doubt this varied from area to area and altered over time. It may be assumed that, initially, any degree of bilingualism was more or less limited to a few individuals but that, shortly before Old Norse died out as a spoken language in Gaelic Scotland – which will not have happened everywhere at the same time – a majority of people became, hypothetically, completely bilingual. Although one cannot be sure of the answers to these questions, the name-forms themselves may provide some evidence in this regard.

§3 Form
The question of form can be approached in three ways: firstly, by considering how name-forms are identified (§3.1); secondly, by analysing the adaptation process and the way in which Norse name-forms were gaelicised (§3.2); and, thirdly, by studying the naturalisation process and the way in which borrowed forms have been treated within the Gaelic nomenclature (§3.3).

§3.1 Identification
For identification purposes, the traditional treatment of Old Norse place-names in Scottish Gaelic has been to delete any element or elements that are recognisably Gaelic within a name-form, leaving only that part thought to be derived from Old Norse. In this way, the first and last elements in the Gaelic name, Loch Lacsabhat Àrd – i.e. ScG loch ‘lake’ and àrd ‘high’ (here with the sense ‘upper’) – would be ignored in order to arrive at *Lacsabhat itself, which is recognisably of Norse origin and no doubt derives from ON Laxavatn ‘[the] lake of the salmon’.

The purpose behind this analysis, of course, is to identify features of the nomenclature that are Norse, and the process is frequently aided and abetted – and can be in this instance – by a charge of tautology, whereby the meaning of an element in the one language is seen to be duplicated by
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the meaning of an element in the other: so ScG loch ‘lake’ in *Loch Lacsabhat Árd duplicates ON vatn ‘lake’ in the Old Norse etymon, Laxavatn. An alternative but similar charge is that of epexegesis, whereby an element is deemed to have been added to a name in order to clarify the meaning of another element.

The problem with these concepts is that they operate only on the level of lexical meaning. Onomastically, names such as *Loch Lacsabhat Árd have complex development histories. In this particular case, one is able to peel back a number of chronological layers, each of which represents a discrete onomastic unit, i.e. a separate unit of onomastic (as opposed to lexical) meaning:

(4) *Loch Lacsabhat Árd ScG ‘the upper *Loch Lacsabhat’
(3) *Loch Lacsabhat ScG ‘the lake of *Lacsabhat’
(2) *Lacsabhat ScG
(1) *Laxavatn ON ‘[the] lake of the salmon’

Here, the Norse form, Laxavatn (1), has been borrowed into Scottish Gaelic, viz *Lacsabhat (2), with, let us assume, the same onomastic meaning. However, the lake was renamed *Loch Lacsabhat ‘the lake of *Lacsabhat’ (3), which presupposes that semantic transference did take place in due course, involving a shift in the onomastic meaning of *Lacsabhat, whereby *Lacsabhat came to be applied to the area of the lake, as opposed to the lake itself. Lakes within the *Lacsabhat area were in due course named after the area, using the areal name as specific (to denote location); as there are two lakes within the area, however, both lakes came to be called *Loch Lacsabhat but were differentiated by the addition of the contrastive modifiers, àrd and iósal, ‘upper’ and ‘lower’, respectively (4).

Having identified a (potential) Old Norse loan-name within the nomenclature, one then proceeds to identify the Old Norse etymon, i.e. reconstruct its Old Norse model. In the case of ScG *Lacsabhat < ON Laxavatn, this is relatively straightforward. Whether straightforward or not, the process is the same in every case: the probable phonological shape of the Gaelic name-form as it may have been several hundred years ago is sought, with the proviso that the Norse form may have been borrowed at any time between the 9th–13th centuries, at least. Part of this process takes account of documentary sources – though these may not go that far back and may sometimes prove an unreliable witness – and, of course, local

Historical analysis sometimes reveals considerable morphological detail preserved in Gaelic forms. Plural endings survive, for example, in ScG Lidbhr [Lt-ido] < ON Hlídhr, nom. and acc. pl. of hlíð f. ‘slope’, and ScG Thaorabotar [‘humtra,bahr’], a form from ON -botnar, nom. pl. of botn m. ‘valley or lake head’. A variety of case-forms can also be discerned: ScG Tolair [‘tborahl-od], for example, derives from ON Hálar, nom. pl. of höll m. ‘hill’, while ScG Loch Mille Thòla [‘Lox,mill ‘hala] contains a loan from an Old Norse prepositional name, Mille/Milli Hóla ‘between the hills’, with gen. pl. of höll. Similar detail can be seen in Old Norse loan-words in Scottish Gaelic, for example ScG beirge ‘a type of promontory’ < ON bergi, dat. of berg nt., ScG ármann ‘warrior, hero; leader’ < ON árman, acc. of ármbr m., and the man’s name ScG Tormod < ON Pormund, acc. of Pormundr m.

Words and names surviving in this way is, of course, a common feature and must reflect, at least partly, the case in which they were commonly used. In Scottish Gaelic, for example, the dative forms sròn ‘nose’, cluais ‘ear’, glùin ‘knee’ and bois ‘palm’ are frequently, if not always, used for radical sròn, cluas, glùn and bas in speech, and variant name-forms such as (dative) An t-Sean Bhaile ‘the old village’, as opposed to (radical) An Sean Bhaile, are equally well attested, and the evidence from Old Norse loans is similar.

Patterns of stress in Old Norse also survive the migration process to Scottish Gaelic, so that the specific qualifier can be expected to retain full stress and the generic weak stress, as in ScG Laca,bhat < ON Laxa vatn, with a qualifier-initial structure, or ScG Beirgh Làgha < ON Bergit Lága dat. ‘the low[er] promontory’, with a generic-initial structure.

The consistency with which Old Norse stress patterns are replicated in pronunciations, which are probably at their most reliable in communities with relatively stable socio-economic histories.

6 It is not always possible to determine the forms of loans with such accuracy; in such cases Gammeltoft (2004, 85) suggests that ‘it may just as well be argued that the missing case endings or modern endings different from the ON forms represent either the stem form of the place-name elements or Gaelic adaptations’. For further discussion, see §3.2.1 below. (As examples of the “apparent” lack of case endings in ON loans in Irish, Gammeltoft cites ON knapp > MI coup(p) ‘knob’, ON pokj > MI póc ‘bag’, ON vindaug > MI fuindeóc ‘window’. Notwithstanding discussion below, MI coup(p) must derive from something formally identical with ON knapp acc. (not from knapp nom. or dat. knapp); the final of ON pokj would be expected to yield a preceding palatalised consonant in Irish, whereas oblique poka would not (there are further problems that are not accounted for in this derivation, namely the inconsistent vowel quantity and the development of the velar stop); the development of -auga in ON vindaug > MI fuindeóc is one of morphological substitution (see below).)

7 For further examples of Gaelic names here, see Cox 2002, 54–55 §7.3.

8 For further discussion on such structures, see Cox 2007c. For similar questions in Old Norse names in the Isle of Man, see Cox 2008a.
Scottish Gaelic, however, is not reflected in the rate at which Old Norse case endings are transmitted. Indeed, perhaps a majority of Old Norse loan-names fail to show any reflex of such endings, an issue which is returned to below (§3.2.1).

The Gaelic loan content in Old Norse forms can be examined at this stage also. This would include both loan-words such as Early Gaelic búaile ‘enclosure’ (cf. Old Norse loan-names such ScG Buaileabhal and Buaileabhair) and loan-names, which are much harder to identify.9

§3.2.1 Phonological adaptation
Turning to the question of phonological adaptation, as part of the reconstruction process, the linguistic level on which the model was adapted into Scottish Gaelic needs to be established.

Einar Haugen’s research on bilingualism in America (1950) describes how loans are made upon either a phonemic or morphemic level, or both. He makes the important distinction between phonemic or morphemic substitution, on the one hand, in which the borrowing language substitutes its own forms, and phonemic or morphemic importation, on the other, in which the model language’s forms are imported into the borrowing language.10

Taking the example of borrowed words first, there are three principal categories, which are termed loan-words, loan-shifts and loan-blends:

(i) Loan-words
Loan-words comprise forms with straightforward morphemic importation (with more or less phonemic substitution):

- ScG mol [m̩ɔl] < ON möl f.: the ON nasal consonant and vowel would have been recognised as ScG m and o /ɔ/; ON apico-dental l would have fallen together with the lenited, non-palatalised Gaelic /l/ (a velarised alveolar lateral), which has since fallen together with unlenited, non-palatalised Gaelic /l/ (a velarised dental lateral).

- ScG sgeir [skɛr] < ON sker nt.: the initial ON cluster sk yields ScG [sk̩], with palatalisation before the half-close front vowel; while ON e

---

9 Cox 2007a, 142–43; Cox 2007d, 56–57; Oftedal 1980, 188.

10 On a phonemic level, either foreign sounds would be replaced with native sounds (substitution), or foreign sounds would be borrowed into the language (importation). On a morphemic level, one or more parts of a foreign word would be replaced by native forms (substitution), or one or more parts of a foreign word would be borrowed into the language (importation).
would have corresponded with ScG /ɛ/ [ɛ], the distribution of the latter would have tended to have palatalised the final consonant, which would nominally have yielded ScG /r/ [ɾ] (a tap), although dative usage would have produced the same result §3.1.

ScG bot ‘valley or lake-head’ < ON botn m.: ON -tn has been replaced by the ScG preaspirated dental /t/ [ʰt]; in effect, the ON cluster, with voiceless nasal, has been treated as though it were a geminate -tt, which in ScG became /tt/, cf. Lacsabhat [ˈlɑʰkɔnˌvaʰt] < ON Laxavatn.

ScG tarfhsgeir [ˈtʰaˈrɛ[kʰer³] ‘peat-iron’ (Lewis) < ON torfskeri nt.: initially, the Norse form would have yielded *[ˈtʰɔrɛβ̣³] [kʰer³], with a svarabhakti (epenthetic) vowel developing within the Gaelic r + bilabial fricative cluster (with extension of both the quality and stress of the initial vowel – now indicated orthographically within the sequence -arfh), before loss of the fricative (cf. ScG Cliosgro < ON Klifsgrovf (Cox 2008b, 54)), with subsequent raising of the stressed vowel and loss of the final stressless open vowel; secondary stress has since been lost. Contrast ScG torpsgian, below.

ScG bìrlinn ‘galley’ < from a dialectal form of ON byrding acc. f.: ScG /rɪ/, retroflex [ɾ], represents a thick allophone of ON /l/ into which late Norse rð developed in East Norse areas (which included the Trondheim area northwards); ScG /i/ replaces ON y, and is subsequently lengthened before the medial cluster in Gaelic; the ON velar nasal ng in this environment yields palatalised ScG /ŋ/], which ultimately develops into the palatal dental nasal /N³/ [ŋ], cf. ScG tarsainn, farainn (besides tarsaing, farsaing), although in this case the form has been generalised across dialectal boundaries, probably as a result of literary usage; see Cox 2007b, 66–67 and 2008c, 171–73.

ScG gàrradh ‘dyke; garden’ < ON garð acc. m.: initially yielding EG garrda /ˈɡɑrdɔ/, development from ON garð is unremarkable, except for the addition of an inorganic final schwa, which avoids an unfamiliar final cluster in Gaelic; ON trilled r has yielded unlenited non-palatal /r/ [ɾ] (a velarised trill), with further development in Gaelic consisting of lengthening of the stressed vowel before assimilation of the dental fricative /ð/ [ð], and closing of the open final syllable (-[ɣ]) (Cox 2007b, 57–61).

(ii) Loan-shifts (i.e. loan-word-shifts)

Loan-shifts comprise forms with complete morphemic substitution:
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ScG _Somhairle_, a man’s name, ← ON _Somarliði_ m.: the familiar EG form, _samaire_ ‘cub, whelp’, also used pejoratively of persons (DIL s.v.), replaces the ON personal name; EG _m_ /μ/ [β] is not a reflex of the ON nasal stop _m_ (Cox 2007b, 71).

ScG _sgoth_ ‘type of boat’ ← ON _skúta_ m.: vowel quality, vowel quantity and the articulation of the dental consonant all militate against ScG _sgoth_ being derived directly from ON _skúta_; both words, however, may refer to a similar feature of design or performance, with the former likely a loan-shift based upon the latter (Cox 2008c, 176–77).

(iii) Loan-blends (i.e. loan-word-blends)

Loan-blends comprise forms with partial morphemic importation (with more or less phonemic substitution) and partial morphemic substitution – they are, in effect, part loan-word part loan-shift:

ScG _torpsgian_ ‘peat-iron’ (Islay) ← ON _torfskeri_: with morphemic substitution by G. _sgian_ ‘knife’ of ON _-skeri_ (of similar sense) – which I assume is a reduced form (in unstressed environment) of _skeri_ nt. pl. ‘shears’ – and dissimilation of the (labio-dental) fricative to a (bilabial) stop before sibilant _s_, which dissimilation evidently took place before the development of svarabhakti (contrast ScG _tarfsgeir_, above).

ScG _uinneag_ f. ‘window’ ← ON _vindauga_: ON _vindauga_ [‘windauya] ‘wind-eye’, can be expected to yield EG */w̥iðn̥a/ (with or without prosthetic _f_), modern _uinneag_ (Ir. _fuinneog_). In the case of ScG _uinneag_ [‘ʊ̝̊̊n̥aːk], phonemic substitution takes place within the first syllable via a redistribution of original phonetic features: the rounding of ON initial [w]- has shifted to the stressed vowel in ScG, [ʊ₁]-, while the high-fronted quality of the ON stressed vowel, [i], has shifted to the following consonant cluster, yielding palatalised /n̥d̥/ > /n̥/ (Cox 2000).

ScG _rannsaich_ (2 sg. imperative of _rannsaich_ ‘to research, search’, verbal noun _rannsachadh_) ← ON _rann-sak_ (2 sg. imperative and stem of the infinitive _rann-saka_): the common verbal 2 sg. imperative and verbal stem ending -(a)ich /i̞c/ (or -igh, if borrowed sufficiently early (O’Rahilly 1976, 53–57, especially 56–57)) replaces ON final -ak; ON geminate -nn is treated as unlenited non-palatalised Gaelic /n/ [n] (a

11 Initial _a_- in this morpheme is purely orthographic.
velarised dental), which is subsequently vocalised via the development of a nasalised diphthong: /ˈrāǔsiç/.

Turning to borrowed names, as opposed to borrowed words, there are representatives of the same three categories (although the term loan-name will continue to be used for them collectively):

(i) Loan-names
Loan-names, comprising forms with morphemic importation (with more or less phonemic substitution); the majority of borrowed name-forms appear to be of this type, e.g.

ScG  Beirghsgeadh ['bɔ̃dioʊj kʲəj] < ON  Bergsjó ‘[the] ravine of the promontory’: ON  rg  [ry] yields a svarabhakti vowel, with subsequent loss in Gaelic of the fricative (cf. ScG  tarfhsgeir, above); the medial consonant cluster is palatalised; ON  ø  [ɔː] is shortened and unrounded in its weakly stressed environment and the final open syllable closed (cf. ScG  gārradh, above) (Cox 1998).

ScG  Stafainn < ON  Stafinn ‘the pillar’, with suffixed article: unlenited palatalised Gaelic  /ŋ/  [ŋ] replaces ON geminate  -nn; ON medial  -f-  [β] (later [v]) yields EG  [β] > modern  [v], which is subsequently devoiced, hence  ['stafínŋ]  (Cox 1992, 143; 2007b, 65 note 36).

(ii) Loan-shifts (i.e. loan-name-shifts)
Loan-shifts, comprising forms with complete morphemic substitution:

ScG  Gaath Bheinn12  ← Pro-Scandinavian  Gait-fjall ‘goat-mountain’: here ScG  Gaath Bheinn  ‘wind-mountain’ replaces the Norse form entirely.

(iii) Loan-blends (i.e. loan-name-blends)
Loan-blends, comprising forms with partial morphemic importation (with more or less phonemic substitution) and partial morphemic substitution:

ScG  Sūlabheinn and Blābheinn ← ON  Súlaťall  ‘[the] mountain of the pillar’ and ← ON  Bláfjall  ‘[the] blue mountain’, respectively: in which ScG (lenited)  bheinn  (originally dat. of EG  benn)  ‘mountain’ has replaced ON  fjall  nt., with the same meaning.

ScG  Èireasort (Blaeu [1590s] Erisport) and  Sniosart  (Blaeu [1590s]

12 Eng. Goatfell, Arran.  Gaath Bheinn  is one of two Gaelic names for this mountain (Cox 2009).
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In these examples, ScG (lenited) *phort has been delenited to *-port after *s, although here *sp has subsequently been reduced in weakly-stressed syllables (Cox 2007b, 74–88). In the case of ON *Djúpadal acc., final *-l yields non-palatalised lenited EG /l/ (a velarised alveolar lateral), which falls together with non-palatalised unlenited /l/ (a velarised dental) in Scottish Gaelic, which in turn yields palatalised lenited /l/ (phonetically [l], an apico-alveolar lateral) in the genitive case in Scottish Gaelic. In ON *Djúpadali dat., ON *l yields ScG /l/ (on account of the front vowel), which has no distinct genitive reflex.

It was noted above (§3.1) that a majority of Old Norse loan-names fail to show reflexes of Old Norse inflexional endings. This may be for one of a number of reasons:

(a) an absence of distinct inflexional forms in oblique (non-nominative) case forms in Old Norse itself, e.g. ON *Laxavatn may be nominative or accusative;

(b) vowel apocope in stressless open final syllables in Scottish Gaelic, e.g. ScG *Creagan Dhibadail [ˈkʰrəɡən ˈdʰiːbədail], with ScG creagan ‘hillock’, contains either a reflex of ON *Djúpadali dat. ‘[the] deep valley’, with Gaelic apocope, or a Gaelic genitive of ON *Djúpadal acc.;

(c) morphemic levelling within Scottish Gaelic, whereby the Gaelic reflex of a distinct Old Norse case form falls together with the commoner Gaelic reflex of an element, e.g. a ScG *Lacsabhait(e) *[ˈlʰaksəˈhəйт(e)] (with palatalised *t), from a dative ON *Laxavatni, might be expected to fall together with the names of neighbouring lochs whose names were derived from forms in Old Norse nominative or accusative -vatn; and, finally,

(d) morphemic apocope, within a bilingual milieu, whereby case endings are lost in favour of an ending-less base. Such a development would have been due to the transparency of such endings, but which were not adopted into the borrowing language, but may also have been precipitated in some cases by the nature of the morphological changes involved within the donor language, e.g. ScG Hiort (formerly also written Hirt; Eng. *St Kilda) < ON *Hirtir ‘[the] stags’ (with nom. pl. of *hjörtr m.), whose oblique forms are Hjörtu acc., Hjarta gen. and Hjörtum dat. In contrast, ScG Tòlar – which, on the example of Hiort, might have otherwise been ScG *Tól – retains a Gaelic reflex of the Old Norse nominative plural

13 In these examples, ScG (lenited) *phort has been delenited to -*port after *s, although here *sp has subsequently been reduced in weakly-stressed syllables (Cox 2007b, 74–88).

14 In the case of ON *Djúpadal acc., final -l yields non-palatalised lenited EG /l/ (a velarised alveolar lateral), which falls together with non-palatalised unlenited /l/ (a velarised dental) in Scottish Gaelic, which in turn yields palatalised lenited /l/ (phonetically [l], an apico-alveolar lateral) in the genitive case in Scottish Gaelic. In ON *Djúpadali dat., ON *l yields ScG /l/ (on account of the front vowel), which has no distinct genitive reflex.
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† Brackets are used to show the extent of ex nomine onomastic units, to one generation only.
ending in Hólar, suggesting the name was borrowed outwith, or at least within a severely limited, bilingual environment.

§3.2.2 Semantic adaptation
As far as the question of semantic adaptation is concerned, the main issue here has already been covered, which is that place-names, from a semantic point of view, are borrowed on an onomastic rather than lexical level, regardless of the accessibility of their lexical meaning, and it is supposed that most borrowed names have inherited their onomastic meanings from their model language.

Once borrowed, of course, the onomastic meaning of names is open to change, but this is dependent upon dynamics within the Gaelic, not Old Norse, nomenclature.

§3.3 Naturalisation
Finally, there is the question of the integration of Old Norse loan-names within the Gaelic onomasticon and nomenclature, which can be seen as a process of naturalisation. Although it is strictly not part of the borrowing process, one or two points are worth raising here.

Once adapted phonologically, borrowed place-names are treated within the nomenclature like any other proper name, in that they may be used as qualifiers in new creations (see Figure). Initially, the loan-name can either be used as a specific qualifier, as in Áird Lacsabhat (2-a); a modifying qualifier, as in Creag Dhubh Bhineasgro (2-b); or be used generically followed by a contrastive modifier, as in Buaileabhal Mhòr / Bheag (2-c). The first and last of these structures are in turn used as qualifiers in new creations, and so on.\(^\text{15}\)

Syntactically, then, Old Norse loan-names are naturalised within the nomenclature. Morphologically, naturalisation is more limited. Some names, usually village names, have distinct genitive forms, e.g. ScG Siabost, gen. Shiaboist, < ON Sæbolstað acc. ‘sea-farm’, and ScG Càrlabhagh, gen. Chàrlabhaigh, < ON Karlavág acc. ‘Karli’s bay’.\(^\text{16}\) However, in Gaelic, while the majority of Old Norse loan-names will be lenited in the genitive, most of them do not have distinct case endings.

In spite of a suggestion that the frequent lenition of adjectives as qualifiers of Old Norse loan-names – as in Buaileabhal Mhòr ~ Buaileabhal Bheag ‘the greater and lesser *Buaileabhal’ – means that they are feminine,\(^\text{17}\) lenition here is accounted for by dative usage (§3.1). (That most Old Norse loan-names are lenited in genitive position in Gaelic would in fact suggest that

\(^{15}\) Cox 2001, 48–52.
\(^{16}\) Oftedal 1954, 377–78.
\(^{17}\) Henderson 1915, 160.
they were masculine, were traditional usage of leniting genitive masculine, but not genitive feminine, nouns followed. There is no reason to think, however, that Old Norse loan-names are identified with either gender, as the gender of pronouns used in relation to them depends upon the gender of the features they denote.\(^1\)

Lenition or non-lenition of Old Norse loan-names in genitive position, in fact, is generally an indication of the relative antiquity of the onomastic unit concerned. While most are lenited in the genitive case, examples such as *Loch Mille Thòla* may indicate name-formation before the phenomenon of lenition became generalised in this environment.\(^2\) On the other hand, more recent creations sometimes fail to show lenition in genitive position. The name *Creagannan Bhaile Both Tastabhat* shows lenition of an earlier, but not a later, onomastic unit:

(5) *Creagannan* (*Bhaile Both Tastabhat*) – ScG ‘the hillocks of *Bhaile Both Tastabhat*,’ without lenition of the onomastic unit

(4) *Bhaile* (*Both Tastabhat*) – ScG ‘the enclosure of *Both Tastabhat*,’ with lenition of the onomastic unit

(3) *Both* (*Tastabhat*) – ScG ‘the bothy of *Tastabhat*,’ without lenition or with delenition of the onomastic unit

(2) *Tastabhat/Thastabhat/Hastabhat*\(^3\)

(1) ON *-vatn*

---

\(^1\) Cox 2002, 54–55 note 1.

\(^2\) Cox 2000, 51 (§7.1(i)6) and 117.

\(^3\) The Gaelic loan-name here may have originally had an initial t- [\(t^{\|}\)]- or th- (EG [\(t\)] > ScG [\(h\)]) or h- [\(h\)], depending on the ON initial and its treatment in Gaelic. The final of EG *both* [\(\theta\)] would have been likely to have prevented lenition of a following t-, and ‘delenited’ (by a process of back-formation) either th- or h- > t-. The etymon, then, is conceivably (1) ON *Hattsvatn* ‘[the] lake of the round hill’, with gen. sg. of *hatr* m. ‘(hat), round hill, summit’ (in Norway, cf. *Hatten* (Sandnes, Stemshaug 1980, 144)), with ON -\(tt\)- > ScG *\(ts\)*, and by metathesis /sd/; (2) ON *Postavatn* ‘[the] lake of the thirst’, with gen. of *\(post\)*, variant of *\(tor\)* m. (cf. modern dialectal *tosta*, and ON *\(porskr\)* ‘cod’ besides *\(porskr\)* m.), with /\(ol\)/ - /\(al\)/ alternation; (3) ON *Taskuvatn* ‘[the] lake of the sack’ (re. shape), with gen. sg. of *taska* f. ‘sack, bag’, with /\(sg\)/ - /\(sl\)/ alternation; (4) ON *Tostavatn* ‘*Tosti’s* lake’, with gen. of *Tosti* m., a hypocoristic form of the man’s name, *\(pts\)* m. (GP 264); or (5) *Tastuvatn*, with gen. of *\(tsta\)* f., an obscure element found in a few Norwegian place-names, e.g. *\(Tasta\)* in Rogaland (Sandnes, Stemshaug 1980, 312).
§4 Conclusion
Place-names are borrowed within a socio-political and socio-linguistic context. Identifying them involves careful peeling back of the nomenclature’s chronological layers and historical analysis of their phonological shape. Borrowed names are analysed according to the level of their adaptation to the borrowing language and can be classified as loan-names (with morphemic importation), loan-shifts (with morphemic substitution) and loan-blends (with both morphemic importation and substitution). Name-forms are borrowed on an onomastic rather than lexical level of meaning, yet are nevertheless treated syntactically and morphologically as more or less full members of the onomasticon.

Phonetic note
ScG [b d] are devoiced; [d dʰ t tʰ l ḷ n ṇ] are dentals; [L N R] are velarised; [Ḷ Ṇ] are palatals; [ɾ] is trilled.
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The Role of Onomastics in Historical Linguistics

Carole Hough
University of Glasgow

Introduction

The initial impetus for this paper was an invitation to contribute a chapter on onomastics to a new handbook on the historical linguistics of English (Brinton and Bergs, forthcoming). It seemed to me significant in terms of the current state of the discipline that onomastics was to appear within a section entitled ‘Linguistic Levels’, alongside longer-established branches of linguistics such as lexicology, morphology, orthography, phonology, pragmatics, prosody, semantics and syntax. Twenty years ago – perhaps even 10 – it is unlikely that onomastics would have been included. Until recently, broadly comparable publications showed a tendency to overlook name evidence, which is only now gradually being rectified. The first edition of the Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics, published in 10 volumes in 1994, had no entry for place-names (Asher & Simpson 1994). The 14-volume second edition, published in 2006, had a substantial entry of around 5,000 words (Brown 2006). Early volumes of the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (Craigie et al. 1931–2002) made little use of toponymic material in comparison with later volumes, and the online third edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) currently in progress is incorporating a substantial amount of place-name evidence unavailable to, or ignored by, the compilers of the first and second editions. Chapters on onomastics have been included in three volumes of The Cambridge History of the English Language (Blake 1992; Hogg 1992; Romaine 1998), as well as in a recent one-volume History of the English Language (Hogg and Denison 2006). Disappointingly, though, there is no such chapter in The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language (Jones 1997), and it is still possible for a major publication entitled A Companion to the History of the English Language to ignore the

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at a conference of the Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ulster held in Perth on 8 December 2007. I am grateful to everyone present for their comments, and in particular to Professor Bill Nicolaisen, Dr Maggie Scott and Dr Simon Taylor.
2 Contributed by myself.
3 Both points are made by Scott (2004).
4 Contributions to the first two are by Cecily Clark, and to the third by Richard Coates.
5 Contributed by Richard Coates.
6 The index has a single entry for personal names, and 12 for place-names, none of them leading to a substantial discussion.
Index entries are disappointingly misleading in this respect. For instance, ‘names – dialects’ turns out to refer to names of Old English dialects, ‘names – personal: in neologisms’ refers to the coining of new terminology, particularly through metonymy, and ‘place-names – Ireland’ leads to a brief mention of bilingual signposts. Just when one is beginning to despair, ‘place-names – and Old English dialects’ leads to a short paragraph acknowledging the relevance of place-names and charter boundaries in the study of dialectal variation.

As this statement illustrates, particularly in its use of the word ‘absurdities’, attitudes towards name evidence have changed considerably in recent years – largely as a result of tireless endeavours by a small number of scholars, some of whom attended the conference where this paper was first presented. It is now widely recognised that, as Scott (2003, 25) points out, ‘Place-name studies can tell us a great deal about language, in terms of early lexis, language contact, morphology and phonological development’. Nevertheless, there appears to be little agreement as to the best way of using this evidence, nor of assessing the ways in which it relates to other areas of language. It is difficult to establish how far the lexical and semantic content of names is congruent with that of non-onomastic vocabulary, and whether their phonological and morphological development parallels or diverges from that of other lexical items. I believe strongly that onomastics is a legitimate field of enquiry in its own right, irrespective of the role of names as evidence for other branches of linguistics. However, it is the nature of that role that I should like to focus on in this article. The central question that I set out to address, then, is: To what extent is name evidence relevant to the study of other areas of language, and to what extent does it stand apart?

**What are names?**

The starting-point for such an investigation must be to establish what names are. Until recently, this would have been straightforward. A brief definition would have sufficed, explaining that names have reference but no sense, and are categorised grammatically as a type of noun. Immediately, however, we run into

---

7 Index entries are disappointingly misleading in this respect. For instance, ‘names – dialects’ turns out to refer to names of Old English dialects, ‘names – personal: in neologisms’ refers to the coining of new terminology, particularly through metonymy, and ‘place-names – Ireland’ leads to a brief mention of bilingual signposts. Just when one is beginning to despair, ‘place-names – and Old English dialects’ leads to a short paragraph acknowledging the relevance of place-names and charter boundaries in the study of dialectal variation.

8 Pamp (1985) provides a clear and succinct exposition of the argument that ‘For syntactic as well as morphologic reasons, names should be classified as nouns’ (p. 111).
difficulty, because deeply entrenched as both views are, revisionist work within the last few years has challenged the established theories, and struck at the very heart of what we thought names were. Arguments have been put forward that names do have sense, and moreover that they are not nouns at all. The traditional view is that expressed by Sklyarenko and Sklyarenko (2005, 277):

It is a common knowledge that the class of nouns falls into two opposite subclasses: common nouns – a city and proper nouns – London. The division of nouns into common nouns and proper nouns is one of the oldest traditional means of classification of lexical stock of the language.

Many theorists, however, prefer to describe names as noun phrases rather than as nouns, and Anderson (e.g. 2003, 2004, 2007) takes this a stage further by proposing that names belong not with nouns but with determinatives: pronouns and determiners. As he argues, the crucial semantic distinction is between classes of entities and individuals, and whereas classes are denoted by nouns (city, man), individuals are denoted by noun phrases (the capital city, the distinguished-looking man), pronouns (it, he), or names (Edinburgh, Bill Nicolaisen). He therefore makes a case for grouping names with pronouns rather than with nouns.

The ‘new theory of properhood’ propounded by Coates (2005) also questions the association with nouns but from a different angle, focusing on referring expressions such as The Milky Way and The Old Vicarage. Following John Stuart Mill, names are generally taken to be differentiated from ordinary language by their lack of sense, and this is for Coates what makes it possible for a single expression to function on different occasions as a name or as a non-name. Challenging the traditional view that a description becomes a name when its semantic content is either opaque or irrelevant, he argues that expressions such as The North Sea or Long Island are in effect polysemous, in that they can be used either with semantic reference – if the speaker has the sense of the words in mind – or with onymic reference – if he or she does not. On the other hand, and perhaps most controversially of all, Anderson (2007, 118–19) argues that even onymic usages carry a limited amount of sense:

It is part of the content of Mary that it refers to a female, as it is of Edinburgh Castle that it refers to a place, specifically a castle. ... That names are typically used for onymic reference does not preclude them having sense, nor this sense from being communicated without their ceasing to be names.9

9 It should be noted that most attempts to address the typology of names, including Anderson (2007) and van Langendonck (2007b), tend to focus on personal names rather than place-names.
It has of course long been recognised that the form of a name may identify the type of referent. Langacker (1987–91 ii, 59) uses the term ‘type specification’ to explain how ‘convention tells us that the individual designated by Stan Smith is a male human’, while van Langendonck (2007a, 438) accounts for the same phenomenon in terms of levels of meaning:

proper names carry a categorical [sic] presupposition or a basic level meaning ... When you say John, it normally concerns a male being, while Mary is rather about a woman.

What is at issue is whether or not this is comparable to the identification of Castle as a castle, and how if at all it affects the categorial status of names. Opinions are polarised between Coates (2005, 128) –

There is no case against Mill’s position. Names are indeed senseless.

and Langacker (2008, 316) –

This classic view cannot be sustained, … The distinguishing feature of proper names is not that they are meaningless, but is rather to be found in the nature of their meanings.

Views concerning the relationship between names and nouns diverge equally sharply, for whereas Anderson, as we have seen, considers that names are not nouns, and Langacker takes them to be less typical of the category than common nouns,10 van Langendonck (2007b, 443) argues that names are not only nouns but are less marked than common nouns, and hence ‘form the prototypical class of nouns’.

It may be safest to say, then, that the situation concerning the linguistic status of names is currently in a state of flux, but that there is at least a strong focus on denotation as opposed to connotation – that is, on reference as opposed to sense – which gives names a special status within language. On the one hand, this special status means that they preserve evidence that vocabulary words do not. On the other hand, the same special status leads to them behaving differently from vocabulary words, so that the evidence they preserve may have only a limited range of application.

How are names created?
Things have certainly moved on a good deal since as recently as 20 years ago

10 He nonetheless (2008, 318) emphasises that even atypical occurrences of names, as with a plural inflection (four Davids) or definitive article (the Hank Barnes), ‘behave as common nouns because they are common nouns’ [original emphasis]. Significant too is that although names receive little discussion in Langacker 1990, the index entry is for ‘Noun – proper’ (389).
Clark (1990, 56) was able to state that ‘Names of all kinds are created out of
elements taken from ordinary language’. It would be difficult today to find
names of any kind to which this statement might unreservedly be applied.
Colman (e.g. 1992, 1996) has argued that the elements making up Anglo-
Saxon (and other Germanic) personal names are rather to be regarded as cognate
with the corresponding vocabulary items, forming part of an anthroponymicon
related to but distinct from the lexicon itself. According to Kitson (2002, 120),
the development of such an anthroponymicon occurred early in the history of
Indo-European, with any separation of monothematic and dithematic names
as productive types going ‘well back to Common Germanic times’. An outline
chronology for the subsequent development of the naming system is provided
by Insley (2006, 113):

In the early centuries of the Christian era, there seems to have been
a common North-West Germanic system of personal nomenclature,
which separated out into a Scandinavian system on the one side and a
North Sea Germanic/Continental Germanic system on the other in the
two centuries between the latter part of the Migration Period and the
eyear Viking period.

As regards place-names, Nicolaisen (1995) has demonstrated the existence
of a North-West Germanic toponymy developing separately from the lexica
of individual member languages, while Kitson’s (1996) work on British and
European river names supports the view that the divergence of such an onomastic
dialect from ordinary vocabulary took place before the Indo-European
languages themselves diverged. To an extent, Clark’s statement remains valid,
inasmuch that the presence of cognate elements, whether in different languages
or in different registers – lexical and onomastic – of the same language, testifies
to a common ancestor, and hence to a stage in linguistic pre-history when
names were created out of elements taken from ordinary language. But this
is very different from regarding either personal names or place-names coined
at different stages in the historical development of Scotland as evidence for
contemporary vocabulary.

Dialectal isoglosses
It follows too that the evidential value of place-names for dialectal isoglosses is
limited. Nicolaisen (1980, 42) pointed this out nearly 30 years ago, explaining that:

The ISONYMS that determine onomastic dialects are not always related
to the lexical ISOGLOSSES of linguistic dialects; and, even when they are,
only partial identity can be expected.
Most recently, Coates (2007, 70) draws attention to a further problem in that the restricted distribution of an element may be due to local naming strategies or material culture as opposed to the dialect lexicon:

A difficulty with onomastic lexicology is in understanding the relations between key terms and semantically similar ones ... We cannot tell from the absence of, say, *scydd* in the *gesell* area whether *gesell* replaces *scydd* linguistically, whether it merely replaces it in place-name construction, or whether the inhabitants built *gesells* rather than *scydds*.

Nonetheless, there are many instances where it would seem perverse to ignore the onomastic evidence. The Norse-derived term *carline* ‘old woman’ is common in Scottish names such as Carlinhead Rocks and Carlingnose in Fife, Carlin Tooth in Roxburghshire, Carlin’s Cairn in Galloway and Carlin’s Loup at Carllops, and it also forms place-names in northern England, including Carling Stone, Carling Knott and a lost *Kerlingsik* in Cumberland, and Carling Gill, Carlingwha and Curling Steps in Westmorland (Hough 2008). The English Place-Name Survey refers such names to the Old Norse etymon even where a comparatively recent date of coinage is indicated, and this tends to obscure the evidence for Middle or Early Modern English. In the first volume of the Scottish Place-Name Survey, Taylor (2006, 192, 375, 396) more sensibly treats *carline* as a Scots term, and the *OED* also describes it as ‘chiefly Scots’.

11 Unless the English place-names represent a toponymic usage only, however, it would appear that the distribution should be extended south of the border.

**Analogy**

A further complication is the role of analogy in place-name formation. A point made by Fellows-Jensen (2007), in her discussion of the Scandinavian element *gata* ‘street’ and its currency as a loanword in Lowland Scots, is that many of the street-names containing the term were probably examples of analogical naming on the model of names coined by the Vikings. Her examination of -*gata* names in Edinburgh reveals only eight that are potentially early, with a similar sparsity in Aberdeen supporting the view that many such names substantially post-date the Viking period (pp. 448–49). Again, there are parallels with Nicolaisen’s (e.g. 1987, 1994) argument that settlers in a new area would draw on ready-made names, characteristically taken from the toponymicon of their homeland, in addition to creating new names from lexical elements. As he points out (1994, 37), it would be difficult otherwise to account for the high proportion

---

11 Hough (2008, 48–49) noted two antedatings of the *OED* entry for *carline*, to which may now be added a lost field-name in the parish of Elwick, Durham, recorded as *Kerlingescros* 1198 x 1204 (Watts 2007, 77).
One such test is zeugma, where two senses of a word are used simultaneously. In examples such as
he read a book and a newspaper and he read a book and the riot act, the first sentence is acceptable because the verb read has the same sense in relation to a book and a newspaper, the second unacceptable because the verb has a different sense in relation to the riot act.

The force of onomastic analogy is persuasively seen at work wherever one looks, and one cannot help feeling that just about any item available in the Norwegian toponymicon at the time of the earliest Viking invasions and their subsequent reinforcements was grist to the Viking namers’ mills, from unanalysed nostalgic transfer to toponymic redeployment on the semantic level.

The same conclusion is suggested by the number of appellatival names within Fellows-Jensen’s corpus of Scandinavian names in North-West England and Dumfriesshire that are paralleled in Scandinavia (1985, 95), and by examples presented by Brink (1996) from more recently colonised areas of the world. Whereas one scenario is synchronic and the other diachronic, the common factor is that names or name elements are being selected from within the toponymicon rather than taken directly from the lexicon – just as personal names are selected from an existing corpus rather than being coined afresh on each occasion.

**Semantic range**

As regards semantics, key research is the systematic investigation of landscape vocabulary by Gelling and Cole culminating in their seminal book (2000). While their work focuses on the Germanic place-names of England, it forms the inspiration for similar approaches to topographical elements in Scottish place-names by Pratt (2005), and to Scots and Gaelic hill-generics by Drummond (2007). Again, however, it is uncertain to what extent the detailed typology of landscape terms identified within the toponymicon is also valid for the lexicon. A single element may have a different semantic range in the lexicon and onomasticon, as Nyström (1998) demonstrates through the example of Swedish berg ‘mountain, rock’, a term with a wider semantic extension as a generic in Swedish toponyms than as an appellative term. So, too, Scots barmkin has recently been shown to have both a lexical meaning ‘battlement, battlemented wall; a wall of defence’ and a toponymic meaning ‘hill with a fortification’ (Scott 2008b, 91–93). A parallel may be drawn with the broader linguistic question of where polysemy sets in. Linguists investigating modern languages have developed a range of tests for polysemy, but the distinction

---

12 One such test is zeugma, where two senses of a word are used simultaneously. In examples such as he read a book and a newspaper and he read a book and the riot act, the first sentence is acceptable because the verb read has the same sense in relation to a book and a newspaper, the second unacceptable because the verb has a different sense in relation to the riot act.
between separate meanings and a single broad meaning is still difficult to draw. As Taylor (2003, 103) notes:

Even though the distinction between monosemy and polysemy is in principle clear enough, it is in many cases tantalizingly difficult to decide if two uses of a linguistic form instantiate two different senses or whether they represent two exemplars, one perhaps more central than the other, of a single sense.

So too the distinction between toponymic and lexical uses of an individual element may be fuzzy. Some modern linguists seem to be moving towards a position where separate senses are regarded as points on a continuum – ‘a seamless fabric of meaning with no clear boundaries’ (Cruse 1986, 71) – and this may also be an appropriate way of regarding differences between the toponymic and lexical registers.

**Generics and specifics**

It is of course important to distinguish between different types of place-name element. Nicolaisen has repeatedly argued for a fundamental distinction between generics and specifics, with generics being drawn from the toponymic register, and specifics witnessing to the existence of terms as lexical items. Most recently in his reconsideration of Gaelic *sliabh*, he contrasts the use of the element as a specific reflecting a lexical dialect, and as a generic reflecting a toponymic dialect (2007, 185):

Names in which *sliabh* occurs as a specific ... do not have the same force as generic witnesses for a toponymic dialect, speaking rather to a lexical dialect.

It is certainly true that place-name specifics have most to tell us about non-onomastic vocabulary, both through the wider range of linguistic items that they comprise in comparison with generics, and through their closer relationship to the lexicon. A complicating factor, however, is that some specifics may acquire a conventional use in place-names which does not correspond to their main use in other areas of language. The most common toponymic use of the term *lady*, for instance, is with reference to the Virgin Mary, as in Ladywell Street in Glasgow, from a well dedicated to Mary (Foreman 1997, 85–86), and Lady’s Mill in Dunfermline, named from the chapel of St Mary (Taylor 2006, 329). This is far from being the most common use of the term in the Scottish lexicon. A similar pattern is found in English place-names like Lady Holme in the Lake District ‘islet of Our Lady’, named from a medieval chapel to the Virgin Mary (Whaley 2006,
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202–03), although again the OED shows this to be a minority usage of the lexical word.\textsuperscript{13} Something similar may apply to Scots \textit{moder}. Overwhelmingly the most common sense in the lexicon is ‘female parent’, but as Scott (2008a, 195–97) demonstrates, the sense in place-names is usually ‘source or fountainhead (of a river, stream or the like)’, as in Motherwell near Glasgow and Mother Water near Garlieston. This meaning also occurs in three lost place-names in northern England: Modrelake (1399) in Cheshire, Modersike (early 13th century) in Westmorland, and Mothersike (1603) in Cumberland.\textsuperscript{14} Again, the implication is that the specific \textit{moder} is characteristically used in place-names with a different frame of reference from the lexicon, and moreover that the dialect isoglosses are different, with the toponymic use spanning southern Scotland and northern England.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Linguistic categories}

The distinction between place-name generics and specifics may also have a bearing on theories of categorisation. Language is hierarchically structured, with superordinate categories such as \textit{animal} and \textit{plant} including within them basic level or prototype categories such as \textit{dog}, \textit{cat}, \textit{tree} and \textit{flower}, which in turn include subordinate or hyponym categories such as \textit{dalmatian}, \textit{poodle}, \textit{oak} and \textit{elm}. The basic level or prototype category is the one most salient to native speakers – the category learned first by children, and the one that people are most likely to use in naming an item. For modern languages, data for identifying category levels are obtained from native informants; and since this approach is not available for historical languages, it has generally been considered impossible to investigate them from this angle. The established view is expressed by Ungerer and Schmid (2006, 315):

\begin{quote}
Now we do not really know what the \textit{bird} category was like in Anglo-Saxon times because the major descriptive tools of category structure, i.e. goodness-of-example ratings and attribute listing by informants, are obviously not available.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} A fuller discussion of Scottish and English place-names in \textit{Lady} appears in Hough (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{14} The Cumberland and Westmorland names are doublets from the generic \textit{sike ‘slow-moving stream’}. They were previously attributed to feminine personal names, and Jesch (2008) offers the latter as an \textit{addendum} to the corpus presented in Hough (2002), without apparently realising that the interpretation has been revised.

\textsuperscript{15} This is one of many respects in which the toponymica of southern Scotland and northern England form a continuum (Hough 2001, 2003, 2005; Scott 2004, 216).
Their example is a particularly relevant one here since bird names are a recurrent type of place-name specific. This may suggest a way forward. As indicated in the extract quoted above from van Langendonck (2007a, 438), ‘basic level meaning’ is a property of names. It may therefore be possible that names preserve evidence for basic level categories in earlier stages of language. This may apply particularly to toponyms, since in order to function properly, place-names must be cognitively salient to a majority of the population. One of the characteristics of basic level vocabulary is that it is ‘the highest level at which category members have similarly perceived overall shapes’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, 27). This is precisely what Gelling and Cole (2000) have identified for landscape features, and what we might reasonably expect of other types of generics in order for the places to be recognisable by the original users of the names. Thus while the main thrust of Gelling and Cole’s argument was to disambiguate apparent synonyms, their work may also have important implications for the investigation of basic level vocabulary.

Whether or not this also applies to specifics remains to be seen. Since these too must be cognitively salient, it seems likely that many specifics also represent basic level vocabulary. Indeed, this was one of the main findings to emerge from a recent study of Anglo-Saxon colour terms in English and Scottish place-names (Hough 2006). Thus, for instance, the wide range of references to individual species of tree in place-names from both the Celtic and Germanic languages may be taken to indicate that this was basic level vocabulary in the medieval and earlier periods, although for many present-day speakers unable to distinguish an ash from an elm, the basic level is tree. Nonetheless, given the wide range of place-name specifics and their function in providing a more precise description of the feature identified by the generic, the possibility cannot be ruled out that specifics may include subordinate level categories as well.17

LINGUISTIC PROCESSES

The two main aspects of names that are generally taken to lead to differences in development from vocabulary items are their lack of lexical meaning and their characteristically compound structure. An extreme view was expressed by Lass (1973, 395), when he claimed that,

---

16 Twenty-three individual varieties are listed in Basden’s subject index (1978, 79), many of which the present writer would be unable to identify.

17 I discussed the role of place-name evidence in identifying category levels within historical languages in a paper presented to a day conference of the Scottish Place-Name Society in Govan on 4 November 2006 (summarised in Hough 2007).
since there is no necessary correlation holding, for a proper name, between phonological and syntactic or semantic representation (since the latter two are probably null), names are not constrained to exhibit any phonetic consistency.

More recently, many linguists have moved away from this position, with Anderson (2007, 159) stating firmly that ‘Individual names, as linguistic entities, participate in the morphological and “phonological processes” of the language they belong to’, and moreover that ‘there is no reason to deny English names the status of words of English’. Nonetheless, their mode of participation in such processes may differ from that of other linguistic entities. As Colman (2004, 90) notes:

Once a common word is adopted as a name-element, it ceases to function as a common word: it may develop phonologically in ways different from any changes to the common word-form ... or it may fail to exhibit variant forms available to the common word.

This means that name evidence must be used with caution, as it may not map directly onto other areas of language. At the same time, however, it may illustrate developments not attested by other sources. Nicolaisen (e.g. 1993, 1996) has demonstrated that place-name spellings can provide a more reliable dating for phonological changes than vocabulary words, and the issues are further explored – and some of Nicolaisen’s conclusions challenged – by Ó Maolalaigh (1998). The OED adopts a cautious stance, taking the view that ‘formal developments or peculiarities shown by a name cannot normally be taken as implying similar forms for the related lexical item, as it is by no means impossible that these forms are unique to the name’ (Simpson et al. 2004, 359). Indeed, scholars such as Fox (2007, §10) and Gammeltoft (2007, 489) have drawn attention to irregular sound changes and lexeme substitutions following loss of lexical meaning in place-names.

**Folk etymology**

These types of irregular developments and substitutions are often the result of folk etymology, a phenomenon that used to be considered trivial in comparison with historical etymology. However, there has recently been a burgeoning of interest within linguistics in folk etymology and the ways in which its operation can throw light on cognitive processes (e.g. Kjellmer 2006; Rundbland and Kronenfeld 2000). Comparison with similar developments in names can therefore be mutually enlightening. As Coates (1987) has demonstrated, this is an area of high theoretical interest where names and lexis can work together
to show how language develops within a cognitive framework. In the field of anthroponymy, for instance, Insley (2006, 115) suggests that Germanic *dazaz ‘day’ as a personal name element may represent a borrowing and reinterpretation of the Celtic name element Dago- ‘good’; while in the field of toponymy, early spellings of the place-name Priest Mill in West Lothian not only attest a previously unrecognised Scots *breist-mill antedating the earliest occurrence of English breast-mill ‘a water-mill in which the water goes in at the side or breast to turn the wheel’, but show the initial consonant being changed to <p> through the operation of folk etymology (Scott 2004, 216).

Returning to the carline names, formations such as Carlingnose and Carlin Tooth emphasise the anthropomorphic aspect, and this may have affected the development of some of the names. An interesting pair is Carlingnose and a lost Carlinknowes in the same county, both included in the first volume of the Fife Survey. Historical spellings of Carlingnose are as follows:

Carlingnose 1683
Carlin Knowes Quarry 1856
the Carlin’s Nose 1921\[18\]

This is relatively straightforward. The only uncertainty is whether the original generic is Scots knowes ‘hillocks’, as in the 19th-century form, or the facial term nose, as in the remaining spellings. If the latter, it would be used in a topographical sense to refer to a headland. Taylor (2006, 375) gives both alternatives:

‘Old woman’s or witch’s nose’, referring to a headland on the steep, rocky coast between Inverkeithing and North Queensferry. Alternatively ‘old woman’s or witch’s hillocks’ (plural of Sc knowe ‘hillock, knoll!’).

At the time of publication, however, the 1683 spelling had not yet come to light, and as Dr Taylor suggests to me (pers. comm.), it strongly supports a derivation from nose, with knowes representing a later re-interpretation. In light of this, we may compare the recorded spellings of the lost Carlinknowes in the parish of Burntisland:

Carlingneb 1775
Carlingneb 1828
Carlinknowes 1899\[19\]

---

\[18\] The two later spellings are from Taylor (2006, 375); the 1683 form has more recently been discovered, and has been kindly been supplied to me by Dr Taylor in advance of publication of an addendum to the entry.

\[19\] All spellings are from Taylor (2006, 192).
Here the original generic is Scots *neb* ‘nose’, replaced by *knowe(s)* ‘hillock(s)’ by the mid-19th century. But is it a coincidence that this is a near homonym of the facial term *nose*, a synonym of *neb*? The replacement of original place-name elements with synonyms has recently been discussed by Sandnes (2006, 2007), and I should like to suggest that the lost Fife name *Carlinknowes* may furnish another example. If this suggestion is correct, it may indicate that one link is missing from the recorded sequence of spellings, but also raises the fascinating possibility that that link may actually have been omitted from the mental process that led from *neb* ‘nose’ to *knowes* ‘hillocks’.

**Research Activity**

Finally, an overall impression of the level of activity within the field, and of the main foci of attention, may be gained from statistical data. The primary source here is the annual bibliography in the journal *Nomina*, which aims to cover all publications relevant to name studies in the British Isles. The most extensive part of the bibliography each year is section III (d) ‘Toponymy’. Many items included under this heading have implications for historical linguistics, as do items in section III (c) ‘Anthroponymy’. However, publications that are primarily concerned with language history, using onomastic evidence, are listed separately under section II (b) ‘Philology’. An analysis of this section of the bibliography over the last 12 years, grouping the publications within broad sub-divisions, produces the following results:

*Nomina* bibliography 1997–2008

- Dialectology: 18
- Language Contact: 16
- Phonology & Morphology: 9
- Vocabulary & Semantics: 78
- General/Miscellaneous: 27
- Total: 148

This is a rough analysis only, as some publications span more than one area and others are difficult to classify. Moreover, since the bibliography for 2008 had not yet been finalised at the time of writing, it is possible that a few additional items may come to light. Rough as it is, however, two points emerge very

---

20 Having been responsible for compiling the bibliography for the last 15 years, I am acutely aware that comprehensive coverage is an aspiration rather than an achievement.

21 Each publication has been counted only once. To avoid duplication, book reviews are not included.
clearly. One is a strong preponderance of publications in the field of vocabulary and semantics. These account for more than half the total, reflecting a vigorous research culture in this area. The second is the sheer number of items overall. As noted above, these are minimalist figures, since other sections of the Nomina bibliography also contain relevant data. Even so, the figure of 148 is strikingly high. The publication over the last 12 years of almost 150 articles and books concerned largely or primarily with onomastic evidence for the historical languages of the British Isles testifies to a very healthy state of the discipline. There is a lot of work going on.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it would appear that names exist in a symbiotic relationship with other areas of language. This relationship has many complexities, so that it is unsafe to draw direct parallels between either the initial formation or the later development of onomastic and non-onomastic items. Indirectly, however, both toponymic and anthroponymic data impact in many ways on our understanding of linguistic history, reflecting patterns and trends relevant to, though not always identical with, those found elsewhere. Like other types of textual and non-textual sources, name material must be handled with care. Since, however, it comprises a range of evidence fundamental to some of the major issues in the study of language origins and development, it occupies an important role in historical linguistics.
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In this article, when referring to place-names in their early forms, citing their appearance in charters and other documentary sources, I will render them in italics.

'A. rector ecclesie de Balinclog'.

'Et per hanc solucionem decem solidorum immune erit monasterium de Melros erga ecclesiam parochiale de Balinclog et rectores illius in perpetuum ab omni vexatione et exactione quo ad decimas dicti territorii de Barmor ...' (Melrose Liber no. 226).

We cannot be certain that Barmor was within the bounds of the core territory of this parish, however. Churches might gather teinds both from their own core parish territory and from detached parts of their parish which might lie at some distance from the core territory. For example, the lands of Kilrie and Inchkeirie, now in Kinghorn parish in Fife, were a detached part of the medieval parish of Aberdour, but lying 2.5km away from the nearest boundary of Aberdour’s core lands, an arrangement which arose from the fact that the lands of Kilrie and Inchkeirie were held by Inchcolm Abbey. For discussion of this arrangement see Taylor, with Márkus, Vol. 1, 394, 412–14. Where parishes included both a core territory and detached portions it may be supposed that this reflects some earlier grant of those detached portions to a religious body which subsequently ended up holding the parish together with its detached portions, or some process of that sort.
Gilbert Márkus

this is not an uncommon name in Scotland we are able to identify this particular one with confidence since this Baremor appears as the name of a territory given to Melrose Abbey by Richard Wallace (Ricardus le Walais) in 1189 × 1198, and the marches of the territory are given in the charter, Melrose Liber no. 69:

Dedi etiam predicte ecclesie illum terram que uocatur Baremor per has diuisas, scilicet ab hostio burne de Hactenewetne sursum usque ad caput eiusdem burne, et sic a capite burne sursum per quiddam uetus fossatum usque ad bog sub Hactnedonan, et sic deorsum sicut cruces facre sunt in quercus usque ad Louteuenan, et sic sursum uersum septemtrionem per uetus foassatum, usque ad Polnecreibs, et sic deorsum sicut Polnecreibs descendent in Fale, et sic deorsum per Fale usque ad hostium burne de Hactnewetne.

I have also given to the said church (i.e. Melrose) that land which is called Barmuir, by these marches, viz, from the mouth of the Auchenweet Burn going up to the head of that burn, and from the head of the burn going up by a certain old ditch as far as the bog below Auchendennan #, and so going down where crosses have been made in some oak trees, as far as Louteuenan, and so going up northwards by the old ditch to Polnecreibs, and so going down, as Polnecreibs descends into the (Water of) Fail, and down along the (Water of) Fail as far as the mouth of the Auchenweet Burn.

The fact that several of the names in this charter have survived as modern names which appear on Ordnance Survey maps enables us to identify Baremor with certainty as Barmuir in the modern parish of Tarbolton, Ayrshire, at OS grid reference NS440288, the centre of the estate. We are also able to give a fairly confident account of the marches of the territory of Barmuir – an account which should be read in conjunction with the map printed below. The Auchenweet Burn (burne de Hactenewetne) forms the south-eastern march, going up from its mouth where it flows into the Water of Fail as far as its head. The march then goes ‘up’ (sursum, though in fact the land goes down) from the head of the Auchenweet Burn by an old ditch to the bog below Hactnedonan. Though this name does not survive now, the place is shown on early maps in the following forms:

5 Witnesses include ‘E. abbate de Dunfermelin’ (i.e. Archibald 1178–98) and ‘A. abbate de Cupro’, who must be either Adam (1189–94) or Arnold (1194–98).
6 I will mark such obsolete place-names thus, #, and when referring to them will use the form in which they most recently appear in the record. Forms of place-names prefaced by an asterisk, such as *Baile Bhaodán, are reconstructed forms which are not actually found thus in the record.
7 All the maps cited in this article are available in excellent high-resolution images on-line at the website of the National Library of Scotland, <www.nls.uk/maps>. The name also appears as ‘Auchindownan vel Auchindonan’ in 1690 (Retours Ayr no. 665).
The loch, which was mostly drained c. 1840, is an area of some archaeological interest: five logboats have been found there, and the remains of a crannog which had evidently been used over several centuries, containing evidence of 1st–2nd-century use, a ringed pin dating from the ninth century and a knife and other metal implements from the 16th or 17th century (Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, on-line database, <http://jura.rcahms.gov.uk/CANMAP/Map>, ref. NS43SE 5).

For example, in 1652 the lands of Barmure are said to include ‘the lands of Eister and Wester Durayes lying at the mill of Milneburne and cornmill of Barmure’ (RMS x no. 11).

From these maps it is clear that Auchendennan lies at or about the site of OS Littlehill, NS467304. The ‘bog below Auchendennan’ must be the howe lying below the 115m contour, straddling the modern parish boundary. The bog is now mostly drained but still contains a pond at NS469303. As this former bog lies on the parish boundary, and as parish boundaries are fairly conservative features of the landscape, it seems likely that at this point and hereafter the northern march of the territory of Barmuir coincides with the parish boundary of Tarbolton and Craigie, as it goes up (not ‘down’, deorsum, as the charter says) from the bog past some cross-marked oak trees, and then down to Loutueunan. I would suggest that a common scribal error has occurred here and amend the t to c giving Louceuenan, probably the earlier name of the loch (here rendered loue) which has given its name to the farm shown on OS maps called Lochlea. The loch itself lies right on the Tarbolton-Craigie boundary, though only a small part of this once much larger loch survives, at NS457302. I cannot determine what the -euenan in this name represents.

From this loch the charter boundary goes up to the north by an old ditch as far as a burn which the charter calls Polnecreihs and which flows down into the Water of Fail (in Fale). One might consider three burns as candidates for the Polnecreihs, all of which join together before entering the Fail:

(1) the Mill Burn, i.e. the burn, not named on OS maps, which flows through the settlement called Millburn,

(2) the burn flowing from East Doura, not named on OS maps, or

(3) the burn shown as Townend Burn on OS maps.

Of these it seems that the Townend Burn is likely to be the north-western boundary of the territory of Barmuir, for two reasons. First of all it forms the boundary of this part of Tarbolton parish, and parish boundaries very commonly coincide with estate boundaries. Secondly we know that, in later centuries at least, the lands of Barmuir included the lands of East Doura and West Doura, both of which lie on the west side of the burn no. 2 above, implying that the...
lands of Barmuir extended west of that burn, and therefore presumably as far as the Townend Burn. The name Polnecreihs also looks as if it may represent Gaelic poll na crìche, ‘the boundary burn’, which would fit both its modern identity as the boundary of Tarbolton parish and its 12th-century identity as the boundary of Barmuir.

Following the Townend Burn to its outflow in the Water of Fail, and then along the Water of Fail to where we started, at the mouth of the Auchinweet Burn, allows us to define the western and southern marches of 12th-century Barmuir with some precision. It is therefore possible to represent the whole territory of Barmuir granted to Melrose in the late 12th century as shown on the map below.

This identification of the territory of Barmuir does not tell us, of course, exactly where we might find Balinclog itself, or what the extent of that parish was. It shows the absolute minimum extent of the parish: it must have included at least this territory, but how much more? In later centuries it seems that Barmuir lay in neighbouring Mauchline parish, but it cannot have lain in Mauchline in the 12th or 13th centuries, since Mauchline was only a chapel until 1315 when a parish church was erected. Furthermore the teinds of Mauchline were enjoyed by Melrose Abbey, not by any local priest, so Mauchline cannot have included the lands of Barmuir at this early stage when the teinds of Barmuir belonged to the rector of Balinclog. In addition, when the territory of Mauchline was granted to Melrose Abbey by Walter the Steward in 1165 x 1177, the marches were specified at length, and they did not include the territory of Barmuir. Whatever post-Reformation parish Barmuir was in, it was clearly not in Mauchline in the 13th century.

At this point it is important to note that there was another parish lying to the immediate west of Tarbolton, called Barnweil. This parish was suppressed in 1673 and its territory divided into two parts, the western part being incorporated into Craigie parish of which it now forms the south-western part, the eastern part being

---

10 Barrow 2003, 321: ‘Barmuir in Tarbolton (formerly in Mauchline)’. This seems to reflect the arrangements found in late 16th- and 17th-century documents, where Barmuir is listed with Kylesmuir and lies in Mauchline parish, no doubt because it was so close to Mauchline (though not actually adjacent as the map below shows) and because they were both held by Melrose Abbey. See for example RMS iv no. 1079 (‘pro decimis garbalibus terrarum de Kilesmure et Barmure, in parochia de Mauchlene’). Kylesmuir (Mora de Kyle) appears to have been originally the estate of Melrose Abbey for which their chapel or church was designated in 1315 as the new baptismal church, located at Mauchline. The territory of Kylesmuir must then have embraced all of the modern parishes of Mauchline, Sorn and Muirkirk, which were part of medieval Mauchline (Melrose Liber no. 407).

11 Melrose Liber nos. 407–08.

12 Melrose Liber no. 66; the description is repeated in no. 67 (x 1177) and no. 72 (1223 x 1226).
incorporated into Tarbolton.\(^{13}\) The map below shows the lands which belonged to the old parish of Barnweil and how they are now distributed between the parishes of Craigie and Tarbolton.\(^{14}\)

It may be that the parish of Barnweil was created in the 13th or 14th century in order to support the newly founded Trinitarian house of Fail,\(^{15}\) and that it was carved out of the older parish of Balinclog, leaving Barmuir as a separate part which would later be taken into Mauchline and then Tarbolton where it is now. It may be that the parish of Barnweil is older than the Trinitarian house, however. Barnweil (Berenbouell) appears before 1177 as a territory which marked the north-western limit of the territory of Tarbolton (Torboultoun),\(^{16}\) and though it is not named as a parish at this point, the secular territory of Barnweil may very well have become a parish long before the foundation of the Trinitarian house of Fail.

Tarbolton parish does not appear in the record until 1335,\(^ {17}\) but it also may well have existed long before that. The secular lordship of Tarbolton appears before 1177, being granted by Alan son of Walter the Steward to one Adam son of Gilbert, a charter confirmed in c. 1290 by James, Steward of Scotland.\(^ {18}\) The name Tarbolton itself suggests an even earlier settlement here, perhaps one of some importance. It is evidently a Gaelic name, whose generic element is tòrr 'hill, mound, heap',\(^ {19}\) and whose specific element is an Old English place-name *bopel-tūn*, meaning 'farm of the hall or dwelling-place'. The creation of a Gaelic place-name in Ayrshire containing a pre-existing Old English name of this sort indicates an earlier settlement than the charter of Alan son of Walter. But I have not found any evidence to show at what point this secular territorial unit became also an ecclesiastical unit, a parish. One possibility is that medieval Tarbolton (i.e. before the addition of the eastern lands of former Barnweil) was the same territory as the parish of Balinclog. It is not a great rarity for a given territory to have one name qua secular estate and another name qua parish. Balinclog may

\(^{13}\) RPC iv, 80. The ruins of the parish kirk of Barnweil stand on high ground, with marvellous views over Ayrshire, across to Arran and Kintyre, and north to Ben Lomond, at NS404298.

\(^{14}\) See for example NAS GD158/390/4; RMS xi nos. 212 and 525; Retours (Ayr) nos. 158 and 619; NAS RH9/3/33; NAS RH15/209/1.

\(^{15}\) Cowan and Easson 1976, 109.

\(^{16}\) Fraser, Lennox vol. 2, no. 1.

\(^{17}\) Melrose Liber no. 447, in which John de Graham, lord of Tarbolton grants right of patronage of the church of Tarbolton to his kinsman Robert de Graham, lord of Walston (Walston-cæs) in Tarbolton parish. There is no mention here of Melrose Abbey having any rights in the church whatsoever. The reason for the inclusion of this charter in Melrose Liber is presumably that seven years later the said Robert granted the right of patronage and advowson to Melrose Abbey (Melrose Liber nos. 452 and 453).

\(^{18}\) Fraser, Lennox, vol. 2, nos. 1 and 16.

\(^{19}\) All early forms of the name begin Tor-, not Tûr-.
have been the name of the territory in its ecclesiastical aspect, Tarbolton its name as secular lordship.

Ultimately we do not have enough information about the early history of the relevant parishes of Barnweil, Tarbolton, Craigie and Mauchline to be able to say with any confidence where Balinclog lay, nor what were the bounds of its parish territory. But there remain some interesting things to say about this lost parish and its name.

The cult of relics

First of all consider the meaning of the name: Balinclog must be Gaelic *baile a’ chluig* (earlier *baile in cloic*) ‘the farm of the bell’. This name makes sense in the context of the traditional Gaelic religious practice in which certain relics such as bells, crosiers and books were associated with the memory of much earlier saints and were held in the custody of hereditary relic keepers. Such a keeper, a *deóradh* (the origin of the family name Dewar), would hold a farm in return for his performance of the duties required of him as relic-keeper. We have records of some of the duties of the relic-keeper including the administration of oaths, healing the sick, accompanying the dead to their graves, and so on. Other place-names in Scotland reflect this practice. Pitbauchlie and Pitliver in Dunfermline parish, Bantuscall # in Kettle, all of them in Fife, all combine a word for a settlement (*pett* or *baile*) with a specific element referring to a relic: *bachall* (crosier), *leabhar* (book), *soisgeul* (gospel).

Peynabachalla on the island of Lismore is ‘the pennyland of the *bachall* or crosier’. Balinclog fits into this pattern, but there is no indication who the saint was whose bell was associated with the place, nor what family held the dewarship of it.

Baile-names and parishes

Place-names containing the now very common Gaelic element *baile* ‘farm, estate, vill’, and perhaps earlier meaning simply ‘dwelling-place’, do not appear in the Scottish record until the late 11th century when Balchrystie in Newburn parish, Fife, first appears. However, the vast majority of *baile* names first appear in the
12th century or later, suggesting that the name Balinclog was probably a fairly recent coining at its sole appearance in the record in 1226.

Although place-names in baile are common enough in Scotland, baile has a strangely low profile when it comes to the names of medieval parishes. Of approximately one thousand Scottish parish names in the Middle Ages, very few can be shown to contain baile. I will discuss each of them in turn.

BALANTRODACH
In Mid Lothian. It became an alternative name for Temple parish, this so named because it was a house of the Knights Templar (their principal house in Scotland). The name is from Gaelic *Baile nan Trodach ‘the farm of the warriors’, and as W. J. Watson noted, ‘there can be little or no doubt that the name was given with reference to the Knights, who fought for the Holy Sepulchre in the Crusades – a valuable indication of Gaelic activity in Lothian about the middle of the 12th century.’23 But Balantrodach itself does not appear in the record as the name of a parish until 1426,24 presumably having originally been the name of a farm belonging to the Templars, the name subsequently being applied to the parish.

BALEGLINEN #
In Perthshire. It first appears not as a parish-name, nor even as a chapel, but as the name of one of the lands belonging to the church of Perth and the castle chapel, granted to Dunfermline Abbey in 1157 x 116025. It appears shortly thereafter as the name of a church:

- ecclesiam de Balglinen 1163 Dunf. Reg. no. 237 (p. 152)
- ecclesiam de villa Gliñen 1165 × 1169 Dunf. Reg. no. 94
- (capella de) Balmacglenin 1184 Dunf. Reg. no. 239
- ecclesiam de Villa de Glinen 1202 × 1206 Dunf. Reg. no. 110
- ecclesiam de Villa de Glinen 1228 × 1236 Dunf. Reg. no. 106

It is possible to identify this now lost ‘church’ by the reference to it in Dunf. Reg. no. 106 which is a confirmation of the church of Villa de Glinen to Dunfermline Abbey, and which has in the margin ‘i. Freretun’. This is Friarton, now a suburb on the south side of the city of Perth (grid reference NN1121), which must

23 Watson 1926, 137. The modern Gaelic word trodach generally means ‘quarrelsome, squabbling, scolding’, but its origin lies in the older Gaelic verb trotaid ‘fights’, and its adjective trotach is ‘fond of fighting’, hence ‘warrior’. Watson also noted (loc. cit.) that Balantrodach is now called Arnieston.
24 CSSR ii, 129: ‘the churches of St John of Baldrenddock and Inchenane’. See also Cowan 1967, 196.
25 Dunf. Reg. no. 40 (= RRS i no. 157).
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have been so named to mark it out as a holding of the ‘friars’ or brothers of Dunfermline Abbey.\textsuperscript{26} It is probable that, in spite of the several references listed above to an ecclesia of Baleglinen, it was never actually anything more than a chapel dependent on the parish church of Perth. After all, it first appears, as we have seen above, as the name of a pertinent of the church of St John in Perth (which had been appropriated to Dunfermline Abbey as early as 1163); and \textit{Dunf. Reg.} no. 239 mentions ‘the church of Perth and the chapels of the castle, St Leonard’s hospital and Balglinen’ (ecclesiam de \textit{Perth} et capellas de castello et hospitale S. Leonardi et \textit{Balmacglenin}). It is likely that Baleglinen never achieved full parochial status, but was always dependent on the parish church of St John in Perth, which was also appropriated to Dunfermline Abbey.\textsuperscript{27}

\section*{BALLANTRAE}

In Ayrshire. The medieval parish was called Kirkcudbright, ‘the church of St Cuthbert’, or Innertig. The medieval kirk was sited at NX116838, about four miles from the shore, where the Water of Tig flows into the Stinchar, whence the name Innertig (the \textit{inbhir} ‘mouth or outflow’ of the Tig). The parish was annexed to the abbey of Crossraguel, and appears thus in early records:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{vic. de Innertig} 1275 \textit{Crossraguel Chr.} i, 11 \textsuperscript{[taxation by Bagimond]}
  \item \textit{Kirkcudbrycht} c. 1560s \textit{Assumption} 567 \textsuperscript{[payment of 40 merks to Crossraguel Abbey]}
  \item rentale of \textit{Kirkcudbrycht} alias \textit{Innertig} c. 1560s \textit{Assumption} 570 \textsuperscript{[set by the abbot of Crossraguel]}
\end{itemize}

The name of the parish was changed to Ballantrae in the early 17th century, on the erection of a new church in the town of Ballantrae in memory of Gilbert Kennedy (NMRS NX08SE 4). This change was presumably made for pastoral reasons, to respond to the emergence of Ballantrae as a more significant population centre on the shore of the Firth of Clyde. Ballantrae was therefore not a parish-name before the 17th century.

\section*{BALLINGRY}

In Fife. The name first appears as the name of an estate, but there was a chapel there belonging to Auchterderran parish. It probably became a parish in the 14th century, but first appears explicitly as a parish church with a rector in 1424.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} The church of Friarton or Baleginen \# is not listed among the parishes of medieval Scotland by Cowan 1967. Barrow identified Baleginen with Friarton (\textit{RRS} i no. 157); for discussion of the variant forms of the name in Gaelic \textit{baile} or Latin \textit{villa}, see Taylor1994, 107–08, n. 12.

\textsuperscript{27} This is the view taken by Rogers (1992, 208–12).

\textsuperscript{28} See Taylor, with Márkus, Vol. 1, 133 and 137–38; \textit{CSSR} ii, 69.
BALLUMBY
In Angus. In origin a chapel of Lundie parish, the first appearance of Ballumby as a parish is in 1470.\(^{29}\) It is presumably the chapel which appears in a taxation roll of c. 1250, ‘ecclesia de Lundy cum capella’.\(^{30}\)

BALMACLELLAN
In Kirkcudbrightshire. This parish was recorded in 1281 as Treuercarco, evidently a British tref-name, older than the Gaelic name Balmaclellan.\(^{31}\) Indeed the Gaelic baile-name for the parish does not appear until the fifteenth century.\(^{32}\)

BALMAGHIE
In Kirkcudbrightshire. This church in the deanery of Glenken was formerly known as Kirkandrews, and first appears in the early 1170s.

\[\text{ecclesi\textit{a} de \textit{Kircandr}'} \text{Balmakethe} 1287 \text{ Holyrood Liber no. 83 [confirmation to Holyrood by Henry, bishop of Whithorn]}\]

The most natural interpretation of this series of Latin documents and their rendering of the early forms of the name is that the church was called *Kirkandrews in the 12th century (rendered in Latin as 'ecclesia Sancti Andree'), and that it was only later re-named in Gaelic with a baile element. Indeed the

\(^{29}\) John Spanky, rector of the parish church of Balum\textit{wy} in the diocese of St Andrews, was dispensed to be promoted to holy orders, in spite of his illegitimacy (CPL xii, 795); Cowan 1967, 13.

\(^{30}\) Dunf. Reg. no. 313, p. 209.

\(^{31}\) Bagimond’s Roll, 74. Although the editor has there identified it with the parish of Troqueer, D.E.R. Watt, in an unpublished note dated September 1975, ‘Some desirable improvements to text of “Bagimond’s Roll” as edited in SHS Misc vi, 25–77’ (of which I have a photocopy), identified Treuercarco with Balmaclellan, noting that Troqueer was in any case in Glasgow diocese, whereas Treuercarco is listed by Bagimond in Galloway diocese (Candide Case), deanery of Glenken (Glenken). This identification of Treuercarco with Balmaclellan is also made by Brooke 1991, 319; and also in Atlas, 357.

\(^{32}\) CPL x, 156.
1287 form Kirkandr’ Balmakethe strongly suggests that even then the parish was called Kirkandrews, but that it was now being given an additional identifier, the name of the secular settlement at Balmaghie (at NX7163, about 3km south of the site of the kirk), presumably simply to distinguish it from another parish of Kirkandrews in the same diocese, in the deanery of Desnes: Kirkandrews Purton, now in Borgue parish (NX6048).

BALMERINO
In Fife. This parish first appears in the record as Coultra, at the end of the 12th century. But a few years later, when a new Cistercian monastery was being founded in the parish (not at Coultra but closer to the shore at Balmerino) and when the lands of both Coultra and Balmerino were being set up in 1225 ready to be granted to that monastery by Queen Ermengarde, the parish kirk was first referred to as ‘ecclesi de Balmurinach’. It is likely that the old parish of Coultra was given this new baile-name simply because its centre was shifting to Balmerino, and because the parish would be appropriated by the monks of Balmerino. The Cistercians finally arrived in their monastery in 1229.

BALNACROSS
In Kirkcudbrightshire. Later becoming part of Tongland parish, the church of Balnacross (Balencros) belonged formerly to the abbey of Iona, but was removed from Iona’s control in 1172 x 1174 and granted to Holyrood Abbey. The name is now represented by Barncrosh in Tongland parish.

BALNAKIEL
On Lewis. Cowan wrongly calls this ‘Balmakiel’ and gives it as an alternative name for Uig parish on Lewis. The name should of course be ‘Balnakiel’, which would be a reasonable representation of its Gaelic name Baile na Cille, ‘the farm of the church’. It signifies either that the farm in question was near the church or that it was land held by the church, a kirktoun. The parish was
named as *Wik* in 1572, *Wuicg* c. 1600, *Wuicg* c. 1630, and *Uge* in c. 1695.\(^{37}\)

The parish was also called *Uig* by the members of the Presbytery of Skye when they met in 1722, lamenting that the inhabitants were ‘brought up in great Ignorance, and are an easy Prey to Priests Jesuits and other Traffickers to Popery’, for the remedy of which situation they sought the construction of a new kirk at *Balnakill*.\(^{38}\) The ruins of the medieval church with its burying ground stand by the shore at NB048338, and beside them are the remains of the later kirk proposed by the presbytery and built in 1724.\(^{39}\) It seems therefore that the medieval parish was called *Uig*, and that the alternative name *Baile na Cille* was applied to the kirk only in the modern period, perhaps encouraged by the fact that the members of Presbytery described the site of the new kirk in terms of its location at *Baile na Cille*, naming the church after the settlement, the settlement itself having originally taken its name from its proximity to, or the fact that it belonged to, the medieval kirk of *Uig*.

**BALIBODAN**

In Argyll. This name first appears in the 17th century as an alternative name for the parish of Ardchattan in Benderloch.\(^{40}\) It appears that although the monastery of Ardchattan, in the parish now called by that name, was dedicated to St Catan, the parish kirk was actually dedicated to St Báetan, later Baodán, as witnessed by the place-names Balibodan and Kilbodan:

(parish church of St Bedan in) *Beanedecaloch* 1420 *CSSR* i, 174
(parish church of St Bedan in) *Beaneadendaloch* 1420 *CSSR* i, 188
(parish church of St Bedan in) *Bean Edder Daloch* 1420 *CSSR* i, 214
*Kil-Bedan* c. 1600 *Geog. Coll.* ii, 515 [‘a paroche Church besyd the Abbay Church ... called *Kil-Bedan* ...’]

*Balliebodane* 1603 *OPS* Vol. 2, part i, 148 [citing ‘Regester’ at Taymouth]
*Kilbedan* c. 1630 *Geog. Coll.* ii, 153 [the name of the parish church near the ‘bigg church’ of Ardchattan]

kirk of *Bailevedan* and *Kilepickerrall* 1641 *Argyll Synod* i, 26
*Bailevedan* 1642 *Argyll Synod* i, 58 [Drissaig, Corries and Letterben are to be

---

\(^{37}\) *Book of Dunvegan* i, 36; *Geog. Coll.* ii, 533, ii, 184; Martin 1698, 106. In the last of these, Martin Martin mentions a ‘St Christopher’s chapel’.

\(^{38}\) NAS TE19/823. I am most grateful to Domhnall Uilleam Stiùbhart for making available to me his transcript of this document. A common scribal error has actually rendered the initial *U* as *N*, giving *Nig*, but clearly *Uig* was the name of the parish which the presbytery intended to record; another error in the same document renders the name as *Uib*.

\(^{39}\) *NMRS* NB03SW 2. The modern parish kirk – a 19th-century building – lies about 500m to the north-east of the medieval and 18th-century remains.

\(^{40}\) At least Cowan indicates that it is an alternative name for Ardchattan parish (1967, 8).
dismembered from Bailevedan and annexed to the parish of Dysart, and the lands of Fanans and Icarachain to be adjoined to Muckerne] (kirk and parish of) Bailevedan 1651 Argyll Synod i, 251 kirk of Ballivadan 1655 Argyll Synod ii, 82 teinds of Balliveodan 1662 Argyll Sasines ii, 344 Ballibodan or Kilbodan 1697 Retours [cited in OPS Vol. 2, part i, 148]

Much of the parish’s medieval record has disappeared into the documentary shadow cast by the monastery of Ardcathann, to which the parish kirk belonged probably from Ardcathann’s foundation in 1230 or 1231, and this means we have no clear medieval place-name referring to the parish. But the likelihood is that it was called *Cill Bhaodáin, since (a) the parish kirk is referred to in medieval Latin sources as the parish church of St Baodáin, (presumably from ‘ecclesia parochialis Sancti Bedani’) as shown above, and (b) when the kirk first appears with its own proper name c. 1600 it appears with its cill element still intact as Kil-Bedan. Only after 1697 does the cill-name seem to have given way entirely to the name *Baile Bhaodáin, a name which probably represents an early modern adoption of a local farm-name as the name of the parish.

There are a number of other medieval parishes which appear to have names containing baile, but the appearance is deceptive. BALDERNOCK is Buthernok c. 1200 × 1225, Buthernok 1504, Bedernok 1504. BALFRON is Buthbrene 1233. BALQUHIDDER is Buffudire 1266, Buchfyder 1268, Buthfuder 1287, Buchquhidder 1467. All these names, rather than containing baile as their generic element, appear to contain both, which can mean ‘hut, bothy, shieling’, but also came to refer specifically to churches or chapels.

Of the eleven baile names briefly discussed above, we see only one which appears to be the original name of an early parish and which has survived into the present: Balnacross (though it is no longer a parish). Of the remainder, four (Balantrodach, Ballingry, Ballumby and Balmaclellan) do not appear until the fifteenth century; three (Ballantrae, Balnakiel and Baliboden) are probably post-Reformation names; two (Balmaghie and Balmerino) are names which replaced earlier parish names in the 13th century. One, the now defunct Baleglinen in Perth was probably only a chapel rather than a parish, and it disappears from view in the mid-13th century. To this list of parish names in baile we can now

41 Cowan 1967, 8.
42 Had it been called *Baile Bhaodáin, rather than *Cill Bhaodáin, it is more than likely that this secular name would have appeared in the medieval record.
43 Respectively Glasg. Reg. no. 103, RMS ii no. 2816, RMS iii no. 983.
44 Inchaffray Chrs. no. 119.
45 Respectively Inchaffray Chrs. no. 95, no. 96, Bagimond’s Roll, 53, ER vii, 483.
add Balinclog, a parish which appears briefly in 1226 and then disappears entirely from the record.

The foregoing discussion indicates that Scottish *baile*-names were secular settlement names that became parish names only rarely, and when they did so they tended to be unstable and disappear; or else they may have become parish names comparatively late in the history of parish development (in the fifteenth century or the 17th century). What explanation should we seek for their rarity and instability as parish names?

One possible reason is that so many of the church sites and territories which were, or were to become, parishes already had perfectly good names in the 12th century when *baile*-names started to be coined. *Baile*-names simply appeared on the scene too late, in the majority of cases, to be useful in coinig names for churches or parishes. Though *baile*-names might become parish names in cases where new parishes were being created later, the great majority of pre-parochial church territories would maintain their older names when they were being rebranded as parishes.

Another possible explanation is that a parish will typically consist of the territory of a secular lordship, and such lordships were generally larger than a single *baile* farm. A single lordship or parish territory might contain several places called *baile* and therefore *baile*-names are less likely to be used for the naming of parishes. Let us take a handful of East Fife parishes, for example: Leuchars contains four places called *baile*, St Andrews and St Leonards contains thirteen, Carnbee contains five, Largo contains four, Coultra (later Balmerino) contains three, and Ceres contains four. If parishes are so much larger than typical *baile* farms, one might expect that they would be given the names of the larger lordships or estates of which each *baile* estate formed only a part.

Either or both of these factors may have worked to ensure that though *baile* is a very productive place-name element through much of Scotland, it did not provide very many parish names, and when it did they were somewhat unstable or appeared rather late. There may, of course, be other quite different explanations of this pattern.

**Gaelic into Scots?**

Finally, it is worth considering that the name Balinclog may survive in a half-translated form in the farm now called Clockston, which lies very close to the lands of Barmuir and within the modern parish of Tarbolton at NS419282 (see map). I have been unable to find any trace of Clockston before 1828 but it is possible that the name is much older than that and was coined at a time of transition from

---

46 It appears as *Clockstone* on John Thomson’s map, *The Southern Part of Ayrshire* (see <www.nls.uk/maps>) in that year, and as *Clockston* on the OS 6 inch 1st edition.
Balinclog: a lost parish in Ayrshire

MLWL records the first instance of ‘bell’ in c. 550 AD.

If this is the case, we must propose an early Scots word *clock ‘bell’, which has not hitherto been recognised with this meaning – at least it is not recorded in that sense in DSL. Old English cluca meant ‘bell’, presumably borrowed directly from Latin cloca. Note that Old Gaelic cloca was actually masculine, while it seems to have entered the mainstream medieval Latin tradition as a feminine noun. However, insular Latin seems to have maintained it at least for a while as a masculine noun, since Tírechán, writing in the 670s or 680s, wrote that St Patrick brought across the Shannon ‘fifty bells’, quinquaginta clocos (Bieler 1979, 122).
translation of Balinclog, but may be a new creation based on the continuing identification of the farm with its bell-ringing dewar.

There remains one other possible explanation of the relationship between Balinclog and Clockston. It is clear from the name Tarbolton that we cannot assume that the sequence of languages spoken in this area and generating place-names is: British > Gaelic > Scots. The name Tarbolton indicates that Older Scots (or Old English or Old Northumbrian, if the term is preferred – in any case a Germanic language) was spoken here and gave rise to the name *Bolton (from *bopel-tūn) before Gaelic speakers adopted the existing name and prefixed Gaelic tòrr to it, to create the modern name Tarbolton. If a Scots name precedes the Gaelic one in this case, might we not be able to imagine a similar sequence for Clockston-Balinclog in which a farm held by the dewar of a saint’s bell was first named in Scots as *clokistūn or similar? As Gaels later began to re-name the landscape, it was they who renamed *clokistūn as Balinclog, either simply translating the older name from Scots into Gaelic, or perhaps creating a new name to reflect the continuing association of the farm with the bell and its dewar. This seems a fairly remote possibility, but one that should be born in mind.
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This article began as an Appendix to Robin Campbell’s ‘Charge of Temporalitie of Kirk Landis and the parish of Lesmahagow’ (see this volume), the intention being to identify the lands in that document, to put their names in the context of other early forms, and to offer a brief comment on their derivation. While that remains at the core of this article, it has ‘grown legs’ to become what will be, I hope, the beginnings of a full toponymic survey of this large and well-documented parish. I remain much indebted to Robin Campbell for providing the immediate impetus for this study, as well as for supplying many of the early modern forms of the place-names surveyed below, along with editorial and tenurial details, and for help in locating names no longer in use. The bulk of the medieval forms, along with the analysis, originated in work I did, in conjunction with the late Ruth Richens, for a paper entitled ‘Pont and the place-names of Lesmahagow’, delivered at New Lanark on 1 April 2000, at the conference ‘A Pont Miscellany’, organised by Project Pont, Map Library, National Library of Scotland. My work on the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Project ‘The expansion and contraction of Gaelic in Medieval Scotland: the evidence of names’, based at the Department of Celtic, University of Glasgow (2006–10), has also allowed me to examine in more depth several early charters in *Kel. Lib.* relating to Lesmahagow which contain what must be one of the most detailed sets of late 12th and early 13th-century boundary descriptions from any part of Scotland. It is, however, to Ruth Richens that I owe the greatest debt, for first alerting me to the rich medieval heritage of Lesmahagow, and for sharing with me her extensive knowledge of the parish with which she had such strong familial and emotional ties, as well as for laying the foundations of our understanding of Lesmahagow’s medieval geography and land-holding patterns. It is to her memory that I would like to dedicate this article.1

While the place-names of Lesmahagow still await a comprehensive survey and analysis, there are several preliminary points which can be usefully made. The most important is that three languages have contributed to the bulk of the place-nomenclature. These are, in roughly chronological order, British (also sometimes referred to as Cumbric), Scottish Gaelic and Scots. The sequence of languages, however, is not straightforward: see, for example, Auchtyfardle,

---

1 I would also like to thank Dauvit Broun, Thomas Clancy, Gilbert Márikus and Andrew Smith for suggestions and comments on the contents of this article.
Names of British Origin

W.J. Watson states that on the 1-inch Ordnance Survey Map there are about 50 names in Lanarkshire ‘which might be claimed to be British’, several of these being river names, with about 100 of Gaelic origin (1926, 197; see also Grant 2007, 111–13). An in-depth survey of the county’s place-names will certainly reveal more names of both British and Gaelic origin, although whether their relative proportion will be radically altered by such a study remains to be seen. However, the limited evidence furnished by a block of Lesmahagow charters covering the period from 1147–1218 (Kel. Lib. i nos. 102–16), discussed below, suggests the number of British names could be somewhat higher, with about nine compared with about 14 Gaelic ones. Corra is one of these names very probably coined by British speakers. It clearly applied to an important territory, which once occupied much of the north-east part of the lands of Lesmahagow, and included *Fincorra (see map in Richens 1992, reproduced in Grant 2007, 118 and Smith 2008, 35). This latter name, which can be interpreted as ‘white Corra’, was coined by Gaelic speakers using a pre-existing British name to apply to a subdivision of the original territory of Corra. The significance of ‘white’ is difficult to determine, but may refer to the high quality of the land: Ruth Richens states that this was probably the best land in the parish (1992, 186). Furthermore, the lands of Affleck (Gaelic) and Greenrig (Scots) were subdivisions of the lands of Corra (or *Fincorra) emerging in the later 12th century. This is a reminder that any comparison between Gaelic and British names in Lanarkshire must not simply consist of a word-count, but must also consider the relative importance and high-status nature of the surviving British names, a fact which did not escape the notice of W.J. Watson (1926, 197). These include Lanark itself, Govan, Partick, Poneil LEW and Douglas.

Names of Gaelic Origin

There are a significant number of Gaelic settlement names, which include a

---

2 Corra is not mentioned in the Charge, but because of its importance in earlier documents it has been included in the survey, below.

3 Fincurrok is 1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 114 [rubric]; Fincurrok’ 1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 114; le Fincurrok’ 1208 × 1218 Kel. Lib. i no. 108 [rubric]; Fincurroc’ 1208 × 1218 Kel. Lib. i no. 108.

4 This is to be preferred to Watson’s interpretation as ‘“white marshes,” from cotton-grass, probably’ (1926, 202).

high proportion of *achadh* and *ochdamh*-names relative to the surrounding parishes, but no *baile*-names.\(^6\) ScG *achadh* ‘field’ is a common settlement name generic throughout much of Scotland, but with a very patchy distribution still not fully understood (for a recent discussion and overview of the literature on this element, see Taylor 2008, 283–84). In Lesmahagow parish there are at least nine names containing *achadh* (not all of them discussed below): Affleck, Auchenbegg, Auchenheath, Auchlochan, Auchmeddan, Auchnotroch, Auchren, Auchrobert and Auchtool.\(^7\) The inclusion of the Anglo-Norman personal name Robert in one of these strongly suggests that they continued to be coined relatively late (i.e. the 12th century or later). Auchrobert is a small and relatively marginal settlement in the western uplands of the parish, the modern dwelling-house lying at 300m (NS75 38), with Auchrobert Hill rising beside it to 346m. Its earliest appearance in the record is in 1326, when ‘the common grazing of Auchrobert’ is mentioned.\(^8\)

Besides these *achadh*-names, Lesmahagow parish contained three names in ScG *ochdamh* ‘an eighth part or division’, reflecting a relatively complex system of land-holding. These are Auchtyfardle, Auchtygemmell and Auchtykirnal, all three of which could well contain non-Gaelic specific elements (for the first two, see discussions, below). Eighths are evidenced locally in the period shortly after Kelso Abbey was granted the church and lands of Lesmahagow: some time in the third quarter of the 12th century John abbot of Kelso feued to Waldeve, son of Boydinus,\(^9\) the abbey’s man, ‘an eighth part of Corra’ (octauam partem de Corroc), for an annual rent of half a merk (*Kel. Lib.* i no. 111).

**The Kelso Connection**

The lands and church of Lesmahagow were granted to Kelso Abbey by David I in 1144 (*David I Chrs.* no. 130). This resulted in a relatively rich charter record for the area over the next few decades, the earliest ones (from the 1140s up until 1218) printed as *Kel. Lib.* i nos. 102–16. While names of Celtic

---

\(^6\) See Grant 2007, 111, who does not, however, recognise *ochdamh*-names. Grant 2007 contains the most extensive discussion of Lesmahagow place-names to appear in print.

\(^7\) In his list of *Auch*-names in Lesmahagow parish, Alexander Grant includes Achingilloch, which is in fact the name of a hill (462m) in neighbouring Avondale parish (NS70 35) (Grant 2007, 114 note 91). Despite the height, the name appears attached to a settlement on Pont MS 34 (1596 *Achingilloch*). Compare this to the nearby hill names of Little Auchinstilloch and Meikle Auchinstilloch LEW, which seem originally to have contained ScG *cnoc* ‘hill’. They are shown as one prominent hill (with no associated settlement) on Pont MS 34 as *Knokinstilloch*.

\(^8\) *cum communi pastura de Agbrobert* (1326 *Kel. Lib.* ii no. 478).

\(^9\) For the suggestion that Boydinus may be Baldwin of Biggar, the first sheriff of Lanark, see Grant 2007, 119.
There are about 36 place-names from Lesmahagow in this block of charters (including the name Lesmahagow itself). Of these 11 are Scots, about 14 are Gaelic, about nine are British (including river names such as Nethan and Clyde) and two are unassigned (Draffan and the burn name Ancellet; theuissford 1147 × 1160 Kel. Lib. i no. 107). In terms of names attaching to settlements, the extant farm name Greenrig, consisting originally of a third of Affleck (a Gaelic name), first appears as a vill or toun 1160 × 1180 (Kel. Lib. i no. 115). It can be assumed that such names reflect Scots speakers in Lesmahagow itself. There even seems to be a man bearing the very Gaelic name Gilcrist with a Scots by-name Kide17 (1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 110), while the equally Gaelic name of Gilmohegu appears combined with Scots toun in *Gilmheuguston 1208 × 1218 (Kel. Lib. i no. 109). It should be stressed, however, that it was probably the same Gilmohegu referred to in this Scots place-name who is recorded as *Gilmahagou mac Kelli 1147 × 1160, using ScG mac ‘son’, which must surely reflect Gilmohegu’s own way of expressing familial relationships.18

It must also be borne in mind that those framing these charters, members of the monastic community at Kelso, were speakers of Scots (or northern Middle English). This can be seen in the (mainly Latinised) topographic and legal terminology which peppers these texts.19 Examples of Scots words not Latinised are mos, fau and ford, all found in a charter of 1147 × 1160 (ibid. no. 107).20 The charter reads:

---

10 There are about 36 place-names from Lesmahagow in this block of charters (including the name Lesmahagow itself). Of these 11 are Scots, about 14 are Gaelic, about nine are British (including river names such as Nethan and Clyde) and two are unassigned (Draffan and the burn name Ancellet).
11 hirdelau; theuissford 1147 × 1160 Kel. Lib. i no. 107.
12 1147 × 1160 ibid. no. 102 (also 1208 × 1218 ibid. no. 103); a tributary of the Cander Water which forms the west march of Blackwood LEW (Richens 1992, 187).
13 riuulum qui dicitur *Kirkburn’ 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 112.
14 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 110. The name is probably preserved in the settlement name Wellburn LEW NS80 41, q.v. below.15 Richens 1992, 188. See also under Garlewod and Wellburn, below. Teiglum, which first appears as Teglum Burn (1816 Forrest), is also found, as Taeiglum, attached to a burn which flows into the Water of Coyle at Drongan AYR (NS44 18). The origin of the name is obscure.
16 1208 × 1218 ibid. no. 109.
17 Scots kid ‘kid, young goat; also a term of endearment’. DOST (under kid, kide, kidde etc.) does not mention this occurrence, but notes that ‘an apparent early example’ of this word is the place-name Kyldeauwcroft [*Kidlawcroft], 1200–02 (Kel. Lib. i, p. 115).
18 ibid. no. 107; see below for full text of this charter. The father’s name is probably Cellach. For a discussion of this and similar names, see Clancy 1999, 86–87.
19 A relatively comprehensive list of such terms can be found in Barrow 1981, 199–203.
20 There is a facsimile of this charter in Kel. Lib. i, between pp. 78 and 79.
[Rubric] Arnaldus abbas super terram de Duueglas cum diuis<is>… Theobaldo Flamatico nostram terram super Duueglas [sic] et heredibus suis per rectas diuisas scilicet de surso de Polnele usque ad aquarn de Duglax et de surso de Polnele ultra se latum mos ad longum fau, de illunc ad Hirdelau, de illuc ad Theuisford in Mosminin elcorroc et sic ad longum nigrum ford et ita ut via iacet usque Croseford. In feudo et hereditate etc Hiis testibus Balwino de <B>igir’, Johanne de Crauford, Gylbride mac Giderede,23 Gilmalagon24 mac Kelli,25 Gilberto clerico et multis aliis.

This can be translated as follows:

Arnald abbot [of Kelso 1147–1160] anent the land of Douglas with its marches26

(Abbot Arnald of Kelso grants) to Theobald the Fleming our land on the Douglas, and to his heir, by its right marches, that is up from Poneil [i.e. up along the Poneil Burn] beyond the broad moss27 to the long fallow land;28 from there to Herdlaw,29 from there to Thievesford30 in the Corra’s (part of) Mossminion31 and so to the long black ford32 and

---

21 For *le*?
22 Written thus, for *et Corroc or del Corroc*
23 This is probably a garbled form, the first element almost certainly representing *Gil*– for *Gille*–, literally ‘lad, servant’, so common in Gaelic personal names of this period. It is more difficult to know what lies behind the second element, but it may be *-doraid*, found in the parallel name Mael Doraid (see Márkus 2007, 83 for its likely occurrence in a 13th-century Fife place-name).
24 Probably for *Gilmahagou*.
26 This is what later became the lands of Poneil LEW and Folkerston LEW. This charter is repeated almost word for word as ibid. no. 116 (also with an accompanying facsimile), but without the witness list.
27 The translation assumes that *se* is for *le*, indicating the vernacular definite article.
28 *fau* probably represents *DOST fauch* (also: *fauch, faucht*). [Northern e.m.E. *faugh* (early 16th c.; mod. dial. *fauf*), OE. *faelh*, *fealh* (rare).] “fallow land; a fallow field”. Usque apud le Croked fauch; a 1325 Liber Calchou 362. The haill boundis leysis and fauchtis; 1578 Aberd. Chart. 338. [Defender alleged pursuer] had not teilled the fauch; 1658 Melrose R. Rec. I. 209. [Payment] for his wheat fauche; 1673 *Ib.* II. 329. This is also proposed by Barrow 1980, 199, adding to these meanings ‘ploughed ground’ or ‘furrow made in fallow’.
29 At NS844382; this name survived at least until the later 18th century, with *Herdlaw Cairn* shown on RHP195 (1750×1799) (Richens 1992, 188). It contains Scots *bird* and Scots *law* ‘law, hill’, where *bird* can mean both ‘a keeper of a herd; a cattle-herd or shepherd’, and ‘a herd of cattle or flock of sheep’ (*DOST*).
30 This is shown as Thievesford on OS 6 inch 1st edn (1864), called on OS Explorer Heatherview (NS874398).
31 This assumes MS *elcorroc* is for *del Corroc*; if for *et Corroc*, then it would translate ‘in Mossminion and Corra’.
32 According to Richens this probably represents ‘a passable route through the boggy ground south of Thievesford’ (1992, 188).
Land Divisions in Lesmahagow

so as the road lies as far as Crossford.\textsuperscript{33} In feu and heritage etc. With these witnesses: Baldwin of Biggar, John of Crawford, Gilbride mac ?, Gilmohogu mac Kelli, Gilbert the clerk and many others.

Examples of Latinised Scots or northern Middle English topographical terms are \textit{mossa} or \textit{muss<um>} ‘moss, bog’ (ibid. nos. 102, 103), \textit{sica} ‘syke, small burn’ (1208 × 1218 ibid. no. 109), and \textit{holmus} ‘holm, water-meadow, haugh’ (1180 × 1203 ibid. no. 110). The use of \textit{holmus} is especially striking, as it relates to two Gaelic place-names, now lost, \textit{Daldroc} and \textit{Dalsagad},\textsuperscript{34} on the Nethan near Kerse LEW (formerly Glenan).\textsuperscript{35} Both these place-names contain Scottish Gaelic \textit{dail} ‘water-meadow, haugh’, a word with an almost identical semantic range to Scots \textit{holm}. The fact that \textit{holmus} is given as an added descriptor to these two pieces of land suggests (no more than that) that the element \textit{dail} was not understood by the framer of the charter, who was drawing his topographical vocabulary from Scots or northern Middle English.

**Lesmahagow the Name**

To conclude this brief introduction to the place-names of Lesmahagow, I want to look more closely at the name of the settlement and parish itself (for some early forms of which, see below, s.n.). In his discussion of this name, W. J. Watson treats it as entirely Gaelic, translating it ‘my-Féchín’s enclosure’, \textit{Mo- Fhégu} being a recognised pet-form or hypocorism of Gaelic \textit{Féchín} (modern Irish \textit{Féichín}), best known as the name of the seventh-century St Féchín (or Féichín), of Fore, Co. Westmeath, in the midlands of Ireland. Watson makes the important point that this is a different name from that which is contained in the Latin texts relating to the church of Lesmahagow, which is Machutus (1926, 196–97). He goes on to say that Machutus is ‘apparently a British saint’, whose name is found in the Breton town name St Malo (1926, 197), the implication being that the cult of the well-known Gaelic saint (probably also culted amongst the Picts, in the form Vigean)\textsuperscript{36} replaced that of the British one. This is made somewhat more explicit by Aidan MacDonald, in his survey of \textit{lios}-names in Scotland (1987, 50), while Alexander Grant is even more categorical: ‘The obvious explanation is an adaptation of the Brythonic form of Machut by Gaelic speakers who were

\textsuperscript{33} ‘Ford at or near a cross’ or ‘ford marked by a cross’. This cannot be the same place as Crossford LEW NS82 46, despite the fact that is shown thus on the map in \textit{Kel. Lib.} i, p. xxviii. Richens is probably correct in assuming it is the same as Cranford (printed Crawford in \textit{Kel. Lib.} i no. 112 1180 × 1203), referring to a ford over the Douglas Water ‘probably at a crook in the river (NS888387) just above the present Douglassmouth Bridge’ (1992, 186).

\textsuperscript{34} ‘two holms on the Nethan, that is Daldroc and Dalsagad’ (duos holmos super \textit{Natihan} scilicet Daldroc et Dalsagad’).

\textsuperscript{35} NS812419; see Richens 1992, 188.

\textsuperscript{36} See Taylor, forthcoming.
taking over Lesmahagow’ (2007, 114). However, already in 1984, Alexander Boyle and Mark Dilworth offered a quite different explanation for the Féchín/Machutus variation. While accepting the British origin of Machutus and the St Malo connection, they suggest that the identification of the saint of Lesmahagow with Machutus was the result of a misidentification made by the Tironensian monks of Kelso when they were given the church and lands of Lesmahagow in 1144. They point out that the founder of the Tironensians, Bernard of Tiron, had close Breton connections, which included two periods of living as a solitary on the island of Chaussey off the Normandy coast only 15 miles from St Malo, later gathering his first permanent disciples at Savigny in the Normandy-Brittany border-land before founding Tiron in 1109 (Boyle and Dilworth 1984, 40). This suggestion has the advantage of explaining the otherwise peculiar situation whereby the tradition of an older British cult should be preserved in the Latin documentation emanating from the relatively recently founded Kelso Abbey of the reformed Tironensian order, while the local onomastic evidence unequivocally points to the cult of Féchín. If Boyle and Dilworth are correct, the accepted sequence of a British cult being replaced by a Gaelic one is reversed.

As to the first element of the name, it is as it stands OG les, which later developed in modern ScG as lios ‘garden’, best translated as ‘enclosure’. It is not especially common in Scottish place-names, with only about 21 examples so far identified. Of these, eleven were medieval parishes. This is in stark contrast to Ireland, where there are literally hundreds of such names, the bulk of them relatively low status (see Toner 2000, and Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, s.v. lios). Furthermore, most of the Scottish names are found in areas previously under Pictish or British control. On the strength of this evidence, Aidan MacDonald, in a carefully considered article on lios in Scottish place-names, has suggested that this administrative, and therefore aristocratic, connotation seems more appropriate to British *lis-, which developed into W llys ‘court, hall’, and connotes an important aristocratic residence (1987, 51).

There are at least two, possibly three, men called Gilmohegu ‘servant of Mo-Fhégu’ associated with Lesmahagow in the second half of the 12th-century: Gilmalagon (for Gilmahagou) mac Kelli, who witnesses a charter of Abbot Arnold of Kelso anent the land of Poniel LEW 1147 × 1160 (Kel. Lib. i no. 107; see also Watson 1926, 196); Gilmagu (for Gilmothagou) mac Aldic, who holds a croft in the land of Glenan (now Kerse LEW) 1180 × 1203 (Kel. Lib. i no. 110); and Gilmagu (for Gilmothagou), to whom the abbey of Kelso grants part of the land of *Fincorra LEW 1160 × 1180 (Kel. Lib. i no. 114), which land is later referred to as *Gilmohaguston (*Gilmothagust<oun>) (1208 × 1218 Kel. Lib. no. 109). It is probable that this last Gilmohegu is the same as the above-mentioned Gilmothagou mac Kelli.

MacDonald identifies 12 or 13 examples of lis-names in Scotland. For a full list of these and other definite or probable examples, see Taylor with Márkus, forthcoming [PNF 5], Elements Glossary, under lios.
Note only are (or were) over half of all les-/*lis-names in Scotland parish names, several of them, such as Lesmahagow, Lismore, Lasswade (?) and Restalrig, were ecclesiastically of more than local importance. The ecclesiastical aspect of names containing this element has not been especially stressed by any of the writers on the subject, although Toner does devote a paragraph to les as denoting ‘part of a larger, usually monastic, complex’ (2000, 18). Place-name evidence may suggest that, while not its primary meaning, it could denote not simply a part of a monastic (or more generally ecclesiastical) complex, but the complex itself. The most striking examples are the two important early church centres, Lismore (Co. Waterford, Ireland) and Lismore ARG (both first mentioned in the sixth century), and Lesmahagow LAN. However, MacDonald is at pains to stress that, in the case of Lismore ARG, despite its early ecclesiastical importance, it was probably named after a pre-existing secular enclosure, in view of the fact that ‘many early church sites [in both Scotland and Ireland] were usually known, not by an ecclesiastical name but by what was the (presumably) pre-existing name of the site or locality’, giving Iona, Applecross, Dunkeld and *Kinrymont, later St Andrews, as examples (1987, 47–48). In fact, Lesmahagow, with its saintly specific, is something of an exception, being the only les-/*lis-name in Scotland which can be called unequivocally ecclesiastical in content (as opposed to function). It is also practically unique amongst this group of names in having unambiguous pre-documentary physical evidence of ecclesiastical activity on the site, in the form of a carved cross base (now lost) and the top of a wheel-cross found in 1866 at Milton (NS815405) during road-widening some 500 metres north of the church. As Greenshields argued already in 1870, this may have well been one of the four crosses around the church of Lesmahagow, within which the right of sanctuary prevailed, first mentioned in David I’s grant to Kelso Abbey in 1144 of the church and land of Lesmahagow (David I Chrs. no. 130). The date of the cross confirms the general impression that David was adding his royal authority to a pre-existing sanctuary site. This impression is further strengthened by the dedication to St Féchin, whose name probably occurs in the name Torphichen WLO, ‘Féchin’s hill’, one of the best-documented of

---

39 Described by J. Romilly Allan, thus: ‘a cross-base of sandstone sculptured in relief on one face [with] parts of two beasts at the left hand lower corner, the remainder of the ornament being defaced’ (ECMS 2, 472). It seems to have been found in or around Lesmahagow parish kirk.

40 NMRS NS83NW 1 no. 1; it is briefly described and illustrated in ECMS 2, 472. It is dateable very roughly to around 1000, and is reminiscent of crosses found in Galloway (around Whithorn) and north-west England (Katherine Forsyth, pers. comm.).

41 capella de Thorpichen 1165 × 1178 St A. Lib. 319 [also Thorfcheon].
medieval girths or sanctuaries in Scotland (MacQueen 2001, 338), while on the east coast of Ireland there is Termonfechin (Tarmann Féichín, ‘Féchín’s Sanctuary’), Co. Louth. All this may point to a special association between the cult of this saint and the offering of sanctuary to fugitives and those accused of crimes.42

Lay-out of entries

The place-names are arranged by their modern form as shown on the Ordnance Survey (OS) Pathfinder map (1:25000, the predecessor of the OS Explorer series, hereafter OS Pathf.). Affixes such as Easter, Nether, Wester are ignored in the alphabetical ordering. Names no longer on modern maps or no longer locally known are denoted by #. This is followed by the three-letter parish abbreviation LEW for Lesmahagow; a letter denoting type of feature on the modern map, e.g. S for Settlement, R for Relief feature, W for Water feature; a (usually four-figure) National Grid Reference; and an indication of accuracy, where 1 = accurate, 2 = assumed location.

Early forms are listed with date, source, and contextual detail in square brackets. Note that this list is by no means exhaustive.

The final section includes an analysis of the name and some discussion.

ACHOCHAN see AUCHLOCHAN

AFFLECK LEW S NS84 42 1

tertiam partem de Auchynlec’ 1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 115 ['the third part of Affleck' granted in feu by Abbot John of Kelso ‘to Waldeve our man, son of Boydinus’43 (Waldeuo homini nostro filio Boydini) for an annual rent of 2 s. 3 d.]
in tercia parte de Hautillet’ 1266 Kel. Lib. i no. 200 [for Haucillec’, with common confusion between t and c]
in feudo de Hautillet’ 1266 Kel. Lib. i no. 200 [for Haucillec’; see preceding]
Ade de Aghynlek 1370 Kel. Lib. ii no. 514 [Adam of Affleck]

Auchinleke c.1575 Assumption, 232

Auchinleks c.1592 Charge ln. 66

Over Auchinleck c.1592 Charge ln. 69

42 That St Féchín had a wide-spread reputation for being a fierce defender of his rights (at Fore) is seen in the two stories told by Gerald of Wales in his Topographia Hibernia of 1185, Part 2, chapters 81–82 (published as The History and Topography of Ireland, transl. John J. O’Meara, 2nd edn 1982, Penguin Classics).
43 For the suggestion that Boydinus may be Baldwin of Biggar, the first sheriff of Lanark, see Grant 2007, 119.
Auchlek 1695 Poll T., 177, 178 [also Auchleck]
Affleck 1783 Linning [3rd Quarter; also Nether Affleck]
Nr. Affleck 1816 Forrest [also Upp<e>r Affleck]

ScG achadh + ScG an + ScG leac
‘Field or farm of the (flat) stones or stone slabs’ (ScG achadh nan leac). Richens suggests that the one third of Affleck feuded to Waldeve by Kelso Abbey 1160 x 1180 (Kel. Lib. i no. 115) is called Greenrig (q.v.), and that at an earlier date it may have been ‘merely a pendicle of Fincurrok [*Fincorra]’ (1992, 186).

The -is ending on the Charge’s Auchinleakis is the Scots plural, showing that the lands had already been divided by this date (represented later by Over and Nether Affleck, lying close to each other).

Nether Affleck is the only Affleck LEW name to survive on modern OS maps such as OS Landranger and OS Pathf.

ARBARBRAY # LEW
lie Arbarbray 1576 x 1577 RMS iv no. 2652 ['and the Lintrig’ (et lie Lintrig)]
Arberbray c.1592 Charge ln. 127 [and Lintrig]
Arbarbray 1605 Ham. M. L/1/24 [and Lintrig; charter of liferent]

? Scots arber + Scots brae
The first element may be Scots arber, also arbour, ‘garden, orchard; arbour’ (DOST). It is always associated with the Lintrig, i.e. rig where flax is grown (for linen).

Neither has been located. However, Abber Cottage, which appears on OS 6 inch 1st edn a short distance south-west of the village of Lesmaghagow, may be connected.

ARDOCH LEW S NS80 38 1
Willelmus de Ardac’ 1160 x 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 114
Eustacio de Ardath 1160 x 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 115 [for Ardach; witness, along with his son William]
Willelmus de Ardauch 1208 x 1218 Kel. Lib. i no. 108
Ardoch c. 1592 Charge Ins. 43, 59, 62

ScG àrd + ScG -ach
‘High place’. It lies at c. 270m on the north-east slope of Warlaw Hill. A place of this name (Ardack’) appears in a boundary description of lands associated with Devon LEW,44 which lies on the other side of the Nethan from Ardoch.

44 ad diuisas de Ardack 1180 x 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 104.
Richen implies that this cannot be modern Ardoch, suggesting that it may be a transcription error for Auchlochan (NS808374) (1992, 189).

AUCHENHEATH LEW S NS80 43 1 446

riuulum Awenhath 1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 114 [awenhath NLS Adv. MS 34.5.1 fo 41v; printed a Wenhath; one of marches of land of *Fincorro (for which see Corra, below)]

riuulum de Auinhath 1208 × 1218 Kel. Lib. i no. 108 [similar to preceding]

5 libratis antiqui extensus vocat. le Manis de Auchneth 1533 RMS iii no. 1330 [(except for) the 5 pound-lands of old extent called the Mains of Auchenheath’]

lie Manys de Auchinauth 1539 RMS iii no. 2008

terris Authmaicis 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 478 [for Authinaicis or Auchenaitis, etc]

lands of Authmaich 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 479 [for Authinaich or Auchenaithe, etc]

few landis Aithmaych 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 480 [for Aithinaych or Auchenayth, etc]

my lord Dukis landis of Authmaich 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 482 [for Authinaich, Auchenaithe, etc]

Auchinaich 1556 Assumption, 245

Achinhaith 1584 RSS viii no. 2559 [precept]

Auchneth c. 1592 Charge ln. 101 [listed between Hallhill (Halhill) LEW and Auchnotroch (Achnautro) LEW]

Auchinhecht c. 1592 Charge ln. 112 [listed following Clannoch (Clenoch) LEW]

Achenhaith 1596 Pont MS 34

maynes of Auchenathe 1613 Ham. M. (Bundle 98) [sasine; £5 lands of the Mains of Auchenheath excepted]

?ScG achadh + ScG an + ScG àth

’Field of the ford’ (ScG achadh an àth), the eponymous ford most likely being over the Nethan, on whose east bank the lands of Auchenheath lie. The burn of Auchenheath, mentioned in the two earliest forms, can be identified as the small burn that ‘rises just behind Auchenheath school (NS811438) and, though partly culverted, can still be traced to its junction with the Nethan (NS803437)’ (Richens 1992, 187).

OS Path. shows Auchenheath as a small village, also Auchenheath House (NS80 43) and Auchenheath Farm (NS80 44).

AUCHINLEK see AFFLECK

AUCHLOCHAN LEW S NS80 37 1

Auchloquhen 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Lands of Auchloquhan 1550 Ham. M. (Bundle 62) [of liferents only, to James Duke of Chatelherault; follows Middleholm (Myddilholme) in list] the Adflothome 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [a scribal or editorial error for Afflochane? Rental of the abbycy, 32 s.]

Auchelochan c. 1575 Assumption, 231 [rents (mails); 31 s.]
Auchlocham c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds; coupled with Stockbriggs]
Auchlochan c. 1592 Charge Ln. 105
Achochan c. 1592 Charge Ln. 109
The Afflocchen Moss 1596 Pont MS 34
O<ver> Achochan 1596 Pont MS 34
N<ether> Achochan 1596 Pont MS 34
Achlochane 1621 RMS viii no. 235
Achlochane 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Auchlochanes 1623 RMS viii no. 413 [appears in the same list as Achlochane; perhaps representing Over and Nether Auchlochan]
Thomas Brown of Townfoot of Auchlochan 1695 Poll T., 167
Thomas Brown of part Auchlochan-Townhead 1695 Poll T., 168
Townhead of Auchlochan 1695 Poll T., 169

?ScG achadh or ?ScG àth + ScG lochan
?’Field of a lochan’; or possibly ‘ford of or by a lochan’. If the latter, it would refer to a ford over the Nethan, beside which Auchlochan lies.

AUCHNOTROCH LEW S NS82 43 1 446

Auchnotro 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Auchnotroch 1550 Ham. M. (Bundle 62) [charter of liferent]
Auchnotro c. 1575 Assumption, 232 [teinds]
Achnawtro c. 1592 Charge Ln. 102

ScG achadh + ScG an + ScG òtrach
‘Field of the dungheap’ (achadh an òtraic) or ‘of the dungheaps’ (nan òtrach). Richens 1996 includes a pre-improvement plan showing local farm boundaries, and mentions earlier change, pre-1623, in the tenement which brought into existence Bearsteads, later Littlegill.

AUCHRENS LEW S NS82 38 1

Aucherne c. 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [rental]
Aucheryn c. 1575 Assumption, 231
Auchron c. 1575 Assumption, 232 [teinds]
Over Aucherne c. 1592 Charge Ln. 110
Simon Taylor

ScG achadh + ?ScG earrann
‘Field of a share?’. The earliest forms so far identified suggest that the second element consisted originally of vowel + r, with subsequent metathesis (resulting in r + vowel). If this is so, then the second element may well be ScG earrann ‘portion, share, land-division’.

AUCHTYFARDLE LEW S NS81 41 1
terr<a> de Hauhtiferdale 1301 Kel. Lib. i no. 193 [on this see Richens 1992, 189]
totam terram nostram de Aghtyfer<e>rdale 1326 Kel. Lib. ii no. 478 [Kelso bbey to John son and heir of Adam the Younger of Devon (Duwan) LEW ‘all our land of Auchtyfardle’]
Auchtifardill alias Glenpedaith c.1592 Charge Ln. 84
Achtifardellis alias Glenpeddethe 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Auchtyfardle 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn

ScG ochdamh + ?
The first element, ScG ochdamh ‘an eighth (part)’ is discussed by W. J. Watson (1926, 201). An eighth division is found in an early charter relating to another part of LEW, viz ‘an eight part of Corra LEW’ (octauam partem de Corroc) (1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 111). However, this has not left any toponymic trace. It is one of three names around Lesmahagow (village) which contain this element, the others being Auchtygemmell and Auchtykirnal.

The second element looks most like Older Scots fardell (farthel, ferdall) ‘a fourth part’, found also in the Derbyshire place-name Fardle, first recorded in the Domesday Book (1080s) as Ferdendelle (Ekwall 1960, 174). So-called hybrid place-names, consisting of words from different languages, are rare. It is much more usual that by the time of the coining of such a name one element (usually the specific) has been borrowed into the language of the coiners as a loan-word: in this case, therefore, it is possible that Scots fardell had been borrowed by local Gaelic speakers. Alternatively, the specific element may have existed as a name or description of a land division in a Scots-speaking context, and then was incorporated into a new place-name when further division took place in a Gaelic-speaking environment. This would then suggest a language sequence of Older Scots followed by Gaelic. Another ochdamh-name, Auchtygemmell, which marches with Auchtyfardle on the north, probably contains the Anglo-Scandinavian man’s name Gammel. This also indicates the same kind of cultural, if not linguistic, mix seen in Auchtyfardle.

It appears on older OS maps but not on OS Pathf. or Landranger.
Place-names of Lesmahagow

AUChTYGEMMELL LEW S NS81 42 1
Auchtigammill 1533 RMS iii no. 1330 [amongst Kelso Abbey lands feued to James Hamilton of Finnart (Fynnart)]
Auchtigemmill c. 1592 Charge In. 102

ScG ochdamh + personal name Gammel
‘Gammel’s eighth’; for the first element, see discussion under Auchtigardle LEW, above. Gammel or Gem(m)el is an Anglo-Scandinavian name current in northern England and southern Scotland in the 12th and 13th centuries.

AULDTOUN LEW S NS82 38 1
Altoun 1550 Ham. M. (Bundle 62) [charter of liferent]
Altum 1556 Kel. Lib. 478
the ald towne 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [rental]
Awletoun c. 1575 Assumption, 232 [teinds]
Altoun c. 1592 Charge In. 110
Auldtoun 1611 Ham. M. (Bundle 98) [discharge and renunciation; described as the 26-shilling 8-pennylands of Auldtoun]
Aldtoun 1613 Ham. M. (Bundle 98) [sasine]
Aldtoun 1623 Charter, Marquis

Scots auld + Scots toun
‘Old farm’.

BALGRAY LEW S NS82 40 2
Balgray 1550 Ham. M. (Bundle 62) [charter of liferent]
The Bawgre c. 1575 Assumption, 231
the Bonegraye 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [rental; probably for Bouegraye or perhaps even Bollegraye; printed ‘Item the bonegraye and bankheid’ (Bankhead LEW)]
Balgray c. 1592 Charge In. 110
East and West Balgray 1816 Forrest
West Balgray 1816 Forrest

?Scots bag + Scots raw
‘Semi-circular row of cottages or houses’? For a full discussion of this relatively frequently-occurring place-name in southern Scotland, see under Balgriebank, Kennoway FIF in Taylor 2008, s.n.

East Balgray and West Balgray are shown on Forrest (1816) near Auldtoun LEW.
BANKHEAD LEW S NS81 39
Bankheid 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [Abbey Rental]
Bankheid c. 1575 Assumption, 231 [coupled with the Balgray (the Bawgre) LEW]
Bankheid c. 1592 Charge ln. 80
Bankhead 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn

Scots bank + Scots heid
‘Settlement or place at the top or head of a slope’.

BANKHOUSE LEW S NS80 39
Bankhous 1576 Charter, Cullace
Bankhouse c. 1592 Charge ln. 33
Bankhouse 1816 Forrest

Scots bank + Scots house
‘House on a bank or slope’.

BENT LEW S NS78 42 1
12 denariatas vocat. lie Bent 1565 × 1580 RMS v no. 15 ['12-pennyland called the Bent'; Kelso Abbey land feued to John Vicars (Vicaris); coupled with Cleughhead LEW, q.v.]
lie Bent 1576 Charter, Cullace [12-pennyland called the Bent]
Bent c. 1592 Charge ln. 18 [a 12-pennyland coupled with Cleughhead (Cleuchheid) and held by John Vicars (Vicaris)]
Bent 1783 Linning [1st Quarter]

Scots bent
‘(Place of) bent grass, open area covered in bent grass’, bent grass being a coarse, reedy type of grass.
Description is given of Bent in Irving and Murray 1864, ii 241, iii 108. They indicate that if named after such grass the holding had been ‘reclaimed’ long before 1864, the farm being large and having large fields. There was no other farm so named in the Upper Ward.

BLACKRECKNING # LEW S NS80 37 1
Blairannocht 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 479
marcatam nuncupatam Blairrechny 1565 × 1580 RMS v no. 15 ['the merkland called Blackreckoning' feued to the Lyne family]
Blarechny c. 1592 Charge ln. 39
Blairauchning c. 1592 Charge ln. 121
Place-names of Lesmahagow

Blarrachneen 1596 Pont MS 34
Blairnachmyng 1607 RPC vii, 688 [caution, for Thomas Lyne (Lein) there]
Blairauchmyng 1609 Retours [quoted in Miller 1932, 28]
Blackrekingning 1663 Comm. Rec. [Miller 1932, 28]
Blackreckoning 1695 Poll T., 168
Blackreckoning 1816 Forrest
Blackreckoning 1897 OS 1 inch 2nd edn

ScG blàr + ScG naithmeach
‘Bracken-field or muir’; ScG blàr is a difficult term to translate, and its meaning probably varied depending on locality. That it referred to open, relatively level land, is clear from its secondary meaning of ‘battle-field’. The somewhat grim Scots re-interpretation of this ScG place-name seems to have evolved in the course of the 17th century.

BLACKWOOD LEW S NS77 43 I
Rothaldi Were del Blakwodd 1400 × 1406 Kel. Lib. ii no. 524 [rubric; ‘of the Blackwood’]
totam medietatem terrarum nostro rerum del Blakwood 1400 × 1406 Kel. Lib. ii no. 524 [Kelso Abbey feus to Rothaldus Were (Wer) ‘the whole half of our lands of the Blackwood’ and of Dermoundyston’ along with all our land of Mossminion (Mossemynyne) LEW ... in the barony of Lesmahagow (Lassemagu), sheriffdom of Lanark]
Blackwood 1532 Ham. M. (Bundle 100/7) [agreement between my Lord Abbot of Kelso and Thomas Weir of Blackwood about the old dykes on the edge of Blackwood]
Blaikwood c. 1592 Charge ln. 111

Scots black + Scots wuid
‘Black woodland’; the eponymous woodland has given rise to Woodhead, c.600m south of Blackwood House. The 1532 reference mentions old dykes on the edge of Blackwood. These dykes have left a toponymic trace in Dykehead LEW NS77 41 (also, possibly, in Dykehead, Stonehouse parish NS75 43).

The above NGR is of Blackwood House; note also OS Landranger Low Blackwood Yards, as well as the village of Blackwood beside Kirkmuyrhill (NS79 43).

BLAIRAUCHNING or BLARECHNY see BLACKRECKNING

BLAIRBANK # LEW S NS82 46 2
Blair 1533 RMS iii no. 1330 [listed between Undir-the-bank and Halhill]
existing name Blair + Scots bank
A bank or slope associated with a place called Blair, deriving from ScG blàr
'field, muir’, for more on which see Blackreckning, above.
The name survives in Blair Cottage.

BORELAND LEW S NS83 40 1
Brodland 1550 Charter of liferent, Ham. M. (Bundle 62)
the Borlame 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492
The Burdland c. 1575 Assumption, 231
Brodland c. 1592 Charge In. 110
Bordland 1623 Charter, Marquis
Boreland 1695 Poll T., 174, 177, 178

Scots bordland
‘Mensal land, table land’, i.e. land which directly supplies the household
of the feudal superior, equivalent to a home farm. See Winchester 1986 for
a discussion of this word in a British context.
OS maps show, close together, Boreland and Low Boreland.

BRAIDMEDOW # LEW S NS80 37 2
Braidmedoheid 1565 × 1580 RMS v no. 15 col. 2
Braidmedowheid 1580 Charter, Watsoun & others [printed version RMS
v no. 15 omits the ‘w’ in this spelling; confirmation of Abbey’s grant of
this 5-shilling land together with a merkland of Ardoch to occupier John
Roger in liferent and heritably to his son]
Braidmedow 1584 RSS viii no. 2559 [precept (procedural document) for
confirmation of, among other Abbey grants, a half merkland so named
of the Mains to occupier John Portar, his heirs and assignees, and one
merkland and a half of the same land to Thomas Wood (Wod)]
Braidmedow c. 1592 Charge In. 57
Braidmedow c. 1592 Charge In. 64
Braidmedow 1623 Charter, Marquis [listed between Archmylne and Clayrigis]
Brigmedow 1636 RMS ix no. 530 [replacement charter to Marquis,
with noticeably different reddendum clause but Brigmedow replaces
Braidmedow in same position in list]

Scots braid + Scots meadow
‘Broad meadow’. Closely connected with the lands of Brigholm # LEW, q.v.
There is a Bredmedow in Selkirk (Kel. Lib. ii, 514; cf. Assumption, 230 note 159).

BRIGHOLM LEW S NS80 37 1

Brigholme c. 1592 Charge ln. 74 [presumably based on a grant to Williame Portar of the 5-shilling land of the Mains part of the same settlement; position near Foulford is suggested by its following the entry in the Charge relating to that place, in feu to a Broun]

Brigholm(e) 1667 Valuation NAS E106/21/1 [final e indistinct; Foulford (Foulfuorde) LEW and Brigholm]

Brigholm c. 1764 Greenshields 1864 (Appendix 28) ['Division of the valued rent of the parish'; ‘John Brown His land of Foulford and Brigholm']

Bridge(t?)holm 1771 Valuation NAS E106/36/7 [(the roll for Lanarkshire) shows a single proprietorship comprising ‘Footsford45 and Bridge(t?) holm, Townhead, Townfoot, Johnshill’]

Bridgeholm 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn

Scots brig + Scots holm
‘Holm (low, flat and fertile land by a water-course) at or near a bridge’; the eponymous brig is presumably the bridge over the Nethan which carries the modern road from Auchlochan to Lesmahagow, and which is named on OS 6 inch 1st edn as Auchlochan Bridge. It probably replaced the ford known as the foul or muddy ford, giving rise to neighbouring Foulford LEW. It was closely associated with Braidmedow #, the 1636-form Brigmedow (RMS ix no. 530) perhaps influenced by this same bridge.

CARNGOUR see GARNGOUR

CASTLEHILL # LEW R NS86 36 2

Johnne Menzeis of Castlehill c. 1592 Charge Ins. 4–5
William Menzies of Castlehill 1683 RPC 3rd ser viii
Raw or Castlehill Quarter 1783 Linning

Scots castle + Scots hill
‘Hill where a castle stands or stood’; this is probably its meaning here, although it can also refer to a conspicuous hill or hillock which resembles a castle, or is considered by the name-givers to be a suitable site for a castle.

45 An error for Fouleford or the like, now Foulford LEW.
Linning’s ‘Raw or Castlehill Quarter’ in 1783 confirms that it lay near modern Rawhills Farm LEW, immediately east of which is Tower Farm, a name probably alluding to the castle itself.

CATTLASAR # LEW S

*Cattlasar* 1577 Charter, Cullace [grant of superiority over ‘the 6-shilling 8-pennylands of the mains lands called Cattlasar’ (sex solidatis et octo denariatis terrarum dominicalium nuncupatarum Cattlasar) occupied by James Fairservice]

6 s. 8 d. nuncupat. *Cattlasar* 1577 RMS iv no. 2652 [amongst Kelso Abbey lands feued to David Cullace; Cattlasar is occupied by James Fairservice (Fairschirvice)]

*Cattlasar* c. 1592 Charge ln. 123

*Cattleser* 1605 Ham. M. (L/1/24) [6-shilling 8-pennylands now called Cattleser occupied by the late James Fairservice; this name might suggest that these, at present unlocated, were near Garngour, of which an older James Fairservice was the occupier in 1622 (see under Garngour LEW)]

6 solidatis 8 denariatis terrarum nuncupatarum *Catclafar* 1609 Retours (Lanark) no. 90 [similarly Catclafar 1634 Retours (Lanark) no. 185; in both these instances original long $s$ has been wrongly transcribed $f$, and $tt$ as $tc$]

? I do not know what to make of this strange name.

CAUSIEFOOT # LEW S NS82 39 2

*Calsayfute* 1584 RSS viii no. 2559 [precept for confirmation of abbey’s heritable feuing of 26-shilling lands of old extent of Calsayfute, namely Peishill, Beirfauld, Benholme, Welbuttis and Steppis, to Rudolph Weir (occupier), with common rights stated]

*Calsayfute* c. 1592 Charge ln. 53

*Causeyfoot* c. 1764 Greenshields 1864, Appendix 28, Note G [‘Division of the valued rent’: ‘Hamilton, His land of Causeyfoot, Auldtown and Dickland’46]

*Causiefoot* 1836 Letter [William Sandilands, ex info. Lanark Library from parish historical association informant]

---

46 Dickland LEW NS84 40.
Scots *causey* + Scots *fit*
‘(Place or settlement at the) foot or low point of a causeway, or of a raised or paved road’. From associated lands it seems to have lain near Lesmahagow itself, hence the above NGR.

CLANNOCHDYKE LEW S NS80 40 1

*Clenoch* 1550 Ham.M. (Bundle 62)  
*Clenne Dikis* 1556 *Kel. Lib.* ii, 479  
*Cleno Dyk* 1556 *Kel. Lib.* ii, 481  
*Chenothe* 1567 *Kel. Lib.* ii, 493 [for *Clenoche*, with Garlewood (*Gorvaldvode*) LEW]  
*Clenoch* c. 1592 Charge L. 112  
*Clenochyett* also *Clannochyett* 1695 Poll T., 176, 182  
*Clandyke* 1816 Forrest [also *Clanoch Yate* at NS121386]

Clannoch probably derives from Gaelic, meaning ‘place at a slope or brae’, containing ScG *claon* ‘sloping’, also ‘slope, incline’, often found in conjunction with steep roads leading to fords or bridges (see Barrow 1984, 62). There is a very similar name (now lost) in Fife (see Taylor 2008, under *Clenoch, Kennoway*).

CLEUGHHEAD LEW S NS77 37 1

1/2 marcat. nuncupat. *Cleuchheid* 1565 × 1580 *RMS* v no. 15 ['half a merkland called Cleughhead'; Kelso Abbey land feued to John Vicars (*Vicaris*); see also Bent LEW]  
*Cleuchheid* c. 1592 Charge L. 16  
*Cleuchbrae* 1691 Hearth T. [a separate but associated name?]

Scots *cleuch* + Scots *heid*
‘(Place at the) head or end of a narrow glen’.

CORRA LEW S NS868398 1

*elcorroc* 1147 × 1160 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 107d [perhaps for *del Corroc* ‘from the Corra’]  
*el Corroc*’ 1147 × 1160 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 116e [perhaps for *del Corroc* ‘from the Corra’]  
*octauam partem de Carrokis* 1160 × 1180 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 111 [rubric]  
*octauam partem de Corroc* 1160 × 1180 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 111 [Abbot John of Kelso grants in feu ‘to Waldeve, son of Boidinus, our man’ (Waldeuo filio

47 There is a facsimile of this charter in *Kel. Lib.* i, between pp. 78 and 79.  
48 There is a facsimile of this charter in *Kel. Lib.* i between pp. 84 and 85.
Boidini homini nostro) an eighth part of Corra for an annual rent of half a merk]
territorium de Corroc 1160 × 1180 Kel. Lib. i no. 111
territorium de Curroch 1160 × 80 Kel. Lib. no. 115
terra de Currokis 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 112 [rubric]
terram de Corroc 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 112
apud Curroc Symonis 1266 Kel. Lib. i no. 200 [Kelso Abbey court meets ‘at Simon’s Corra’]
Reginaldo de Corroky 1294 Kel. Lib. i no. 192 [witness]
Reginaldo del Corrokes 1301 Kel. Lib. no. 193 [witness]
Johannes de Bennachyn de la Corrokys 1362 RMS i [Watson 1926, 202]
Johannes Benauchtyne dominus de Corrokes 1363 RMS i [Watson 1926, 202]
Richard Bannachtyn dominus de Corhouse 1459 RMS ii [Watson 1926, 202]
terras terrasque dominicales de Corhous 1623 RMS viii no. 413 col. 2 [‘the lands and mains lands of Corra’]

? British *cur or *cor + British -*ōc
‘Small point, projecting part, end, corner; place at or near a point, projecting part, end, corner’. The suffix, which regularly appears in the earliest forms as -oc or -ok, suggests a British rather than a Gaelic origin (see Russell 1990, 108–16). The stem proposed is cognate with Welsh cur, OG corr, ‘point, end, corner etc’. The same element (as well as the same suffix?) is probably found in Carmunnock LAN (ecclesia de Cormannoc 1177 × 1185 RRS ii no. 220). W.J. Watson proposed that Corra is from ScG currach or corrach ‘marshy plain’ (1926, 202). However, both on the evidence of the early forms, as well as of the local topography, this is unlikely.

The original centre of the lands of Corra lay at what later became known as Corehouse, which according to W.J. Watson developed from a Scots plural form of Corra (1926, 202). At Corhouse the remains of a castle stand above the Clyde on a corner of land round which the Clyde flows, beside the famous waterfall of Corra Linn, and it could well be this feature which gave rise to the name. Both Corra and *Fincorra. The equivalent of this name in Gaelic would be Corran, with the more usual Gaelic diminutive (Watson 1926, 506).

Corra also forms part of the Gaelic name *Fincorra LEW, ‘white Corra’ (ScG fionn ‘white’), which includes what Richens describes as probably the best land in the parish (1992, 186), a fact that may be reflected in the specific ‘white’. 49

The lands of *Fincorra, a name which seems to disappear during the 14th

49 This is a more plausible interpretation than that made by W. J. Watson, who interprets it as “white marshes” from cotton-grass, probably’ (1926, 202).
century, covered an extensive area north-west of Corra between the Nethan and the Clyde, comprising later farms and estates such as Auchnotroch, Blackhill, Brodiehill, Clarkston, Hallhill, Littlegill and Stonebyres (see Map, p. 70, above). It is clear, therefore, that Corra once applied as a territorial name to much if not all of the land between the Nethan and the Clyde from opposite Lesmahagow northwards, an area of very roughly 35 square kilometres.

CROSSFORD LEW S NS82 46 1
Corseford 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Croceford c. 1592 Charge Ln. 100
Corseford 1621 RMS viii no. 235
Corseurde 1623 Charter, Marquis
Corseford 1637 Rental (Richens (4))
Croceford boat 1695 Poll T., 171 [the taxpayer presumably living at the Clyde ferry]

Scots cross + Scots ford
‘Ford at or near a cross’ or ‘ford marked by a cross’.

CUMBER LEW W NS78 35 2
Cummir 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
the Cummyre 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [rental]
Cummir c. 1592 Charge Ln. 100
South Kumbyr 1596 Pont MS 34

ScG comar
‘Junction of a watercourse’. See Watson 1926, 476 (comar, gen. comair). This refers to the confluence of the River Nethan and the Scots Burn. Richens 1997, I, 5, deals with its 1533 description and site (with Cummir 40-shilling land antiqui extenti excepted) and later references.

DEVON LEW S NS83 38 2
villa de Douane 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 104 [rubric]
villam de Dowane 1180 × 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 104
terra de Dowan 1294 Kel. Lib. i no. 192
Dowan c. 1592 Charge Ln. 110
Dowane 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Divan or Divon 1783 Linning [Upper and Lower, in names of two parish Quarters]
Devon Water 1816 Forrest
For the political and social significance of this grant in feu-ferme, see Smith 2008 (1).

ScG *domhain*

‘Deep, low-lying place; place lying in a hollow’ (ScG *domhain* ‘deep’). This is also the derivation of Devon, Kettle FIF (Taylor 2008, s.n.), which has undergone the same transformation, probably under the influence of the English county of Devon.

The name survives on OS Pathf. in Glendevon (in the village of Lesmahagow itself); Devonburn Road NS82 39; Devon Burn (a burn) and Devonburn (a settlement) NS83 38.

DRAFFAN LEW S NS79 45 1

*Draffane* 1147 × 1160 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 102 [rubric]
terram de *Draffane* 1147 × 1160 *Kel. Lib.* i no. 102 [Arnald abbot of Kelso 
feus to Lambin Asa (*Lambyno Asa*) ‘the land of Draffan and Dardarach #’
(terram de *Draffane* et de *Dardarach*); marches given] 50
*Draffane* 1539 RMS iii no. 2008
*Deffrane* 1556 *Kel. Lib.* ii, 479 [‘Thripvod Deffrane and South feild’]
*Draffan* c. 1592 Charge Ln. 100
*Draffan* 1623 RMS viii no. 413

The derivation of this name is obscure to me. It is not even clear in which 
language it was coined.

DUMBRAXHILL LEW S NS82 40 1

*Drumbrekishill* 1567 *Kel. Lib.* ii, 492 [abbacy rental]
*Drumbrakischill* c. 1575 *Assumption*, 232 [teinds]
*Dumbrexhill* c. 1592 Charge Ln. 116
*Drumbrax* 1654 *Blaeu* (Pont) Nether Ward
*Dumbrex(?)hill* 1611 *Ham. M.* (Bundle 98)
*Dumbrax Hill* 1783 *Linning* [9th Quarter]

existing name Dumbrax + Scots *hill*

Dumbrax, a Gaelic name, consists of *druim* ‘ridge’ qualified by *breac* 
‘speckled, variegated’. It may be connected to *Tòrrbreac* (1235 × 1240 *Kel. 
Lib.* i no. 194), ScG *tòrr breac* ‘speckled or variegated (conical) hill’, which, 
like Dumbraxhill, is associated with the lands of Devon LEW.

FOLKERTON LEW S NS85 35 2

*Folcardistune* 1208 × 1218 *Kel Lib.* i no. 106 [rubric]
*Folecartust’* 1208 × 1218 *Kel Lib.* i no. 106 [see discussion, below]

50 For the political and social significance of this grant in feu-ferme, see Smith 2008 (1).
The 14th-century MS reads Solph', which G.W.S. Barrow suggests should read Folcard.<i>*</i> of Folcard’ (1980, 56–57).

The personal name Folcard + Scots toun
‘Folcard’s farm’; the eponymous Folcard was very probably one of the Flemings who were made hereditary tenants of Kelso Abbey in the later 12th century, for details of which see Smith 2008 (1). His father may have been Theobald the Fleming, who in 1147 × 1160 was granted land which included what later became known as Folkerston (<i>Kel. Lib.</i> i nos. 107, 116). The place-name is first mentioned in the early 13th century, when Henry abbot of Kelso (1208–18) granted to Richard son of Folcard<sup>51</sup> Folkerston, which his father and predecessors had held of the abbey (<i>Kel. Lib.</i> i no. 106).

The Fulcard<us> who witnesses a charter anent land in Lesmahagow 1160 × 1180 (<i>Kel. Lib.</i> no. 115) is almost certainly the same man.

See Richens 1992 for discussion of the general extent and possible boundaries of what later became Folkerton LEW. The name survives in Folkerton Mill.

The personal name appears in also in <i>Fokartisland</i> by Haddington ELO (<i>RMS</i> v no. 2048).

Scots foul + Scots ford
‘Foul or muddy ford’; the eponymous ford was probably over the River Nethan at or near Auchlochan Bridge (see Brigholm, above).

Scots foul + Scots ford
‘Foul or muddy ford’; the eponymous ford was probably over the River Nethan at or near Auchlochan Bridge (see Brigholm, above).

FOULFORD LEW S NS80 37 1
8 solidatas nuncupatas Foulefurde 1565 × 1580 <i>RMS</i> v no. 15 col. 3 [8-shilling lands called Foulford]
Foulefurde c. 1592 Charge ln. 20 [8-shilling land of the Mains of Lesmahagow]
Foulfurd c. 1592 Charge ln. 73 [8-shilling land of the Mains of Lesmahagow]
Foulford 1596 Pont MS 34

GALLOWHILL LEW
Gallow Hill 1567 <i>Kel. Lib.</i> ii, 493 ['Item the gallowrig and gallow hill’]
Gallowhill c. 1592 Charge ln. 111
O<vert> Galahil 1596 Pont MS 34
Gallowhill 1623 <i>RMS</i> viii no. 413

<sup>51</sup> The 14th-century MS reads Solph', which G.W.S. Barrow suggests should read Folcard<i>*</i> of Folcard’ (1980, 56–57).
Scots gallow + Scots hill
‘Hill at or near the gallows’; presumably this was the site of the gallows of the barony of Lesmahagow, referred to also in the associated Gallowrig (q.v.).

GALLOWRIG LEW S
the Gallowrig c. 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 493 [‘Item the gallowrig and gallow hill’]
Gallowrig c. 1592 Charge ln. 111
Gallowrig 1623 RMS viii no. 413 [... Balgray, Bordland, Dovane, Gallowhill, Gallowrig, Blaikwod ...]
Gallridge 1783 Linning
?Goldrig 1816 Forrest [see discussion]
?Golrig Burn 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn 31 [see discussion]

Scots gallow + Scots rig
‘Ridge or rig at or near the gallows’. This is presumably the same gallows referred to in Gallowhill, q.v. The name may have survived in the Galrig Burn, the lower course of the Devon Burn. If so, then Gallowrig is probably the small settlement of Goldrig on Forrest (1816), at around NS817403.\(^52\)

GARLEWOOD LEW S NS80 42 1
Garrollwood 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Gorvaldvode 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 493 [abbacy rental]
Garwelwood c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [list of teinds]
Garrelwood c. 1592 Charge ln. 103
Garrellwood 1695 Poll T., 172

ing existing name *Garrel + Scots wuid
*Garrel likely derives from ScG garbh-allt ‘rough burn’. The burn in question is probably the Teiglum Burn, above which Garlewood stands. If so, then this burn has had three names attached to it, the third being Hallwelburn ‘holy well burn’.\(^53\)  
Compare the Garrel Burn in Kilsyth STL, which joins the Kelvin at NS70 76, and the associated Garrel Hill.

\(^52\) For a similar intrusion of d, compare The Gauldry FIE, which was originally *Gallow Raw (PNF 4, s.n.).
\(^53\) 1180 x 1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 110. For the identification of Hallwelburn with the Teiglum Burn, see Richens 1992, 188; see also discussion, above, p. 68.
GARNGOUR LEW S NS80 40
_Carnegoure_ 1565 × 1580 _RMS_ v no. 15 col. 2
_Uter Carnegoure_ 1565 × 1580 _RMS_ v no. 15 col. 3
_Carngour_ c. 1592 _Charge_ Ins. 47, 122
_Uter Carngour_ c. 1592 _Charge_ ln. 49
_Carngour_ 1596 _Pont MS_ 34
_Garngour_ 1681 _Comm. Rec._ [Margaret Meikle spouse to Thomas Paitt in _Garngour_]
_Carngour_ 1695 _Poll T._, 162, 166, 181
_Garngour_ 1695 _Poll T._, 166
_North Garngour_ 1816 _Forrest_
_South Garngour_ 1816 _Forrest_

ScG càrn + ScG gobhar
?‘Goat cairn’. The initial _g_ in later forms is probably the result of assimilation of _c_ to a following _g_. _Carngour_ also appears as a place-name in east Fife (Cameron parish); see _PNF_ 3, s.n.

OS Landranger shows only North Garngour (1987 Sheet 71).

GILBANK see KILBANK

GLASHLEES # LEW V NS75 37 2
_Gleisbleis and Dunsyde_ 1584 _RSS_ viii no. 2559 [precept; refers to ‘common in the bounds of’]
_(commonyt of)_ _Gleschelyis & Dunside_ c. 1592 _Charge_ ln. 54
_pasturage in _Glashlees_ and _Dunsyde_ 1655 _Retours_ (Lanark) no. 258

? + Scots lea
The second element is Scots _lea_ ‘tilled ground now pasture, open grassland’; the first element is uncertain. The name has not survived, but the approximate NGR given above is from that of the associated land of Dunside.

GREENRIG LEW S NS85 42 1
 Vill<> de _Grenrig_ 1160 × 1180 _Kel. Lib._ i no. 115
_resignacio Willelmii filii Philippi de _Greneryg’ 1266 _Kel. Lib._ i no. 200 [rubric; resignation of a third of Affleck (Hâtillet’ LEW]
_le _Greyryg_ 1370 _Kel. Lib._ no. 514 [resignation by Adam of Affleck (Aghynlek)
_LEW_ of all his land of the Greenrig and of the Teaths (le _Tathys_ LEW to his lord, abbot of Kelso]
Grenerig c. 1592 Charge ln. 66, 70
Greenridge 1596 Pont MS 34
Greinrig 1623 RMS viii no. 413

Scots green + Scots rig
‘Green ridge’; Scots rig here is used in its topographical sense of ridge of land, not in its later arable sense of a cultivation strip. It refers to the extensive ridge about 2 km long which forms a north-east outlier of Boreland Hill. The farm-steading and small settlement of Greenrig sits at the north-east end of this fertile ridge.

Richens (1992, 186) suggests it represents the one third of Affleck feuded to Waldeve by Kelso Abbey 1160 × 1180 (Kel. Lib. i no. 115).
A chapel at Greenrig is mentioned in 1623 (RMS viii no. 413 col. 2).

GREYSTONE LEW S NS80 38 1
Graistane 1565 × 1580 RMS v no. 15 col. 2 [feued to Robert Brown (Brown)]
Graystanis c. 1592 Charge ln. 59
Ralph Weir of Graystone 1683 RPC 3rd ser × 658
Graystane 1695 Poll T., 168

Scots grey + Scots stane
‘Grey stone’.

HALLHILL LEW S NS82 44 1
Halhill 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
The Hawhill c. 1575 Assumption, 232
Halhill c. 1592 Charge ln. 101

Scots hall + Scots hill
‘Hill on or near which the main hall or residence stands’.

Richens 1996, 99, has an excellent plan which sets out clearly the pre-improvement boundaries of this farm and several of its neighbours (article also cites other plans).

HOODSHILL LEW S NS82 41 1
Huddishill c. 1592 Charge ln. 85
Hudishill 1623 RMS viii no. 413

personal name Hood + Scots hill
For this personal name, see Black 1946 s.n.
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KERSE LEW S NS81 42 1
The Kers c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds]
Kerr c. 1592 Charge ln. 35
Kars 1596 Pont MS 34
Kerse 1695 Poll T., 176

Scots carse
‘Land along a river-bank, alluvial land’, the river in question being the Nethan.
Richens 1992, 188, states that it applied to the land known previously as Glenan # (1180×1203 Kel. Lib. i no. 110).

KILBANK LEW S NS85 43 1
Gilbank 15th c. Blind Harry, I, VI [Wallace’s sojourns at Patrick Auchinleck’s house at Gilbank in Lesmahagow 1296×1297]
Gillbank c. 1592 Charge ln. 66
Kilbank 1623 RMS viii no. 413 col. 2

Scots gill + Scots bank
‘(Settlement on or near the) bank of a small, deep valley (gill)’.

LESMAHAGOW LEW PS
ecclesia de Lesmahagu 1144 David I Chrs. no. 130
totam Lesmahagu 1144 David I Chrs. no. 130
ecclesiam et terram de Lesmagv 1159 RRS i no. 131
(barony of) Lassemagu 1400×1406 Kel. Lib. ii no. 524
Lesmahago 1592 Charge passim

There is a full discussion of this place-name in the Introduction, above, pp. 71–74.

LETHAM LEW S NS80 38 1 458
marcatam nuncapat<am> Lethame 1565×1580 RMS v no. 15 col. 3 ['a merkland called Letham’ occupied by Thomas Thomson (Thomesoun) junior]
Lathame 1576 Charter Cullace [but not in RMS iv no. 2652]
Letham c. 1592 Charge ln. 35
Lettha<m> 1596 Pont MS 34 [Blaeu (Pont) Nether Ward (1654) has Letham Mains]

ScG leathan
‘Broad slope’. This is a common place-name in eastern Scotland.
OS Pathf. has Latham beside Letham Mains.
LOGAN LEW S NS73 35
Logane 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Logane c. 1592 Charge Ln. 105

ScG lagan
‘Little hollow’.

MIDDLEHOLM LEW S NS80 37
Myddilholme 1550 Charter of liferent, Ham. M.
Myddilholme 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [rental; ‘Item the quhysteid and myddilholme’]
Mydleholm c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds; coupled with Whiteside (Quhytsyd)
LEW]
Middilholme c. 1592 Charge Ln. 109
Midlam 1596 Pont MS 34
Middleholm 1695 Poll T., 166

Scots middle + Scots holm
‘Holm’ can be a small island in river or sea; more usually it is low-lying land
beside a river or haugh. Its ScG equivalent is dail, common in place-names
along the Tay, for example. This equivalence is neatly shown in a Lesmahagow
charter from 1180 × 1203, in which ‘two holms on the Nethan’ (duos holmos
super Naithan) are mentioned (just north of Lesmahagow) called Dalsagad
(containing ScG sagart ‘priest’) and Daldroc’ (Kel. Lib. i no. 110). See discussion,
p. 71, above.

MILTON LEW S NS81 40
The myltowne 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 493 [abbacy rental]
Mylntoun 1576 x 1577 RMS iv no. 2652 ['the mill of Lesmahagow called the
mill of Milton’ (molendinum de Lesmahago, molendinum de Mylntoun
nuncupat<um>)]
Mylntoun c. 1592 Charge Ln. 112
Miilton c. 1592 Charge Ln. 125
Mill of Mylntoun 1605 Ham. M. (L/1/24) [charter of liferent, 4 s. 5 d.]
Mylntoun 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Milltown 1816 Forrest

Scots miltoun
‘Mill farm, settlement at a mill’.
MONKSTABLE LEW S NS81 38 I
marcatam vocatam in *Monkstable* 1565 × 1580 *RMS* v no. 15 ['a merkland called in Monkstable', feued to Robert Tweddell]
*Monkstable* 1576 Charter, Cullace
*Monkisstable* c. 1592 Charge ln. 31 [Robert Tweddall]
*Munkstibbil* 1596 Pont MS 34
*Monkstable* 1623 *RMS* viii no. 413
*Monk Stables* 1816 Forrest
*Monkstable* 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn

Scots *monk* + Scots *stable*
‘Monks’ stable’. As the name indicates, this is where the monks of Lesmahagow and Kelso stabled their horses. It lay about one kilometre south of Lesmahagow kirk (and priory).

MUIRSLAND LEW S NS79 41 I
*Murisland* 1533 *RMS* iii no. 1330
*Murisland* c. 1592 Charge ln. 103
*Muirsland* 1816 Forrest

? Scots *muir* + Scots *land*
‘Worked land which has previously been muirland or rough grazing land’?

MURTHERGILL # LEW NS80 39 2
*Murthirgill* 1565 × 1587 *RMS* v no. 1200 [a half merkland]
*Murthirgill* c. 1592 Charge ln. 94
*Murthergil* 1596 Pont MS 34
*Murthergyle* 1747 × 1755 Roy’s Military Map
*Murthergil* 1700 × 1799 RHP195

Scots *murther* + Scots *gill*
‘Murder gill’, a gill being a small, deep valley, comparable to Fife *den*. It was part of the mains or demesne lands of Lesmahagow (*RMS* v no. 1200).

NIVIELAND # LEW S NS81 41 2
*Neveland* 1533 Charter, *Fynnart* [printed as *Newland* in *RMS* iii no. 1330]
*Naviland* c. 1592 Charge ln. 103
*Newyland* 1623 *RMS* viii no. 413
*Niviland* 1684 Fugitive Roll [John Hervie ‘in the holm of Carse <Kerse LEW> beneath *Niviland*’]
*Nivieland* 1695 Poll T., 169
The first element of this name may be Scots nevay, a form of nevo ‘nephew’, perhaps signifying land belonging to or inherited by the nephew of the feudal tenant (the feudal superior being Kelso Abbey). It may, however, represent ScG neimhidh ‘churchland, glebe’, which has then been combined (probably as an existing name) with Scots land.

The above NGR is posited on the fact that it is described as being above Kerse LEW (NS81 42) (see early forms, above, under 1684). It is also found grouped with Clannochdyke and Milton in 18th-century documents, as well as with earlier tenements Knockin and Langlands, all nearby (Richens 1997, I, 4–5).

PATHHEAD LEW S NS81 39 1
Petheid 1576 Charter, Cullace [omitted from printed version RMS iv no. 2652]
Petheid c. 1592 Charge ln. 45
Paithead 1683 RPC 3rd ser. x 658 [Richard Vickars of Pathhead, reported insurgent]
Pathhead 1695 Poll T., 169 [cf. also Pethfoote, 184]
Pathhead 1816 Forrest [shows ‘Mr Wharrie’ below place-name]
Pathhead 1864 OS 6 inch 1st edn

Scots peth + Scots heid
‘(Settlement at the) head or top of a steep road or path’.

PRIORHILL LEW S NS75 40 1
Pryorhill alias Pryorcroft 1550 Charter of liferent, Ham. M.
Priorhill alias Priorcroftis c. 1592 Charge ln. 111
Pryourhill 1596 Pont MS 34 [not on Blaeu (Pont) Nether Ward]
Pryourhill alias Pryourcroft 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Pryorhill 1695 Poll T., 181

Scots prior + Scots hill
The eponymous prior was the prior of Lesmahagow. It was also known as Priorcroft.

The above NGR is of North Priorhill, the older site; South Priorhill is at NS75 39.

RICKARTHOLME # LEW S NS78 37 2
Richardholm 1550 Ham. M. (Bundle 62) [charter of liferent]
Rothbart holme 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [coupled with the Skellyhill (the skaillihill)]
Place-names of Lesmahagow

Richartholme c. 1592 Charge ln. 109
Ricarholme 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Rickarholme 1636 RMS ix no. 530 [later Hamilton confirmation]

? + Scots holm
The first element may be an unusual personal name which, despite its earliest appearance as Richard, has been only partially assimilated to the more familiar name. There is a Rothald(us) Weir of Blackwood LEW who was alive around 1400 (see under Blackwood, above), and this may be the name, if not the person, involved here, if the abbacy rental form Rothart holme (1567) can be relied upon. For a personal name combined with a Scots generic without a possessive -(i)s, see Rogerhill LEW. It may, however, be an otherwise unrecorded adjective, perhaps related to Scots ruch, roch ‘rough’ (with Rothart- for Rochart). For Scots holm, ‘land by a river etc’, see above under Middleholm LEW.

ROGERHILL LEW S NS78 43 1
Rogerhill 1547 Ham.M. (Bundle 100/2)
Rogerhill c. 1575 Assumption, 233
Rodgerhill c. 1592 Charge ln. 90

personal name Roger + Scots hill

SCORRIEHOLME LEW S NS78 37 1
Scoryholme 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
waist of Scurresolme 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 481 [sic; for Scurreholme]
Scorryholme c. 1592 Charge ln. 104
Scorieholme c. 1592 Charge ln. 115
Scoriholm 1691 Hearth T.

? Scots scaurie + Scots holm
‘Rocky holm,’ holm near a rocky or precipitous slope’, Scots sca(u)ry, sca(u)r(r)ie being defined as ‘rocky, precipitous, bare and rugged, of a cliff-face’ (DOST). It lies beside the Logan Water at the foot of a relatively steep slope.

SKELLYHILL LEW S NS78 37 1
the skaillihill 1567 Kel. Lib. ii, 492 [abbacy rental; ‘the skaillihill and rothart holme’ (see Rickarholme # LEW)]

54 For holm, see under Middleholm, above.
The Skellehill c. 1575 Assumption, 231, 233
Skellihill c. 1592 Charge Ins. 7, 24, 26 [corresponding to three separate merklands feuded]
Skellyhill 1596 Pont MS 34
Jon Steill zounger of Skelliehill 1629 SJC [juror]

Scots *skelly* + Scots *hill*
Scots *skelly*, *skellie* is a difficult word to interpret in place-names, as it has a variety of meanings, such as ‘ridge of rock’ (chiefly coastal); ‘lop-sided or awry’; and ‘charlock or wild mustard’ (a form of *skelloch*).

The principal farmhouse in the 17th century was that which survives as a ruin at Upper Skellyhill.

SLABODUME # LEW S NS 80 42 2
Slaybodum 1533 RMS iii no. 1330
Slaboddome c. 1592 Charge ln. 102
Slabodume 1649 Retours (Lanark) no. 239

Scots *slae* + Scots *bottom*
‘Valley bottom where sloes grow’.

SOUTHFIELD LEW S NS79 44 1
Southfeild 1539 RMS iii no. 2008 [see Threepwood LEW for more detail]
Southfeild c. 1592 Charge ln. 100
Southfield 1695 Poll T., 174

Scots *south* + Scots *field*

STANECROFT # LEW S 81 42 2
Stancroft 1533 RMS iii no. 1330 [listed between Auchtygemmel and Slabodume #]
Sthancroft 1534 × 1539 RMS iii no. 2008 [for Schancroft]
Schancroft 1543 RPS 1543/12/49 [coupled with Auchtygemmel (‘Auchtygamill and Schancroft’)]
Stanecroft c. 1592 Charge ln. 102
Stanecroft 1623 Charter, Marquis [Stanicroft in 1636 RMS ix no. 530]
Schancroft 1657 Comm. Rec. (CC14/5/5) [confirmation testament of James Cleland of Auchnotroch]
Scots ? + Scots 
craft
While the first element may be Scots stane ‘stone’, there is enough evidence to suspect a quite different first element, perhaps Scots 
shan ‘of poor quality, mean, shabby, pitiful’ (not recorded in Scots before 1714 (DSL, SND1)).

The above NGR is deduced from its close association (discussed in Richens 1997, I, 4) with Auchtygemmel.

STEPPIS LEW S NS81 40 2
lie Steppis 1576 × 1577 RMS iv no. 2652 [‘a piece of land called the ‘Steps’ (peciam terre vocat. lie Steppis) extending to about 8 acres]
Steppis c. 1592 Charge In. 126

Scots step
‘Steps’, referring to a piece of steep land? Or to stepping stones? It is listed in the Charge immediately after Milton (hence the above NGR), and may therefore have lain on the Nethan.

STOCKBRIGGS LEW S NS79 36 1
Stokbrig c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds; coupled with Auchlochan]
Stokbriggis c. 1592 Charge In. 104
Ouer Stokbrig 1596 Pont MS 34
N<ether> Stokbriggs 1596 Pont MS 34
Stokbridgis 1623 RMS viii no. 413
James Whyte of Stockbridges 1695 Poll T., 167

Scots stock + Scots brig
‘Bridge made of stocks or tree-trunks’, referring to a bridge over the Nethan. The plural ending is the result of a division of the lands, as seen already on Pont MS 34.

STONEBYRES LEW S NS84 43 1
dominum de Stanebyris 1508 Kel. Lib. ii no. 536 [rubric]
Willelm<us> Weyr de Stanebris 1508 Kel. Lib. ii no. 536
Stanebris c. 1592 Charge In. 65
Stanebyris c. 1592 Charge In. 69
Stanbyres 1596 Pont MS 34

Scots stane + Scots byre
‘Stone-built byres or animal sheds’. ‘East Fincurrok # [*Fincorra] became
the basis of the Stonebyres estate …[which] later absorbed most of Dowane [Devon], Affleck and Mosminion [now Hawksland]’ (Richens 1992, 189).

TEATHS LEW S NS85 42
le Tathys 1370 Kel. Lib. no. 514 [see Greenrig LEW]
Tathis c. 1575 Assumption 232 [teinds list]
Tethis c. 1592 Charge ln. 66
Tethis c. 1592 Charge ln. 70
Taes 1596 Pont MS 34
Teathes 1623 RMS viii no. 413
Taes 1695 Poll T. 177, 178

Scots tathe
‘Manured grounds’, with Scots plural ending -is.

THREEPWOOD LEW S NS82 47
Threepwood 1516 Gavin Ros Protocol Book (Scottish Record Society, 1908), 167
Threipwod 1539 RMS iii no. 2008
Thripwod 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 479
The Trypwod c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds list]
Threipwod c. 1592 Charge ln. 100
Threipwood 1596 Pont MS 34
Threipwood 1654 Blaeu (Pont) Nether Ward
Threepwood 1695 Poll T., 170

Scots threip + Scots wuid
‘Disputed woodland’; Scots threip ‘quarrel, dispute’ is frequently found in Scottish place-names combined with words such as inch (‘water-meadow, haugh-land’), muir and wuid, indicating that they have been the subject of contested ownership or rights.

TROWS LEW S NS81 38 1
marcatam vocatam the Trowis 1565 × 1580 RMS v no. 15 ['the merkland called the Trows', occupied by John Matthew]
Trowis c. 1592 Charge ln. 29
Trowis 1596 Pont MS 34
Traws 1665 Deed NAS, RD2/12 1035 [Court of Session, Discharge Duke to Steill]
Trows 1695 Poll T., 168 ['relict of Robert Steel of Trows']
?
Scots *troch*
Probably the plural of ‘trough, pipe, channel, etc’ (*DOST*). May Williamson writes: ‘OE *trōh*, Modern Scots *trow*, “sluice or lade leading to a mill”, is the origin of *Trows* (Kelso): *Trowis*, 1511 *RMS*. The river here runs in narrow channels between shelves of rock, and it has been suggested that this is the meaning here’ (1942, 279). For topographical usage in England (especially northern England), see Smith 1956 under OE *trōg* ‘a trough, a long narrow vessel for various purposes’, used later of ‘a hollow or valley resembling a trough, the bed of a stream’. Smith also mentions *mylentrōg* ‘mill-stream or conduit’ (loc. cit.).

Modern OS maps have New Trows only, which supplies the above NGR.

UNDERBANK LEW S NS83 45 1
*Undir-the-Bank* 1533 *RMS* iii no. 1330
*Under the Bank* c. 1592 Charge ln. 101
*Wnder-the-bank* 1623 *RMS* viii no. 413
*Under-the-bank* 1636 *RMS* ix no. 530
*Underbank* 1695 Poll T., 172

A Scots prepositional name referring to this settlement’s position at the foot of a bank or slope, in this case the large slope running down to the Clyde on its left or west bank. See plan of local farms in Richens 1996, 99.

WELLBURN LEW S NS80 41 1
*Welburn* 1533 *RMS* iii no. 1330
*Wailburne* c. 1592 Charge ln. 103
*Walburne* 1695 Poll T., 172
*Wellburn* 1695 Poll T., 174

Scots *wall* + Scots *burn*
‘Burn flowing from or past a well’. The settlement of Wellburn is near the Teiglum Burn, which Richens (1992, 188) suggests was the *Haliwelburn* mentioned in a boundary description of 1180 × 1203 (*Kel. Lib.* i no. 110). If this is correct, then Wellburn is best seen as a reduced form of *Halywall Burn* (*‘Holywell Burn’*), the burn name later becoming attached to a settlement near its southern bank. See also Garlewood LEW, above.

WHITESIDE LEW S NS79 37 1
the *Quhytsteid* c. 1567 *Kel.Lib.* ii, 492 [rental; ‘Item the *quhytsteid* and *myddilholme*’]
Quhytsyd and Mydleholm c. 1575 Assumption, 233 [teinds]
Quhytsyde c. 1592 Charge In. 109
Whytsid 1596 Pont MS 34
Whyteside 1695 Poll T., 168, 181 [Whiteside 169]

Scots white + Scots steid or Scots side
‘White place, steading (Scots steid) or hillside’. It lies on the southern side of Warlaw Hill.

WOODHEAD LEW S NS80 38 1
the Wodheid 1556 Kel. Lib. ii, 479
Wodheid 1577 Charter, Cullace
Wodheid c. 1592 Charge In. 121
Woodhead 1695 Poll T., 166, 167

Scots wuid + Scots heid
‘(Settlement at the) head or end of a wood’. This is to be distinguished from Woodhead LEW at NS77 42.
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Neglected Topographic Names: Ness-names in Orkney and Shetland

Doreen Waugh
University of Edinburgh

The traveller who approaches either Orkney or Shetland by boat, from whichever point of the compass, cannot fail to be impressed by the land rising out of the sea, very often in the shape of a long finger or ness, and sometimes as a more prominent and abrupt headland, such as Sumburgh Head at the southernmost tip of Shetland or the cliffs of Hoy in south-west Orkney. Nowadays, travellers approaching by air have a panoramic view which allows them to see these headlands and all the narrow connecting necks of land which knit the islands together. Early Norse mariners, without the advantage of the aerial view, but with their intimate knowledge of the coastline and its prominences, would have identified such necks of land as useful crossing-places and, in certain locations, the Old Norse (ON) element eið nt. an isthmus or neck of land – surviving most commonly as the present place-name Aith – records that special usefulness.

There is, of course, a huge variety of place-names which have their origins in the topography of both sets of islands and such names have been slightly neglected as sources of information about the past because they are secondary to the more frequently discussed farm-names with their Norse generics such as bólstáðr m. ‘homestead, farm’, stáðr m. (stáðir pl.) “stead”, place, abode’ and setr nt. ‘homestead, farm’. Chronologically, of course, topographic place-names may well be primary in the sense that it is extremely likely that place-names describing physical features of the landscape were among the first to be created by the incoming Norwegian settlers as they arrived in new territory (e.g. Voe, Shetland (HU4063) from ON vágr ‘voe or inlet of the sea’, and Sandwick, both Orkney (ND4388) and Shetland (HU3632, HP6102, HU2877), where the place-name is particularly common, from ON sandvík ‘sandy bay’).

To illustrate the type of information which can be gleaned from the numerous place-names which have their origins in the topography of the islands, therefore, I selected names created from these two Old Norse words – nes nt. ‘promontory’ and eið nt. ‘an isthmus, neck of land’ – the first of which has been borrowed extensively, as ness, into the Insular dialects of Scots spoken in Orkney and Shetland and has, therefore, continued in use throughout several centuries in various contexts and the second of which has, for the most part, remained in use only as a place-name element. Discussion in this paper will focus on nes-names, with brief reference to eið-names. There are many interesting points of comparison between these two place-name elements, one or two of which will be mentioned later.
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Ness is, in fact, one of the most common words for a headland in both the place-names and dialects of Orkney and Shetland, which makes dating of place-names containing ness very difficult because the word has had a long and creative existence both as a place-name element and as a dialect term. Some of the ness-names from both Orkney and Shetland would have been created in the very early period of Viking activity in the Northern Isles because promontories are an important part of the navigable seascape, but some would not have been created until the land was settled and promontories were regarded as part of the pastoral farming landscape. Some examples of place-names containing ness can, of course, be confirmed as being in existence from the dates of early documents in which they are recorded, although the first written record does not necessarily represent the time of creation of the name. It is also possible to suggest the broad historical period during which such names are likely to have been created because many of them are compounded with other Norse lexical items which specify the nature and appearance of the ness or indicate something about its part in the rural economy. The period in which Norn was spoken in Orkney and Shetland can be identified as being approximately from 800 AD to 1700 AD (in Orkney) and to 1750 AD (in Shetland). Some of the Norse terms used as specifics with ness, however, have themselves been borrowed into the local dialects of Scots and then it becomes very difficult to say what is Norn and what is Scots in origin.

Scots would have been spoken by some people in Orkney and Shetland from circa 1400 onwards and there was, therefore, a substantial period of overlap during which time both languages would have been spoken to an extent. Full bilingualism probably occurred but there would also have been many people who spoke their additional language (whether Scots or Norn) only in the context in which it was socially and commercially useful and who, therefore, would have had a limited vocabulary in the additional language. It seems reasonable to argue that for most indigenous Orkney and Shetland inhabitants the language of place-name creation would have remained Norn for most of the period throughout which the language survived in regular daily use in the home (i.e. up to approximately 1700 or 1750). Thereafter, Scots constructions, such as Ness of X, and compounds with Scots or English specifics would have been more probable and more widespread. The names of places particularly associated with social contact with incoming Scots could, of course, have been created in either language and by either linguistic group before 1700.

A further dating complication should be noted, in that both elements in a Ness of X construction can appear to be etymologically Norse but that does not prove Norse origin because X is commonly a pre-existing Norse place-name.

---
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such as *Ness of Seatter* (HY2712), *Ness of Tenston* (HY2816), *Ness of Brodgar* (HY2913), *Ness of Tuquoy* (HY4543) in Orkney, and *Ness of Wadbister* (HP5601), *Ness of Cullivoe* (HP5502), *Ness of Vatsetter* (HU5389) and *Ness of Rannageo* (HU6299) in Shetland. There is also a *Ness of Rannageo* (HY2217) in Orkney and, indeed, there is much duplication in the compound ness-names, not only in Orkney and Shetland but extending north to the Faroes as well. There are, obviously, no examples of the *Ness of X* type in the Faroes because neither Scots nor English is used as the language of place-name creation, but there are some names which occur in Orkney, Shetland and the Faroes such as: *Whiteness Taing* (Orkney, HY5227), *Whiteness* (Shetland, HU2447) and *Hvítanes* (Faroes).

Orkney and Shetland are apparently well ahead in terms of the sheer quantity of ness-names which are recorded on the 1980 OS 1:25,000 maps (380 for Shetland and 252 for Orkney), while the Faroese map has only 81, but this is a very questionable statistic because of a number of factors affecting the likely accuracy of the comparison, not least that the only Faroese map available to me is not on the same scale as the maps used for Orkney and Shetland. Part of the difference in numbers may, however, have to do with differences in population distribution and differences in topography because ness – although a general term for a headland – does tend to imply, in Orkney and Shetland, that the headland has land-use potential by way of providing pasture for animals, a source of fuel etc. Note that Orkney appears to have fewer ness-names than Shetland and this could be to do with the fact that it has a greater extent of fertile land available for farming, which means that there is less need to extract the last tiny bit of agricultural usefulness out of the promontories jutting out into the sea or into lochs, or it may simply be due to the fact that Orkney has fewer promontories which are called -ness. There are other terms which can be used in both Orkney and Shetland to describe promontories, such as ON *tangi* m. ‘spit of land, point projecting into the sea’, or ON *múli* m. ‘muzzle, snout’, used often in place-names of a jutting crag between two inlets of the sea.

There is no part of either Orkney or Shetland where ness-names do not occur. They are ubiquitous and they occur at all levels of usage, in that they can refer to significant units such as the parish and to very minor features on

---

2 Bracketed four-figure references used for the place-name examples refer to the 1980 1:25,000 OS maps; the references have been extracted from the electronic Pathfinder™ Gazetteer – 1.Ov – Scotland, compiled by Robin A. Hooker FRGS.
4 For further discussion of this type of name, see Cox 2007.
5 The only Faroese map which I could acquire at the time of the Viking Congress in Tórshavn (2001) was *Fóroyar Topografiskt Atlas 1:100000*. 
the coast, with a whole range of applications in between. As I indicated at the start, topographic names have not been given enough prominence as probable indicators of permanent early settlement in Orkney and Shetland. This is a point to which I keep returning with increasing conviction the more I investigate the place-names of the north of Scotland and the Northern Isles. When speaking at a conference in Bettyhill in 1992 about the place-names of Strathnaver, I made the following comment in a paper subsequently published as part of the conference proceedings:

When examining evidence for Norse settlement, it is traditional to look for those place-name generics which describe farms or other types of human habitation and, of course, they are the most reliable indicators of extensive and prolonged Norse presence. It is my opinion, however, that we should give more weight than we do to topographical naming as evidence of Norse presence in a settled capacity in north and north-west Scotland. I find it difficult to accept that, on the one hand we argue that topographical names are often the oldest names in a region of Norse settlement (e.g. Fellows-Jensen 1984, 154) and yet, on the other hand, we tend not to cite these as sound evidence of any form of permanent settlement …

(Waugh 2000, 15)

Promontories are, of course, important focal points when seen from a seafarer’s point of view and some of the headlands named *ness* may well have been the first pieces of land to be identified by the Norse but, in my opinion, they must surely have been named by seafarers who then went on to settle on or near the *ness*, and the individual examples of *ness*-names must have been regularly used by people living on the land, for them to have survived over the centuries. It makes sense to argue that the bulk of the early Norse settlers were already inhabitants of either Orkney or Shetland when they named the land in which they were living. The name-givers had the conception of a *ness* as a commodity and generally focused, in their nomenclature, on its possible practical use, or hindrance, in their everyday lives. The impulse behind Norse place-naming is essentially pragmatic and this applies both to the generics in names, such as *ness*, and to the specifics which give more precise information about the *ness*.

In addition to describing the land as they intended to make use of it, the Norse name-givers also quite frequently noted evidence that a place had been previously occupied, without necessarily implying that it was occupied at the time of their arrival. The stone of previous buildings, such as brochs (ON *borg* f.), would have been useful to them in their own construction, this element being found in such names as *Burness*, Orkney, for which see below. Their preference in
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choice of specifics when creating place-names was obviously passed on to ensuing generations because there is no real change in the pattern of naming nesses over the centuries, as far as one can judge from those written records which have survived. Sometimes, of course, the emphasis in specifics is naturally placed on the surrounding sea because of its dangers to incoming and outgoing sailors, but the overall emphasis is heavily biased towards land use and appearance.

Several ness-names in both Orkney and Shetland have the status of being used as the names of both medieval and present-day parishes. Such use is, of course, a secondary development and generally suggests that the ness-name had come to denote an area much greater than that to which it originally referred. Some examples of ness-names which are also parish names are, in Orkney, Burness (parish of Cross and Burness, Sanday), Stenness (parish of Firth and Stenness), Deerness (parish of St Andrews and Deerness), Stromness; in Shetland, Nesting (parish of Nesting), Sandness (parish of Walls and Sandness), Whiteness (parish of Tingwall, Whiteness and Weisdale), Dunrossness.6 Stromness in Orkney also has the distinction of being the name of one of Orkney’s two urban developments, second only to Kirkwall in size. Across the waters of the Pentland Firth from Stromness lies Caithness – sometimes referred to in the sagas as Katanes and sometimes just Nes. In the form Katanes it is a territorial name identifying the indigenous occupants of the Nes lying to the south of Orkney in the early days of Norse settlement. The northern mainland of Scotland was occupied by the tribe known to the Norse in Orkney as the Cats (Watson 1926, 30).

Burness and Stenness belong to the category of names which recognises previous inhabitants and their monumental remains. Hugh Marwick defines the specifics in these names as deriving, respectively, from ON borg f. (probably with reference to the broch at West Brough, Sanday) and from ON steinn m. ‘stone’ (probably with reference to the standing stones at Brodgar, which are difficult to ignore when viewing the Orkney landscape) (Marwick 1952, 7, 110). Deerness is a name which is replicated in Durness (Sutherland, north mainland Scotland) and in Skye (Duirinish), but not in Shetland. The fact that it occurs in these three different locations may, in this instance, suggest that these are places which could have been named by seafarers who, speculatively, may either have seen some passing resemblance to an animal or who may have seen real animals in numbers at these headlands and who brought that useful information back to the land with them when they returned home. ON dýr nt. ‘an animal, beast’, is a generic term which applies to wild animals rather than domesticated breeds.

As well as being a parish name, Deerness has also developed as a surname in Orkney. George Black also records Burness as a surname but does not attribute it

6 For further discussion of the individual parish names, see Marwick 1952 and Jakobsen [1932] 1993.
to Orkney and, although he records one instance of Whiteness as a surname, he describes it as local with reference to a particular place and, as far as I am aware, it is no longer used as a family name (Black [1946] 1984, 117, 812). There is, unfortunately, a considerable degree of randomness in this type of development from topographical description to parish name to family surname, or simply from place-name to personal name, and there is no way of predicting that any one place-name will develop in such a way.

_Nesting_ in Shetland is a particularly interesting example of ON _nes_ being used as specific in a compound name in which the generic is ON _þing_ nt. ‘an assembly, parliament or public meeting place’. It is logical that a _ness_ should be an appropriate location for such a meeting place at a time when travel between places would have been much easier by boat and it bears out the importance of the topography in defining the daily lives of the Norse settlers. Several of the _þing_-names in Shetland have topographic specifics and are located in places chosen for ease of access to the assembly place and in addition, when the specific is ON _eið_, for the ease of transport of men and goods to and from the location. The name _Aithsting_ on the west side of Shetland has ON _eið_ as its specific, and I have argued elsewhere that the element _eið_ in place-names can be interpreted as evidence of a network of transport routes around Shetland and also Orkney where the same element occurs in several place-names, many of them now surviving as the simplex name _Aith_.

_Dunrossness_ has the particular distinction of being the name of much of the southern part of Shetland, now known in Shetland as _De Ness_ (The Ness) and covering several miles of territory roughly equivalent in extent to the medieval parish of Dunrossness and running southwards from Quarff to the southern extremity of the mainland, now known as Sumburgh Head. Whether the point of land at Sumburgh Head was ever called _Dunrossness_ is not known, but there was a reference in _Orkneyinga saga_ to _Dynröst_ described by the translator Joseph Anderson as ‘Off Sumburgh Head, now called Sumburgh Roost’ (Anderson 1981, 164). Another example of a much larger area of land being defined as a _ness_ is, of course, to be found in the name _Caithness_, mentioned above. It was probably never a name which applied specifically to the north-east point of the land, although the fact that the name of the most prominent north-eastern point in Caithness – _Duncansby Head_ – is not topographical in form, might suggest that the name _Caithness_ preceded it as a reference to the north-eastern point of the mainland, but it is impossible to prove one way or the other. Present-day Shetlanders referring to _De Ness_ always mean the southern part of Shetland and, while there are other simplex _ness_-names in both Shetland and

---

7 See Waugh 2006, 239.
8 See Cant 1996, 165.
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Orkney, they tend to be much more localised in reference and are used when there is no possibility of confusion with other ness in the vicinity or, alternatively, as an abbreviated version of the other ness in the vicinity. In Orkney, in particular, there are several smallholdings which now have the name Ness, although in some instances there is no very obvious topographical feature in the immediate vicinity to explain the name e.g. Ness (HY2815), now the name of a smallholding on the peninsula between Loch of Harray and Loch of Stenness. It may take its name from the Loch of Stenness or from another neighbouring compound name in -ness, although it could also be that the neck of land on which it is located is the ness. If ON nes could be used in this rather different sense referring to an isthmus of land, it makes the appropriateness of comparison between ON nes and eidi in Orkney and Shetland place-names even more apt. It is certainly wrong to think of ness purely as a word for an elongated headland jutting out into the sea, although that is its most frequent application in the modern Scots dialects of the Northern Isles. Quite a few of the simplex examples of ness in Orkney and Shetland describe small, relatively broad pieces of land and often these are located at the sides of lochs rather than stretching out into the sea. The element is extremely flexible in application, even in its simplex form and when further descriptive elements are compounded with it, the possibilities for conveying information about the past use of the land by its inhabitants are extensive.

Human presence or farming activity of one kind or another provides the specifics for a large number of ness-names in Orkney and Shetland. In my opinion, the evidence of specifics points to the ness as a feature which was much more often named from the perspective of land use than from its seaward appearance or significance, although the latter type may also occur in names such as Roe Ness (HY4631) in Orkney and the identical Roe Ness (HU3243) in Shetland from ON rauðr ‘red’, or Whiteness Taing (HY5227) in Orkney and Quida Ness (HU1761) or Whiteness (HU2447) in Shetland from ON hvítr ‘white’, although the adjective could imply that the ness was grass-covered rather than being a reference to white or light-coloured rock noticeable from the sea. This is, of course, a disguised reference to farming activity because the grass would have been grazed by domestic animals. The Orkney name Inganess (HY2114) (ON eng f. ‘meadow’) also suggests good grazing and probably also the practice of hay-cutting on the ness. Other less useful vegetation is mentioned in the English name Gorseness (Orkney, HY4119) from English gorse ‘prickly broom’, known in Scots as whin.

Examples of naturally occurring resources which could have been important to farming life in neighbouring settlements are found in: Watsness (HU1749) in Shetland, from ON vatn nt. ‘fresh water’ – essential to animal husbandry; and, perhaps surprisingly, there are parts of Shetland where good surface water for
animals is scarce (there does not appear to be an equivalent name in Orkney, although there is a parallel Vatsnes in the Faroes); Tor Ness (Orkney, HY7555) and Turr Ness (Shetland, HU5340), probably from ON *torf* n. ‘turf or sod’ (cf. Faroese Torvanes); Fugla Ness (Shetland, HU3635) from ON *fugl* m. ‘bird’ (collection of eggs or of the birds themselves would have provided an additional source of food) – collection of eggs may also be suggested in a name such as Spoo Ness (Shetland, HP5607) from ON *spói* m. ‘curlew’, or it may just be a place where the species could be regularly seen; Sella Ness (HU3973) and Selie Ness (HU3460) from ON *selr* m. ‘seal’ (sealskin and oil were both important commodities) (cf. Faroese Selnes) and, in Orkney, a parallel Taing of Selwick (HY2205) from ON *tangi* m. ‘spit of land, a point projecting into the sea or river’; What Ness (HU3351) from ON *hvalr* m. ‘whale’, which could also be named thus because of its shape – the same name occurs in English in Orkney as Whale Point (HY6445); Hoga Ness (Shetland, HP5500) from ON *hagi* m. ‘pasture’; Winnia Ness (Shetland, HU4775) possibly from ON *vin* f., gen. *vinjar*, ‘meadow, pasture’; Fiska Ness (Shetland, HU3066) from ON *fiskr* m. ‘fish’, probably freshwater fish in this instance because the *ness* is located alongside the Town Loch as opposed to the nearby Laird’s Loch on the island of Muckle Roe – the name Fisk Hellia (Orkney, HY3328) seems to be a parallel reference to a good fishing location.

Nesses were important to sea-fishermen as well because they were recognisable points on the land and could be used as *meads*, markers by which to pinpoint fishing grounds, or as places by which to tell the time when the sun dipped behind them. With regard to Shetland place-names, Jakobsen suggests an interpretation of *nóns-vardá* for the hills known as “de Nunsvird, -firt” in Whalsay and North Mavine, which he identifies as ‘hills used as solar marks’ ([1936] 1993, 113), from ON *nón* nt. ‘about three o’clock in the afternoon’, and I believe that the common *ness*-name No Ness (HU2377) or Noness (HU4422) might have the same origin, although there could be other explanations of the specific. As far as I am aware, there is no name of this exact type in Orkney, although there must have been *meads* which had other names. Fishermen also drew their boats up on *nesses* in suitable places such as Neostie Ness (HU6771) on Skerries and Noussta Ness (HU6689) in Fetlar, both Shetland. There are many examples of names in the Scots pattern Nous of … in Orkney – significantly more than in Shetland – but the closest Orkney parallel to the name Noussta Ness is Noussta Taing (HY5040), from ON *tangi* m.

Further pursuit of the theme of the natural resources of the *ness* leads to the *ness*-name Saltness (HU2448; HU3666) / Salt Ness (HU4562; HU3450; HU4880) of which there are five examples in Shetland and at least two in Orkney (HY4719; ND2790), with a further Orkney example referring to the tip of the land, Saltataing (HY4122). When the name Saltness occurs in Norway, according
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I would like to thank W. P. L. Thomson, L. Hollinrake and P. Mason for their assistance with my exploration of possible Orkney portages.

to Jakobsen ‘we find a reminder of the boiling of sea-water carried on there for the extraction of salt’ ([1936] 1993, 86). Alternatively, salt could also be procured by burning seaweed (Cleasby, Vigfusson and Craigie [1874] 1982, 510). In whatever way the saltworks were undertaken, there is a certain similarity between the places which are described as Saltness in Shetland. Saltness in Walls is situated by The Houb (ON hóp nt. ‘small landlocked bay or inlet’), an inlet of the sea which has a narrow channel leading in from the sea and which affords sheltered, easy access to sea-water and plentiful seaweed driven in by the prevailing westerly winds; another Saltness is situated to the south of Brae by shallow water and gravel-flats; Salt Ness in Whalsay is now by the pier at Symbister and it is difficult to tell what it would have been like in the past, but certainly sheltered; Salt Ness by Semblister on the Westside is on a low-lying headland; the final example of Salt Ness is situated on a low-lying point by shallow water opposite The Vadill (ON vaðill m. ‘shallow water which could be forded on horseback’) in the south of the island of Yell. The Orkney example which best fits the pattern of location beside a shallow, sandy bay, sheltered from the sea is Salt Ness in Hoy, just opposite the island of South Walls which is linked to Hoy by a narrow isthmus of land marked as a significant crossing-point by the neighbouring place-name Aith (ON eið nt.). There are many similarities between the location of this Orkney Saltness and the location of Saltness in Brae, Shetland; not least that the etymology of Brae also indicates an isthmus, like the Orkney Aith, although in the case of Brae the name is a compound *breið-eið, meaning the broad neck of land.

It seems quite probable that these bays were chosen as appropriate places for extraction of salt for two reasons. Firstly, there is the need for an appropriately shallow and sheltered bay but, secondly, there is location close to one of the important routes or portages signposted by the ON element eið. It is, as has already been mentioned above, possible to re-create a pattern of movement of boats and goods around the islands of Orkney and Shetland using the Aith place-names which have survived from the early Norse period as indicators of where the land was suitable for transport of goods or, on occasion in some of the locations, of boats themselves. It is impossible to prove exactly when such names were created, but the fact that eið did not survive as a word in the dialect may suggest that the isthmuses could have lost their earlier locational significance as modes of transport changed or that, having named the appropriate spots for such transport, there was no logical need for proliferation of the word eið in the dialect, whereas ON nes was more generic in application and there were simply more places which could be called nes without implying any single type of activity. A specific is needed with nes to give it focused meaning but eið conveys its message that it is

---

9 I would like to thank W. P. L. Thomson, L. Hollinrake and P. Mason for their assistance with my exploration of possible Orkney portages.
a suitable place for crossing the land without need of any further defining word.

There is one qualification to the above, in that Shetland does have a dialect word *je* or *jae* which derives from ON *eĩð*, but it is used in a slightly different sense ‘viz.: a longish bank in the sea, which lies (or formerly has lain) dry at ebb, esp. a sand-bank, forming an intertidal way at low water between two places’ (Jakobsen [1936] 1993, 37). Interestingly, Jakobsen notes that ‘de Point o’ Saltnes’ in Yell ‘is a *jae*’ ([1932] 1985, 387), linking the place-name *Saltness* to an *eĩð* in this instance too, albeit of a slightly different type – not so much a permanent isthmus as a spit of land covered at high tide. Marwick records no such word from Orkney in his dictionary of the Orkney Norn (Marwick 1929). There is perhaps some similarity between the *je* and the Orkney use of the term *oyce* (ON *ós* m. the mouth, outlet of a river or lake) which, according to Marwick, is the element which may be the specific in *Ouseness* and which ‘is frequently found applied, as here, to a shallow bight or lagoon having a narrow spit of land or ‘ayre’ running across its mouth and leaving only a narrow entrance from the sea outside’ (Marwick 1952, 41).

As well as being used for its naturally occurring resources such as salt and peat, the most obvious function of a *ness*, in both Orkney and Shetland, is as a place where animals were regularly put out to pasture. In fact, in a rural economy dominated by animal husbandry the importance of the *ness* as part of the farming unit is considerable, particularly in Shetland where the quality of the land available for agriculture is inferior. *Ness*-names which incorporate words for animals can be found widely throughout Orkney and Shetland and there are related names in Shetland which refer to the penning of animals. The *rooing* (cf. ON *rýja*) of the sheep (or plucking the wool off by hand) was still a very important social occasion in Shetland in my 1950s childhood in Sand on the Westside of Shetland, when people gathered at the *crö* (ON *krá* or *kró* f. ‘small pen or fence’), as we called the enclosure where the sheep were penned. The word for animal enclosure which appears as the specific in two Shetland *ness*-names is not ON *krá*, however, but *rétt* f. and *rétttr* m. ‘public fold’. This word has generally disappeared in the dialect, although Jakobsen records it from the island of Unst in the sense of ‘enclosure for horses’ and in Northmavine in the compound ‘*retta*-dyke’ ([1936] 1993, 91), but it survives in two place-names located on islands on the Westside as *Rit Ness* (HU3362) on Papa Little and *Reitta Ness* (HU2166) on Vaila. The only Orkney place-name which I have found that probably contains this element is *Ritquoy* in Birsay (Marwick 1952, 140) but Marwick does not record any variant of *rétt* or *rétttr* as a term in his dictionary (Marwick 1929).

The animals which were being penned on the *nesses* cover the range that one would expect. There have been sheep in the Northern Isles for many centuries and names such as *Lambaness* (HU1662) and *Lamba Ness* (HP6517) (ON *lamb* n.t.) on Papa Stour are testimony to their presence (cf. Faroese *Lambanes*), as,
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possibly, is Sodasness (HU4778) in Yell (from ON sauðr m. ‘sheep’). Pigs were also reared, as can be seen in the name Swinna Ness (HP6409) in Unst from ON svin nt. ‘swine’; and, probably, Galt Ness (HY4821) in Orkney from ON galti m. ‘boar, hog’; as well as the Scots-influenced dialect form Grice Ness (HY6728) in Orkney, from ON gríss m. ‘young pig’. The name Hesta Ness (HU6692) (ON hestr m. ‘horse’) occurs on Fetlar, Shetland, while Rusness (HU3064) (ON hross m. ‘horse’) is on Muckle Roe and Russa Ness (HU5063) in a remote part of Vidlin and, equally, in Sandsound (HU3749) on the Westside of Shetland. There are three examples of Rusness on Sanday, Wyre and Gairsay in Orkney, respectively (Marwick 1952, 21, 74, 75), and there is also a Lamaness on Sanday (Marwick 1952, 12). Cattle are possibly being inferred in the name Buness in Unst and Bu Ness (HZ2272) in Fair Isle (ON bu ñt. ‘an abode, farm’ or ‘stock, particularly of cattle, on a farm’). There is much less frequent reference in Orkney place-names to the grazing of cattle on a ness but perhaps there was always plenty of good grazing closer to the home farm. There is one example of Bu Ness (HZ2272) which may simply be a reference to grazing stock but, in the Orkney context, it is more likely to be a reference to the abode or farm where the cattle form part of the stock. Another possible reference to cattle occurs in the name Yuxness (Shetland, HU3414) which seems to contain ON uxí m. ‘an ox’, but it is improbably located on the precipitous edge of Fitful Head and it may be that the unfortunate animal merely met its death at that spot.

The association of Ux Ness (HU3835) on Burra, Shetland, with living cattle is more probable because it is recorded as a place from which cattle were swum to the neighbouring island of Trondra (Stewart 1987, 307). Attracting attention across water was important for humans as well and there are several ness-names which incorporate ON kalla to call, cry or shout – by implication, shouting for means of transport. Jakobsen notes the Trondra example of Kalliness from ‘*kallaðar-nes’ ([1936] 1993, 86) and there are other identical names elsewhere in Shetland. Its spelling has been further anglicised on the OS Pathfinder map as Kallee Ness (HU3835). Jakobsen also notes a translation of an earlier Norse name of this type in ‘de Cryin’-teng’ (Shetland) from ON *kallaðar-tangi’ (ibid. 5). At first search, it seemed that Orkney had no such place-names, but I see that Marwick suggests that Carness may be an abbreviated form of ON kallaðar-nes which seems very probable (Marwick 1952, 101).

Habitative specifics are not commonly compounded with ON nes, with the exception of ON kví f. which, in a Shetland and Orkney context, has developed to apply to the habitation associated with an outlying farm, from its original meaning of fold or pen (Marwick 1952: 227–29). Names in Shetland such as Qui Ness (HU2965), Quee Ness (HU4865) or Queyin Ness (HU6671) contain ON kví, as does Orkney Quoy Ness (HY6236) and the identical Quoyness (ND3794).
ON *garðr* m. ‘an enclosure’, also occurs in *Garda Ness Hill* (HU4369), with reference to the place where the two enclosures of Holligarth and Bennigarth in Yell, Shetland, had their peat-cutting rights. The Orkney name *Ness Garth* (HY7038) is unusual in that *ness* is the specific rather than the generic, which is the above-mentioned ON *garðr* m. ‘enclosure’. Other minimal evidence of building can be seen in *Skee Ness* (HU4769), in which *skee* is the Shetland term recorded by Jakobsen and still used today for ‘a loosely built up stone hut or shed with small slits in the walls, used for drying, esp. meat and fish, occas. also clothes’ ([1932] 1985, 790). Jakobsen draws a parallel with Norwegian *skjaa* m. ‘shed, drying-hut (*fiskeskjaa*, *torvikjaa*, etc.), a wooden hut with interstices for letting in the air’. As mentioned earlier, buildings which were already there when the Vikings arrived are recorded in names such as *Burra Ness* (HU4475) (ON *borg* f. ‘broch’) although the reference can be to the dome-shape of the ness itself, while in Orkney there is the later structure *Ness of Brough* (HY4548). Names such as *Toft Ness* (Shetland, HU4476) (ON *top, tomt* and *tupt* f. ‘site, place on which a building may be erected or has been erected’ or simply ‘site of a settlement’) and *Tofts Ness* (Orkney, HY7547) may also point to previous habitation or buildings associated with farming (Gammeltoft 2001). *Kirk Ness* (HU5565) or *Kirka Ness* (HU3043; HU3346) (ON *kirka* f. ‘church’) is also a *ness*-name which occurs in a few locations in Shetland, and in Orkney as *Kirkness* (HY2818). A *ness* is not at all an unusual location for a church for many historical reasons but one obvious practical reason is that, in certain parts of the islands, it was easier for people to travel to church by boat and location near the sea meant that the church could serve a wider community.

Other than these examples, specifics in *ness*-names, where it is possible to interpret them with reasonable certainty, are largely topographical. They note the shape or size of the *ness*, as in the several examples of *Mio Ness* (HU6670) or *Mu Ness* (HP6301) in Shetland and *Mou Ness* (HY3917) or *Mooness* (HY4802) in Orkney (ON *mjár, mjór* ‘slender’) (cf. Faroese *Móanes*); *Brei Ness* (HU3167) in Shetland (ON *breiðr* ‘broad’) (cf. Faroese *Breidanes*); *Snarraness* (HU2356) in Shetland (ON *snara* f. ‘snare’) with reference to the narrow neck of land beyond which the rounded *ness* juts out into the sea; *Scatness* (HU3809) in Shetland falls into this shape category, if my suggestion of derivation of its specific from ON *skati* m. in the sense of ‘something long and thin, probably protruding’ is accepted (Waugh 2001, 47–57); the Orkney name *Odness*, which is discussed inconclusively by Marwick (1952, 26), is a likely parallel to *Scatness* in that the most probable derivation of its specific is from ON *oddi* m. ‘point, tongue of land’ (cf. also ON *oddr* m. ‘point of a weapon’). Such apparently tautologous compound place-names are relatively common and they are not really tautologous because the specifics have the effect of defining the shape of the *ness* very precisely.
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The form Odin Ness (HY4322) seems to be a much later attempt at imposing a possible etymology through the spelling of the name.

Some characteristic of the neighbouring sea may also be the source of the reference, as in the examples of Strom Ness (HU2965) in Shetland and Stromness (HY2508) in Orkney (ON straumr m. ‘stream, current, race’) (cf. Faroese Streymnes), and Brim Ness (HP 6117) in Shetland and Brims Ness (ND2988) and Brim Ness (ND4992) in Orkney (ON brim nt. ‘surf’) (cf. Faroese Brimnes); the quality of stone in the locality; as in Esha Ness (HU2278) in Shetland and, arguably, Ess Ness (HY2916) in Orkney (ON esja nt. ‘kind of clay or soft stone which flakes easily); or Stenness (HU2177) in Shetland, where the beach is now noted as a collecting place for agates and other semi-precious stones, and Stennes (HY2812) in Orkney (ON steinn m. ‘stone’), the first record of which is from Orkneyinga saga (Anderson 1981, passim); Grut Ness (HU5766) in Shetland, Grut Ness (HY2919) in Orkney (ON gryót nt. ‘rough pebbles’) and Urie Ness (HU5994) in Shetland (ON eyrrløykr f. ‘gravelly bank’) all describe the most common material found on Shetland beaches; Sandness (HU1857), a parish name in Shetland (ON sandr m. ‘sand’); a wild animal associated with the ness, as in Catta Ness (HU4967) in Shetland (ON kötr m. ‘cat’ or possibly ‘weasel’); the vegetation as in Ling Ness (HU4560) (ON lyng nt. ‘heather’) and Grunes (HU2755) in Shetland (ON grœnn ‘green or grass-covered’), and so on. The list of topographical specifics could be very lengthy, and the above names have been selected to present an impression of the broad spectrum of Shetland and Orkney ness-names.

One of the most interesting aspects of this search for examples of names has been the frequency with which both sets of islands – and sometimes the Faroes as well – have provided exactly, or very nearly, the same examples of Old Norse topographic place-name elements in combination with the element -nes. This emphasises the similarities between the patterns of habitation and land use which developed in the Northern Isles, some of which were replicated across the North Atlantic. In addition, however, it is also true to say that Orkney can often provide more examples of Scots influence on its topographic place-names than can be found in Shetland. This is hardly a startling conclusion because it confirms what is already known about the earlier disappearance of Norn from Orkney which is, after all, much more accessible from the Scottish mainland. It tends also to confirm that the creation of place-names based on the topography was ongoing throughout the centuries during which the Norn language remained in use in both Orkney and Shetland.
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A Note on the Place-name Dreva, Stobo, Peebleshire

Alan G. James, Scottish Place-Name Society

In a substantial note in JSNS 2, Professor T.O. Clancy has put forward good reasons to remove Trearne (Beith AYR) from the leet of place-names in southern Scotland containing the Brittonic habitative trev-, offering a convincing etymology from Northumbrian Old English. Another name where derivation from trev- may be doubtful, and a Northumbrian Old English origin possible, is Dreva (Stobo PEB).

In his chapter on ‘British Names’ in The History of the Celtic Place-Names in Scotland, W.J. Watson (1926, 363) wrote:

Dreva on Tweed, east of Broughton, is: Draway, 1649 (Ret.); Drevay 1688 (ibid.); it may be for (y) dref-fa, “the tref place”. Near it on an eminence are what seem to be traces of an old settlement.

Subsequent writers have generally accepted this as one of the names in southern Scotland that may incorporate the Cumbric habitative trev. It is indeed a plausible Brittonic formation, in an area where there are several probable or possible P-Celtic names. The combination trev-fa does occur in Wales, albeit very rarely: there is a Coed-trefe (sic on 1st edition OS) in Tregynon, Monmouthshire, and a Moel-drefa in Llanegryn, Merionethshire. -va ‘-place’ is a derivative of early Celtic *mago- ‘plain’, formerly neuter but feminine in neo-Brittonic, so it is reasonable to suppose that a compound name formed with it would have been treated as such, as is implied by Watson’s bracketed (implying elided) definite article (y) causing lenition. And Watson is right about ‘traces of an old settlement’: indeed, there are extensive remains of settlements and field systems around a fort.
on Dreva Hill, and the uplands round about are rich in prehistoric remains indicating a landscape of some significance from megalithic through to Iron-Age times. ‘Site of a settlement’ might be an appropriate interpretation of *tref-fa.

However, there is room for doubt. It is suspicious that the modern form should look so much more ‘Welsh’ than the earlier versions. Those are, in more detail:

terras de Draway 1577 RMS iv no. 2727 [James archbishop of Glasgow feu lands of D. to Regent Morton]

Jacobo Twedy de Draevay 1613 × 1619 RMS vii no. 2102 [James Tweedy]
terris de Drevay 1613 × 1619 RMS vii no. 2102 ['cum manerierum locis, pasturis, communiis, moris, marresiis, vic. Peblis; to be held of the archbishop of Glasgow]
terris de Drevay 1619 RMS vii no. 2102 ['terr is de Drevay et Meirburne, cum pendicul o de Drevay vocato Hopeheid'; cf. Drea Muirburn]
terris de Drevay 1649 Retours (Peebles) no. 126
Dreua 1654 Blaeu (Pont) Tweed Dale etc.
terras de Drevay 1688 Retours (Peebles) no. 192
Dreuvah 1775 Armstrong map

Draway, Drevay etc. could, at a stretch, be explained as attempts to transcribe local Scots pronunciation of ‘Dreva’, but it seems that forms ending with an open vowel rather than a diphthong begin with Blaeu. Unfortunately we do not have Pont’s form, which would take us back to around 1600, but assuming Blaeu did not simply miscopy *Dreuay (vel. sim.), the evidence up to 1654 leaves open the possibility that the medial consonant was [w] rather than [v], and indicates that the final syllable was originally diphthongal. The development of a non-diphthongal vowel might have been a hypercorrection of *[weɪ] misperceived as a case of dialectal diphthongisation. The modern spelling (from the 19th century on) has doubtless influenced pronunciation, and may well have introduced the medial [v]. If it was not directly taken from Blaeu, the possibility of an antiquarian, school Latin-influenced spelling echoing Deva, the river name Dee, cannot be ruled out.

Draway suggests another, fairly obvious English origin: ‘draw-way’. This would have been Old English *drag-weğ. *Drega gives us (more or less obsolete)
Varia

10 SND s.v. dreg n³ states ‘the form drag is not found in Sc. a1700 and is still not in common use’. The English verb dredge is thought to derive from an OE weak verb *drægian (OED s.v.); Scots and northern English dreg, meaning both ‘drag’ and ‘dredge’, seems to be a variant development from *drægian, parallel to that of drag from dragan (DOST s.v. drag v, n³; see also Onions 1966, s.v. dredge). Dreg occurs as a verb in the sense of ‘drag’ in The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedy (also dreger ‘dredger’) and is recorded in DOST (n⁰) as a noun from 1564 × 1575; SND (v³, n³) gives 20th-century examples from ELO, MLO and AYR, though CSD says ‘now only Ayr’. The suggestion in SND (under n⁰), ‘our form dreg ... is a new analogical formation from English drag’, seems inconsistent with the DOST evidence.


12 Now an outer suburb of Edinburgh. Norman Dixon (1947) gives: Dregerne c.1240, 1336–37; -erne 1373–74; -garne 1438; Drygarne 1492; -horne 1529, 1529 et passim to 1654 RMS; -orne 1538 RMS; -horne 1656 RMS. His interpretation is: “Corner-spit” v. drag, hyrne; Dreghorn lies on a spit of land in a corner formed by the Howden Burn; OE dreg (dreg) has various meanings from “portage where boats are dragged over a narrow piece of land” to “a narrow spit of land”, but the Howden Burn is too small to permit of the first meaning.’ The other Dreghorn, in AYR (on the south-east outskirts of Irvine), is on a loop in the River Irvine where a portage is more likely. Clancy (2008, 106 note 9) considers ‘a narrow spit of land’ may be possible at either place.

13 As Clancy says (loc. cit.), ‘The early forms ... suggest ærn rather than hyrne.’

14 As do early forms for Dreghorn AYR, for which see Clancy, loc. cit.

15 See note 10 above.
or bottom of a steep slope (2008). She emphasises how difficult, and potentially dangerous, it would be to conduct a laden ox- or horse-drawn waggon up or (especially) down a steep gradient: if a place on their route was called \( X\text{-weg} \), Anglo-Saxon carters would have looked for an alternative.

Now, Dreva is not in an area where there are many place-names likely to be of Northumbrian Old English origin, though it is generally assumed that Northumbrian imperium extended over the whole of the Tweed basin, and the geopolitical significance of the location might explain an isolated Northumbrian name here. Dreva Hill actually forms part of the central Tweed-Clyde watershed, the putative boundary between the Angles of Bernicia and the Britons of the Clyde. It is a high ridge (at the north-west end, over 350m above sea level) extending south-west from Trahenna Hill, ending with a steep drop down to the river below the fort-site on Dreva Craigs (which is at 276m). From the hill-fort, one looks west along the route from Clydesdale through the Biggar Gap into the Tweed valley, an important line of communication in early medieval times. The preferable route from the west would have involved fording the upper Tweed below Wrae Hill (at NT122328, about a mile upstream above Merlindale, where the B712 road now crosses) and then taking the relatively gentle way along the hillsides above the river by Drumelezier, Tinnis and Dawyck. However, the river-crossing would have been impossible for laden waggons in times of heavy rain. Those with loads to move might have been tempted to use the alternative route staying north of the river, but this would have entailed steep climbs up Dreva Hill and down the other side: *\( D\text{ræg-weg} \) would have been doubly ‘a waggoner’s warning’.

---

16 Somewhat modified in the 19th century by excavations for the building of a railway line, with a new road and bridge across the Tweed.
18 Average annual rainfall at Dawyck Arboretum is reported as 973mm on \(<www.plantnetwork.org/directory/dawyck.html> \) (accessed 27/1/09); not very high compared to West Highland levels, but sufficient on the hills to cause sudden river-spates, flash floods and plenty of mud.
19 7.5%, approximately 1 in 13 on the west side, 11.4%, approximately 1 in 9, on the east. The existing road cuts into the hillside – it is probably an ancient route, albeit modified by modern engineering.
20 The hamlet now called Dreva is shown (as Drevah) at roughly the present site on a map of 1741 (William Edgar’s map of ‘The Shire of Peebles or Tweeddale’). The present settlement is at NT139359, above the Tweed opposite Drumelezier, on a burn flowing down the hillside about ¾ mile east of the fort. There are other dreva-names in the surrounding area (Dreva Wood, Dreva Muir etc.), and the early records indicate fairly extensive landholdings pertaining to Dreva, but the name – whether it is Brittonic *\( t\text{ræv-va} \) or Northumbrian Old English *\( d\text{ræg-weg} \) – evidently refers primarily to Dreva Hill and Craig.
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In Scotland there are a number of place-names which have for their first element *Inver-* or *Aber-*. *Inver-* reflects Gaelic *inbhir* ‘confluence’, whilst *Aber-* reflects a P-Celtic word of the same meaning. In the case of *Aber-*, the denoted river name is nearly always of P-Celtic origin (or earlier). In the case of *Inver-*, the denoted river name is usually of Gaelic origin, although there are a number of river names which derive from an earlier stratum (e.g. Inverlunan, Inverness or Inverugie). Some scholars have implied that at least some of these names in the last set could reasonably be translations of *Aber-* to *Inver-*. The old form *Haberberui* is often quoted as evidence for just such a process, representing *"Aberbervie*, now Inverbervie. This is a staple argument in pieces on *Aber-* names, supposedly exemplifying the replacement of Gaelic place-names over Pictish. Given the importance placed on this single form, the purpose of this short piece is to examine the likelihood of its authenticity.

There is no doubt as to the derivation of Inverbervie: *inbhir* discussed above with the existing river name Bervie, almost certainly of P-Celtic origin, cognate with Welsh *berw*, ‘boiling, seething, foaming’. The old forms for Inverbervie are as follows:

- *Inuerberuyn* early 13th Century Arb. Lib. i no. 89 (p. 61)
- toftis de *Inuerbervyn* 13th Century Lind. Cart. XVIII [rubric]
- uilla de *Inuerberuyn* 13th Century Lind. Cart. XVIII
- De *Inirberwyn* 1266 Lind. Cart. no. CXV [rubric]
- in *Inirbervyn* 1266 Lind. Cart. no. CXV
- ?*Haberberui* 1290 Stevenson, *Documents* i, 183–86
- *Inverbervyn* 1291 Duchy of Lancaster Charters [Stevenson, *Documents* i, 235]
- *Inner Bervy* c. 1341 RRS vi no. 483
- *Inuerberwyn* 1354 Arb. Lib. i no. 27
- *Inuerbervy* 1359 ER i, 34
- *Inuerbervie* 1360 RRS vi no. 231
- *Inner Bervy* c. 1368 RRS vi no. 504
- *Inverbervy* 1369 RMS i no. 234
- *Inverbervie* 1554 Brech. Reg. i no. CCCCIX

2 See *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* 2009. For the derivation see Watson 1926, 469, although his Welsh cognate *brwd*, ‘hot, warm, boiling’ seems to be in error for *berw*. The term *brwd* is cognate with *berw*, and the confusion may have occurred because Watson (correctly) proposes this for the derivation of the name Burn of Brown in the same paragraph.
As can be seen, the form Haberberui appears only once, in Joseph Stevenson’s, Documents, in an edition of a manuscript called ‘Account of the Expenses of the English Agents going to Orkney and Returning’, dated 1290. The implications of this form were first noted by Erskine Beveridge in 1923 and made well known a few years later by William J. Watson in his famous Celtic Place-Names of Scotland. As noted above, in these cases, and in those mentioned below, it was championed as a rare example of alternation between Aber- and Inver- in Scottish place-names. This observation has been cited in a number of works since then, such as Nicolaisen, Barrow and others. In each of these cases, the reference given to the form was either to Stevenson’s published edition, to Watson’s discussion, or in most cases unacknowledged, with simply the date 1290 mentioned. The original manuscript from which Stevenson’s edition derives is entitled Expensae Dominorum Thomae de Braytoft et Henrici de Ry versus Orcadiam, et Retro; it is quoted by Stevenson as being in the Public Records Office in London (now called the National Archives), but has actually been missing since at least May 1997, and, to my knowledge, no facsimile or other transcription has been made.

Stevenson’s work was published in two volumes in 1870. The sources for these works are numerous, but predominantly derive from documents from the Public Records Office (many of the Scottish documents were moved to Edinburgh in 1949) and the British Museum (now mainly in the British Library). The Latin document in question is a list of expenses of English agents travelling from Newcastle up to Wick and then returning. Although not stated in the book, this journey relates to events concerning the death of Margaret of Norway. The original appears to have been a single folio, written on both sides. Nearly every line comprises a date and place, with the amount spent to that point. The line in question reads (in the edition): ‘Die Veneris, apud Haberberui . iiiij s. iij d. q.’. The document has the following footnote:

3 Stevenson, Documents i, 183–86.
4 Beveridge 1923, 3.
5 Watson 1926, 459.
6 Nicolaisen 2001, 211.
7 Barrow 1973, 49.
8 For example: Nicolaisen 2001, 211.
10 The events described in the manuscript are discussed in CDS ii no. 464, 109, Bain 1893, 101 (incorrectly citing the State Papers) and MacKenzie 1948, 61.
From the Original, among the miscellaneous documents in the Public Record Office. It is much defaced by damp, partly destroyed, and in some places illegible. No second copy exists.

Stevenson’s phrase ‘much defaced and in some places illegible’ is somewhat at odds with the actual edition, in which almost all the text appears to have been legible. Nearly every line in the document seems to begin Die, i.e. ‘on the day’ followed by a day of the week. Just over half of the 40 lines on the front page contain text at the beginning of the line in square brackets and italics, suggesting these are the illegible sections, filled in from context. This correlates with the second section of the edited manuscript, called Dorso, i.e. ‘on the back’. The amounts of the expenses, on the right-hand side of the page, are missing for the entire page, which would correspond with the illegible areas on the left-hand side of the front page (assuming the damage had affected both sides of the leaf). The area of missing expenses on the back, however, is larger in extent than the declared reconstructed forms on the front, and the form Haberberui would stand well within the area corresponding to the missing expenses on the back. Although the damage in this area could have been only on the back of the document, there is other evidence that some of the other text has been reconstructed (i.e. guessed at).

The name-form Montrose is mentioned on the line above the one in question. Elsewhere in the document, on the return trip, Montrose is referred to as Munrosse. If one looks at the old forms, it can be seen that, ignoring the dubious form, the earliest known mention of the form with the intrusive -t- (as in Montrose) is from 1430, which would make the other form the earliest by 140 years. This name-form is suggestive of a transcription error in Stevenson’s work, in which he substituted a modern name-form for an old one, which was presumably partially or wholly illegible.

Munros 1171 x 1184 Moray Reg. no. 2
munros 1178 x 1180 Arb. Lib. i no. 6
munros 1178 x 1198 Arb. Lib. i no. 76
munros 1189 x 1999 Arb. Lib. i no. 19
munros 1189 x 1199 Arb. Lib. i no. 28
munros 1189 x 1199 Arb. Lib. i no. 31
monros 1189 x 1199 Arb. Lib. i no. 80
munros 1189 x 1199 Arb. Lib. i no. 97
Munros 1189 x 1196 Arb. Lib. i no. 304
Monros 1204 x 1211 Arb. Lib. i no. 86
munros 1214 x 128 Arb. Lib. i no. 100
Munros 1225 Moray Reg. Carte Originales no. 5
Having introduced reasonable doubt concerning the accuracy of the edition, it now remains to be proven that Stevenson was aware that the Aber- and Inver- were in some sense equivalent, and was thus able to confuse them. The earliest mention known to the author of the equivalence between Inver and Aber is in Blaeu’s *Atlas Novus*, in ‘Praefectvrarvm Aberdonensis Et Banfiensis’ written by Robert Gordon in c. 1654:

\[\text{Inner vel Abyr confluentiam fluminum vel eorundemm ad mare ostia notat : at multa sunt quae vestigare inanis operae est.}\]

‘Inver’ or ‘Aber’ means the confluence of rivers or their mouths at the sea.

But there are many which it is an idle task to investigate.\(^{11}\)

Several works throughout the 18th and 19th century discuss the equivalence of the terms Aber- and Inver-: *The Old Statistical Accounts\(^{12}\)* and those by Chalmers,\(^{13}\)


\(^{12}\) OSA, 1791–99, Fife: Parish of Kirkcaldy, 1: ‘All names of places beginning with Bal, Col or Cul, Dal, Drum, Dun, Inch, Inver, Auchter, Kil, Kin, Glen, Mon, and Strath, are of Gaelic origin. Those beginning with Aber and Pit are supposed to be Pictish’ (author’s italics).

\(^{13}\) Chalmers 1807 vol. 2, 481: ‘Of those words which form the chief compounds in many of the Celtic names of places in the Lowlands, some are exclusively British, as Aber, Llan, Caer, Pen, Cors, and others; some are common to both British and Irish, as Carn, Craig, Crom, Bre, Dal, Eaglis, Glas, Inis, Rinn, Ros, Strath, Tor, Tom, Glen; and many more are significant only in the Scoto-Irish or Gaelic, as Ach, Ald, Ard, Aird, Auchter, Bar, Blair, Ben, Bog, Clach, Corry, Cul, Dun, Drum, Fin, Glac, Inver, Kin, Kil, Knoe, Larg, Lurg, Lag, Logie, Lead, Letter, Lon, Loch, Meal, Pit, Pol, Stron, Tullach, Tullie, and others’ (author’s italics).
Kemble\textsuperscript{14} and Taylor.\textsuperscript{15} These last three were popular in their day and were presumably published whilst Stevenson was working on the volumes in question, and it is very likely that, as a learned archivist and historian,\textsuperscript{16} he would have been aware of the equivalency of the two terms and was thus able to confuse the two elements.\textsuperscript{17}

The town Inverbervie is now generally known as Bervie and this was the case even in Stevenson's time.\textsuperscript{18} It is possible that Stevenson discerned a form such as \textit{H..erberui} in the document and was himself unclear as to the original form of the name, guessing \textit{Haberberui} when the actual form may have been *\textit{Hinerberui}.\textsuperscript{19} This is made all the more likely by the proximity of other \textit{Inver-} and \textit{Aber-} names in the document. The word \textit{Haberberui} appears on line 22 of the text, while immediately underneath on line 23 is \textit{Haberdene}, i.e. Aberdeen. Line 27 contains \textit{Hinernairn}, i.e. Invernairn (now Nairn). It would thus seem possible for the author to have confused the forms in these circumstances.

The authenticity of the form can also be called into doubt when the context of the manuscript is considered. One would expect to find a form such as \textit{Haberberui}, essentially a Pictish version of the name – at a time when Pictish had given way to Gaelic for a century or so at the very least – in a manuscript containing some local knowledge, such as that found in \textit{Arb. Lib}. In fact, this document was written or compiled by English scribes working for English agents, who stopped off in Inverbervie for one night before continuing their journey north by sea. It seems incredible that such people would be aware of, and choose to use, an alternative Pictish name when such a form would have gone unattested by other manuscripts from the local area.

\textsuperscript{14} Kemble 1849, 4: ‘The distinctive names of Water in the two principal Keltic languages of these islands, appear to be \textit{Aber} and \textit{Inver}: the former occurs frequently in Wales, the latter never: on the other hand, \textit{Aber} rarely, if ever, occurs in Ireland, while \textit{Inver} does.’
\textsuperscript{15} Taylor 1865, 245: ‘\textit{Inver} and \textit{aber} are also useful test-words in discriminating between the two branches of the Celts.’
\textsuperscript{17} Stevenson would almost certainly have been aware of W.F. Skene’s famous \textit{Celtic Scotland} published in five volumes from 1876–80, which discussed \textit{Inver-} and \textit{Aber-} names at some length, but the date of this was six years after that of Stevenson’s own work.
\textsuperscript{18} See \textit{OSA} 1791–99, vol. 13, 1, called ‘Parish of Inverbervie or Bervie’ stating: ‘The name seems to be taken from the rivulet of Bervie; with the addition of the Gaelic word \textit{Inver}, which, in its signification, applies particularly to the town of Inverbervie, but in common writing and speaking is now in disuse.’
\textsuperscript{19} There is even a possibility that the final two letters were illegible, since in the index this form cited is HABERBEROY.
On toponymic grounds, the type of alternation as seen here is unattested both in other Inver- and Aber- names, and also in other pairs of equivalent P- and Q-Celtic elements. Variation between, for example, Gaelic ceann and P-Celtic pen[n] (direct cognates meaning ‘head’ or ‘hill’) may be seen in the name Kirkintilloch, but this shows the name changing from pen[n] into ceann. The old forms above show the existence of Gaelic inbhir before 1290, the date of Haberberui. To accept the authenticity of the form Haberberui one would need to posit two concurrent names for the same place, and not that the name evolved from a P-Celtic to a Gaelic form. This type of dual-naming, especially at a time when any P-Celtic language had long ceased to be spoken in the area, is unknown anywhere in Scotland.

It is possible that *Aberbervie and Inverbervie related to two distinct, but closely located settlements, in the manner of Abernethy and Inernethy PER, Aberuchill and Inver-ruchill also PER, and possibly Arbroath (formerly Aberbrothock) and Inverbrothock ANG, but this seems remote given the context of the manuscript discussed in the preceding paragraph.

Unless the original manuscript or a facsimile is uncovered, which seems very unlikely, we will probably never know for certain what the original form of the name was. The following facts, however, make it very likely that the original form was *Hinerberui:

1. The original document was certainly illegible in various places; these places have not been identified in the edition.
2. Other place-name forms in the document appear not to be authentic.
3. Contextual evidence suggests the possibility of a confusion between Aber- and Inver- in the mind of the editor.
4. The context and purpose of the manuscript make the use of a Pictish variant of the name Inverbervie very unlikely.
5. This type of generic element variation is not in evidence in other similar place-names in Scotland.

---

21 See Taylor 1997 on the nature of variation between pett and baile.
22 Inverbrothock ‘possibly dating only from the year 1827’; see Beveridge 1923, 43.
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Review Article

Paul Cavill and George Broderick

Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland

Alan G. James
Scottish Place-Name Society


This fine publication contains nine papers first presented at a conference, organised by the Institute for Name Studies of the University of Nottingham in conjunction with the Centre for Manx studies of the University of Liverpool, in Douglas, Isle of Man, during September 2004. It is commendable that the English Place-Name Society has undertaken this publication (as number 3 in its Extra Series), especially as only two of the papers deal directly with place-names in England. Scotland gets the rampant lion’s share, with four contributions specifically devoted to Scottish place-names, and the two focused on Man and one on Ireland are also of considerable interest to Scottish toponymists.

But of course, national boundaries are anachronistic in considering historical contacts among languages, and the seaways were channels of communication as much as marks of division throughout most of the two millennia or more in which the contacts under consideration took place. Moreover, this collection raises issues, and offers models for research, worthy of the attention of any scholars interested in the ecology of languages in historical time and in the value (and limitations) of place-names as evidence for linguistic interactions. That being so, it is a pity that the editors did not take up the challenge of writing, or commission an authoritative scholar to write, some overview drawing out the themes that emerge from the papers and placing them in the wider context of current scholarly opinion on the processes and consequences of language-contact in both synchronic and diachronic perspectives.

‘The Isles, and the inhabitants thereof’

For an excellent example of a clear, convincing discussion of an important issue in place-name studies arising in contexts of language-contact, one would advise students to read Berit Sandnes’ ‘Describing language contact in place-names’. This tackles the woolly concept of ‘hybrid’ place-names by distinguishing, in place-names in Orkney that contain both Scandinavian and Scots elements,
among those that involve words adopted from Norn into Orkney Scots (obviously implying that their meaning was understood), those adopted from Scandinavian that have been modified in ways showing that their meaning was at least partly understood, and those modified in ways which indicate that the meaning (or form) of the original was opaque. She rightly emphasises the unlikelihood of even a fluent bilingual actually code-switching in the process of coining a place-name: a name is formed in a single language, even if it contains elements that originated in another.

A delightful companion-piece to Sandnes’ is Doreen Waugh’s ‘From the “banks-gaet” to the “hill-grind”: Norn and Scots in the place-names of Shetland’. This deals, again, with names formed by speakers of the successor language (Shetland Scots) using elements retained from the one which had become extinct (Norn), showing how a rich Norn-derived toponymic vocabulary current in the early 18th century has gradually dwindled, so now Shetlanders (and, even more, incoming settlers) scour dictionaries of Norn (or even of modern Norwegian) to find ‘authentic’ names for their houses, boats and businesses. It shows, as do so many of Waugh’s studies, how close attention to the place-names of a small district (here, the townships of Sand and Garderhouse on west Mainland), informed by both documentary evidence and the knowledge of local inhabitants, can provide rich material for adducing general principles, in this case complementing and expanding Sandnes’ study by showing how adopted terms are used, how they develop over time, and how they may eventually fall into disuse.

Another very recommendable model for a student undertaking a study of language-contact is George Broderick’s ‘Goidelic-Scandinavian language contact in the place-names of the Isle of Man’. This considers, very systematically, the fate of Scandinavian-formed place-names in the speech of Manx Gaelic, and, subsequently, Manx English, speakers. Broderick employs four categories: names which remain recognisably Scandinavian, those which have developed under the (phonological) influence of Manx Gaelic, those containing or consisting of Scandinavian elements adopted into Manx Gaelic (which, following Sandnes’ argument, must be seen as Gaelic formations), and those which now exist in English forms (whether based on originally Scandinavian names or Gaelic ones containing Scandinavian elements, names like The Flatt or Bayr ny Hayrey Road must be English formations). The distinction between the first two categories is, perhaps, a little subjective, but helpful as we are taken through a clear account of the 23 best-attested Scandinavian elements in Manx place-names. The conclusions raise questions for further research: the phonological developments affecting even the ‘recognisable’ names could be studied in more detail, and the observations regarding elements which were not adopted into Gaelic, or which
were adopted and may have ‘competed’ with Gaelic words, point to the general need for more sophisticated approaches among toponymists to the semantics of language-contact. One feels that the statistical analysis of the findings attempts to give an air of ‘scientific’ respectability to an excellent study that does not need it. Those findings have considerable relevance to comparable contexts in the Scottish islands, and the methodology could be applied fruitfully to these and many other cases where one language has succeeded another.\footnote{A small point of confusion is the implication on pp. 7–8 that the earldom of Derby was associated with the county town in the English midlands. The Stanleys were (and are) earls of (West) Derby in Lancashire. Fellows-Jensen gets this right on p. 106.}

Gillian Fellows-Jensen gives ‘Some thoughts on English influence on names in Man’. This begins with a fascinating piece of onomastic detective work, investigating one Blæcgmon commemorated in runic inscriptions on a couple of the carved stones at Maughold. Her conclusions are of Scottish interest: while this ‘Englishman’ might possibly have settled in Man in the time of Edwin or his successors, when the island was apparently subject to Northumbrian imperium, she considers a date in the eighth or early ninth centuries most likely, on epigraphic grounds, and a link with the Northumbrian monastery at Whithorn possible.

The second part of her paper updates her views on the names in Man with east Norse -bý.\footnote{In particular, Fellows-Jensen 2001 and 2004.} This is again of importance to those interested in the Scandinavian names of south-west Scotland, as she now sees those in Man in the context of a movement of Danish settlers from their heartlands around York by way of the Solway basin, the Cumbrian coast and thence to Man, where they took possession of a substantial number of valuable landholdings (several of which became treens or quarterlands). Her discussion of the modification of these -bý names by Manx Gaelic speakers complements Broderick’s survey, which agrees with her (revised) view that, even though cognates can be found for the majority of them among the place-names of northern England, these were original east Norse formations, not later transferred names. It is also of importance that she sees the application of -bý names to major landholdings (which may have already had earlier Scandinavian names) as associated – on Man as in the Danelaw – with a change in the fiscal system, whereby these settlements came to be taxed directly rather than through an ancient estate centre. This would have been part of the radical changes in patterns of settlement, landholding and taxation which affected the whole of the British Isles (apart, perhaps, from the Scottish Highlands) in the central middle ages; I shall return to these below.\footnote{See below under Invisible Britons: a view from north of the Humber.}
In discussing names of the ‘Kirk Bride’ type, Fellows-Jensen endorses the view of Daphne Brooke (1983) that these arose as ‘a compromise between Danish names such as Kirkby ... and Gaelic names such as Kilbride’. This is too vague: returning to Sandnes’ argument, were they Danish formations or Gaelic (or even English)? Alison Grant has offered a persuasive answer, that they were formed by ‘Gaelic speakers utilising the culturally-dominant Scandinavian language into which they transferred some features of their native speech’ (2002, 83). That may not be the last word on the matter, but it at least addresses the question with precision.4

A rigorously specialised approach is demonstrated in Richard Cox’s ‘The development of Old Norse -rð(-) in (Scottish) Gaelic’. This is a further contribution to the admirable work Cox has been doing in elucidating the origins and development of place-names in the areas of intense and prolonged Scandinavian-Gaelic contact in the Western Isles, especially Lewis.5 It will be studied with great profit by those interested in the toponymy of the Isles and the western seaboard, but should also be recommended as a model for advanced students examining other cases of language contact who have not only a mastery of the languages involved but also of theoretical and applied phonetics. It demonstrates above all the diversity and complexity of the modifications of Scandinavian names in the mouths of Gaelic speakers. These are not random, but to understand them requires close attention to the precise phonology of both the ‘donor’ and ‘successor’ languages, even of the idiolects of living (or recorded) informants (an especially important source of evidence for Cox and others working in this geographical area). It also requires alertness to the possible effects of analogy, folk-etymology and extraneous linguistic influences (most obviously here, Scottish English).

The Mere of the Thing: A Viking mystery

The five papers so far reviewed, although very various, constitute a coherent group. They obviously have in common their bearing on islands, from Shetland to Man, where Scandinavian dialects co-existed with, and were ultimately superseded by, either Gaelic (of Lewis or of Man) or local forms of Scots / Scottish Standard English. They demonstrate a range of systematic comparative-linguistic approaches in examining the place-name evidence for linguistic interaction in contexts where both the ‘legator’ and ‘legatee’ languages have been comprehensively described at all levels. The remaining four are more disparate and require separate consideration, though Paul Cavill’s ‘Coming back to Dingesmere’ still takes us to a place where Old Norse co-existed with Old English and Middle Irish, not

---

4 It also draws attention to the neglected possibility of morphological influence from a ‘subordinate’ language on a ‘dominant’ one, a potentially important facet of language-contact: see note 23 below.

5 See now Cox 2008, with the accompanying bibliography.
to mention Old Welsh, and which was almost an island: the Wirral peninsula. The northern part of the Wirral especially, which was a Viking colony from the first decade of the 10th century to the fourth, has been the subject of scholarly onomastic study by Cavill and his colleagues in recent years. Cavill follows up their strong endorsement of the view of John McN. Dodgson that the battle-site of *Brunanburh* can be identified with Bromborough, Cheshire, on the Wirral, by examining the (apparent) place-name *Dingesmere* that occurs in the poem celebrating Athelstan’s victory in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Insofar as that battle imported Gaelic speakers from Alba and Cumbric-speaking Britons from the Clyde into the linguistic mixture, and as it proved to be a critical turning-point in ‘Anglo-Scottish’ relations, there is Scottish interest here too.

After dealing thoroughly with the grammatical objections to reading *dingesmere* as a kenning, not a place-name, and with the morphological difficulties with Dodgson’s proposal that the first element is a formation with the ‘naming after’ suffix *-ing* added to the river name Dee, Cavill proposes that *Dinges-* is the genitive singular of a modified form of OE *þing*, ‘an assembly’, the *þing* in question being that at Thingwall, Cheshire, on the Wirral, ON *Þing-vollr* ‘meeting-place of the assembly’. He sees the non-fricative, voiced initial as evidence of Gaelic influence, though (as he points out), similar forms are found sporadically throughout the English midlands as far afield as Leicestershire, where Gaelic influence seems unlikely. Again applying the ‘no hybrids’ rule, while the Thing referred to was presumably established by the Northmen, the formation with the genitive singular and an English generic is unquestionably English – one feels that the need to justify the presence of this paper in a volume on language-contact has pushed the author to unnecessary complications here.

He then turns to the generic *-mere*, examining meticulously the semantics of this element in place-names and in literary usage, and finds the view taken by both Campbell and Dodgson that *Dingesmere* was ‘a poetic and figurative invention of a name for the Irish Sea’ inconsistent with the toponymic and literary evidence. *Mere*, he argues, must mean ‘a pond or lake not part of a larger feature’, ‘wetland’, ‘land liable to flood’. While most have long since been drained, such meres were a widespread feature in the acid flatlands behind the sand-dunes on the Wirral. His case is philologically and topographically impeccable. The only problem remains in the poem:

---

6 Indeed, the paper under review here is ‘a revised and supplemented version’ of Cavill, Harding and Jesch 2004, itself addressing a question raised in idem (2000).
12 Drawing together senses cited by Cavill from various sources on p. 37.
which Cavill translates, ‘Then the Northmen, dreary survivors of the spears, went in the nail-studded ships on Dingesmere, over deep water, to seek Dublin, [went] back to Ireland ashamed’.  He argues that we need not look for an exact parallelism in Old English poetry – Dingesmere and deep water need not both refer to the Irish Sea. But the parallel he adduces from the poetic Solomon and Saturn is not really convincing. In this Coforflood is paired with Wendelse. Coforflood is presumably the River Chebar (Chaborus in the Vulgate Bible), a major tributary of the Euphrates, Wendelse is the Mediterranean, both of them to be crossed en route to the land of the Chaldeans. Solomon and Saturn does not imply, as does The Battle of Brunanburh, that the two crossings are parts of a single voyage. If the bard of Brunanburh – not, be it admitted, the greatest of Anglo-Saxon poets – knew Dingesmere, or simply understood the meaning of mere, he must have been aware that he was making the worsted Northmen board ship on a marshy, land-locked dune-slack. Was he desperate for a name to alliterate with Difelin?

Pictish: a view from south of the Forth

With Nicolaisen’s ‘The Change from Pictish to Gaelic in Scotland’, we turn to a language much less well-described than Old Norse and its eventual replacement by Scottish Gaelic. The author begins with another analysis of the ways in which a place-name in one language may be treated in the successor language. This somewhat enhances Broderick’s classification and deals, in a similar way to Sandnes, with the different ways in which bilingual forms may arise. It is odd, though, that he does not take into account in this introductory overview the important possibility – the more so in the case of two relatively closely-related languages – of toponymic elements from the earlier language being adopted into the later one, or influencing the usage of related or similar-sounding elements in the latter.

He then turns to the great distractions that complicated discussion of Pictish for much of the 20th century. It is a useful summary, but readers needing to know precisely why Pictish is P-Celtic, and not (even a bit) non-Indo-European, pre-

---

13 p. 27, the OE text being from Campbell 1938.
14 Krapp and Dobbie 1942, 31–48 at lines 19–20 and 204–05.
15 A possibility now examined in detail in Taylor, forthcoming: I am grateful to Dr Taylor for sight of a pre-publication version of this chapter. Taylor acknowledges there the influence of articles by Aidan MacDonald in the Bulletin of the Ulster Place-Name Society and Ainm on elements such as dün, rath and lios in Scottish place-names (1981, 1982 and 1987 respectively).
Celtic or Q-Celtic, will need to refer to Nicolaisen’s earlier writings and those of the other scholars he cites.

The rest of the article updates the author’s magisterial body of work on place-name elements characteristic of the parts of Scotland most associated (in documentary sources and in the distribution of symbol-stones and other diagnostic artefacts) with the historical Picts, discussing the findings of relatively recent scholarship and locating their treatment by Gaelic speakers in the perspective of his initial analysis.

He restates W. J. Watson’s view (1926, 459) that aber was apparently replaced by Gaelic inbhear in ‘part translation’ at Inverbervie, and that the same may well have been the case wherever Inver- now precedes a P-Celtic or ancient river name. His discussion of pett remedies the omission of adoption from the introductory analysis by accepting that this element was used by Gaelic speakers in a tenurial or fiscal sense associated (like Danish bý in Fellows-Jensen’s paper) with the reorganisation and eventual break-up of ancient landholdings. However, in an unsatisfactory gallop through some 10 further Pictish elements towards the end of the paper, he fails to sort out clearly whether (for example) pres/preas, pawr/púir, dol/dail, or monid/monadh are cases of adoption from Pictish into Gaelic or of Gaelic cognates influenced by Pictish usage. A number of detailed points need to be made regarding these and other elements touched on in the paper, but these are dealt with more appropriately below (see Appendix, p. 150).

Considered overall, while Nicolaisen’s overview provides a useful guide to the present state of understanding of Pictish, it raises for the present reviewer a couple of serious concerns of a more fundamental nature about the study of that language.

In the first place, in the context of this collection, the contrast between Nicolaisen’s discussion of Pictish and Gaelic and Cox’s, or even Broderick’s, of Old Norse and Gaelic, highlights the very sketchy picture we still possess of the phonology of Pictish. While the introductory overview refers to, and exemplifies, ‘phonological adaptation’, the examples given involve Gaelic and English, not Pictish. Of course, we can hardly expect to ever achieve the depth of detail that can be adduced from the ample written evidence for Norse, but at present all we have for Pictish is the set of notes appended by Jackson to his seminal paper, ‘The Pictish Language’ (1955, 161–66, and 1980 reprint, 171–76). In these he drew attention to a range of phonological features in respect of which the language represented

---

16 Notably Nicolaisen 1996; and 2001 (1976), 192–204.
17 However, Jacob King has now raised serious doubts about the solitary form Haberberui, see King, this volume. I am grateful to Dr King for sight of a pre-publication version of this note.
19 There is no discussion in the paper of elements which appear to show distinctive Pritenic phonological characteristics, such as *abbor for aber, *ochel for uchel, *bren for bryn; the only element which receives phonological consideration is lanerc/*lannrec, where Nicolaisen is citing Cox (1997; see the Appendix to this review, p. 150).
in Pictish inscriptions differed from Brittonic, the form of P-Celtic which he had analysed in comprehensive detail in *Language and History in Early Britain* (1953). Very little attention has been paid to these notes by subsequent scholars,\(^{20}\) they have never been systematically tested against the place-name evidence, and they have certainly not been integrated into a coherent phonological system comparable to that provided by Jackson for Brittonic. Before we can really understand the nature of Pictish, its relationship with other Celtic languages, and its fate when it was superseded by Gaelic, Jackson’s seven pages of notes need to be systematically compared and contrasted with his 497 pages of close analysis of Brittonic.

A second concern is with the assumed geographical extent of this ‘Pictish’ language. Nicolaisen observes in passing ‘many of [his leet of Pictish elements] occurring in Cumbric territory south of the Forth-Clyde line’. In fact they all do, some only once or twice, others as frequently as they do to the north.\(^{21}\) This points to, but fails to address, a major problem arising from Jackson 1955. Jackson proposed a branch of Celtic which he called ‘Pritenic’, arguing that it belonged to the P-Celtic section but must have diverged from Brittonic at an early date, not long after the P/Q separation. He identified the language of the Pictish inscriptions with that ascribed to the Picts by Bede (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, Book I, Chapter i) seeing their Pictish as the sole recorded exemplar of Pritenic. He had previously, in *Language and History in Early Britain*, given the name ‘Cumbric’ to the form of West Brittonic spoken by the Britons of the north, i.e. south of the Forth and Glen Falloch (not, be it noted, ‘the Forth-Clyde line’ – Nicolaisen even follows Bede’s geography). Unfortunately, he never revisited the implications of these proposals, and an uncritically simplistic reading of them (again, influenced by Bede’s biblical equation of *gens*, language and territory) has left us with a linguistic geography in which P-Celtic north of the Forth is ‘Pictish’, P-Celtic south of the Forth is ‘Cumbric’, with the absurd implication that (for example) the P-Celtic of Lothian had more in common with that of Dyfed than it did with that of Fife!

The idea that there was a ‘Pictish’ language co-terminous with the extent of Pictish *imperium* or cultural influence is, like the Great Wood of Caledon, a myth.\(^{22}\) Like the Great Wood, it attracts a good deal of emotional investment, but it needs to be challenged. It is probably too much to hope that ‘Pictish’, with its baggage of misleading connotations, will ever be abandoned as a linguistic label, but we would do much better to think in terms of a northern P-Celtic continuum, in which the isoglosses between Pritenic and Brittonic lie not in a neat plait along

---

\(^{20}\) The chief exception being Koch’s short discussion in Koch 1983, 215–16.

\(^{21}\) See the Appendix to this review, p. 150.

\(^{22}\) On the Great Caledonian Wood, see Rackham 2006, 390–95: like the Great Wood, the concept of Pictish envisages a homogeneous entity covering the land from coast to coast and (in the case of Pictish) even out to the Isles. The reality was probably much more patchy.
the Forth, but in a luxuriant and shifting tangle across southern Scotland and even northern England.

Invisible Britons: a view from north of the Humber

Richard Coates’s ‘Invisible Britons: the view from toponomastics’ is a companion piece to his ‘Invisible Britons: the view from linguistics’ (Coates 2007). In these, he launches a two-pronged attack on the received wisdom of the past quarter century among archaeologists and historians that the Anglo-Saxon conquest was achieved by a small warrior élite. In its more absurd manifestations, this has led archaeologists to speak of the Britons’ adoption of Old English as a life-style choice on a par with sporting a new fashion in costume jewellery. Coates is right to object to such nonsense, and it is encouraging to see in the Higham volume (2007) that well-known advocates of ‘élite dominance’ have come around to accepting that the adventus Saxonum must have involved quite considerable numbers of settlers and a good deal of disruption for the indigenous population at least in the areas of primary settlement. The issues raised by the two papers considered together extend beyond the scope of the present review, which will focus specifically on the toponymic case mainly presented in the contribution to Cavill and Broderick’s collection.23

This case rests chiefly on the simple but significant point that the number of place-names of P-Celtic origin that survive in England (or, one might add, Northumbrian Scotland) is small, and in the areas of primary settlement, very small indeed. He concludes from this that Britonic-speaking communities must have suffered, if not outright slaughter, either dispersal (‘ethnic cleansing’) or reduction to slavery. He reviews his own efforts and those of others24 to demonstrate a greater quantity of Celtic place-names than has generally been recognised by English place-name scholars, concluding ‘but that number is by no means large, especially in the south and east’.25 This is undoubtedly true: the question is, whether the hypothesis of dispersal or enslavement is the only or best explanatory model? There may be other considerations.

In the first place, during the mid-fifth to mid-sixth centuries, all four Horsemen of the Apocalypse enjoyed a free gallop throughout Britain:

23 In the paper under review, Coates rightly draws attention to the paucity of Britonic place-name elements adopted by OE speakers. This is a facet of the broader question of the small number of Celtic loan-words of any kind in Old or Middle English, which is the main theme of his case in his 2007 chapter. Suffice to say here that it is a strong point, but we need a more comprehensive theory of language-contact addressing the ways in which languages in varying status-relationships may affect one another, phonologically, morphologically, lexically and syntactically: simply counting loan-words may not tell us very much.

24 Notably in Coates and Breeze 2000.

internecine warfare among British warlords, outbreaks of plague, acts of God in the form of harvest failures and other natural disasters, and famine attendant on all these, probably decimated the population (the Anglo-Saxons did not, of course, enjoy immunity, but having control of much of the most fertile soil, the chances of survival were tipped in their favour). Wide tracts of marginal land, especially in the northern uplands, were probably deserted and may well have remained the haunt of wolves, deer and feral cattle for two or three centuries (which, incidentally, should make us cautious of assuming that Celtic, or any other, place-names in such regions are ‘early’).

Coates remains wedded to the notion that Celtic place-names throughout England must necessarily be pre-English or evidence of ‘Celtic survival’. I have argued recently\(^\text{26}\) that a significant number of such names in the north (such as those formed with \(\ast t\text{-}\) and those with the definite article between two nouns) are unlikely to be early, and that these, as well as English and Scandinavian names referring to Britons or \textit{Cumbre}, may be traces of Cumbric- (or Welsh-) speaking ‘economic migration’ (especially, though not only, into upland and other sparsely-populated regions) in the circumstances of the early 10th century.\(^\text{27}\) This could apply throughout what had been Northumbria and as far south as the Danelaw and the Welsh Borders. If so, the number of genuinely ‘early’ (pre-eighth century) Celtic names may be less than Coates supposes even in areas where Celtic names seem relatively numerous (including southern Scotland and Cumbria).\(^\text{28}\)

But between the areas of primary settlement and the lonely upland wastes, there must have been extensive regions in which the transition from Brittonic to English was a more gradual and complex process. It would have involved various factors, from opportunistic immigrant settlement, via establishment of political \textit{imperium} and elite dominance, through to land-grants and sponsored colonisation, and it would have entailed prolonged periods when both languages were in use, and some speakers were bilingual, in varying and shifting contexts of power-relationship. Coates refers to his interesting findings in north-west Wiltshire,\(^\text{29}\) but sees the concentration of Celtic names there as no more than evidence of ‘persistent survival of cohesive groups of Brittonic-speakers in a limited number of areas’. This concept of ‘Celtic survival’ needs critical

\(^{26}\) James 2008, taking further the proposal in Jackson 1963.

\(^{27}\) A specific example is Carburton, Nottinghamshire, to which Coates refers, re-stating his view of this name presented in Coates and Breeze 2000, 150–52. In James 2008, 192–93, I argue that, if this is \textit{Cair-Brïthon}, it is more likely to have been a ‘stockade-farm’ of Cumbric immigrants in the Danelaw than the redoubt of a sixth-century British chieftain.

\(^{28}\) By Cumbria I mean the historic region comprising (roughly) Dumfriesshire, Cumberland and the Barony of Westmorland, not the modern English county.

\(^{29}\) As presented in Coates and Breeze 2000, 112–15.
examination: it implies that the only context in which Celtic place-names could have been preserved was in isolated, presumably marginal, enclaves. Even if Brittonic was eventually confined to such enclaves, there must have been a period, probably several generations, when the relationship between the two languages was more evenly balanced.

Coates refers in passing to the much-debated term \(w[e]alh\). Yes, it did come to mean ‘a slave’, at least among some Old English speakers, but this overlooks the fact that the Laws of Ine, while they systematically disadvantage those perceived as \(wealh\), certainly do not imply that they were all slaves.\(^{30}\) Moreover, the places whose names incorporate this element are by no means marginal backwaters: several of the Waltons, in particular, are on good land and became mediaeval parishes.\(^{31}\) \(W[e]alhas\) (whether or not they continued to speak Brittonic) were present at all levels of Anglo-Saxon society, and there was no bar to inter-marriage. The integration of those who, for one reason or another, continued to be viewed as \(W[e]alhas\) into Anglo-Saxon society was a complex and, doubtless, long-term process.

In Northumbria, Coates’s model of Anglian oppression might be relevant to the heartland of early Germanic settlement in Deira (though even here, Dominic Powlesland’s excavations at West Heslerton point to a much more complex pattern of interaction),\(^{32}\) but it can hardly help us understand the relationship between Northumbrian Old English and neo-Brittonic speakers in most of the kingdom. Such widely-separated districts as East Lothian, Galloway and south Lancashire each present patterns of distribution of (‘early’) Celtic and English names implying long-term and developing bilingual relationships – probably surviving in Lancashire well into the eighth century, and in East Lothian and Galloway throughout the Northumbrian period and beyond.\(^{33}\)

So why, then, do ‘early’ Celtic place-names constitute so small a proportion of the total, even in areas like these? I have referred already in this review to radical changes in patterns of settlement, landholding and taxation which affected the whole of the British Isles (apart, perhaps, from the Scottish Highlands) between the late eighth and early 12th centuries, the implications of which for toponymy still remain to be fully understood. In very much simplified terms, the Anglo-Saxons took over, and incorporated into their emergent kingdoms, territorial units that had probably originated as iron-age chiefdoms, with a redistributive economy based on renders in kind and services to the local lord. During the seventh to ninth centuries, the internal


\(^{31}\) Parishes in Cheshire, Derbyshire, Essex, Lancashire (x3), Leicestershire, Suffolk, Surrey.


\(^{33}\) For Galloway, see Brooke 1991.
organisation of these units (especially those now in royal or ecclesiastical hands) became increasingly complex, with different settlements within them playing increasingly specialised roles, and these eventually began to break down to be replaced by more compact units, taxed directly rather than through the estate centre, and participating to an increasing extent in a market economy (in lowland England, a monetary economy). These changes affected not only Anglo-Saxon England (and Northumbrian Scotland) but, somewhat later and in varied ways, Cornwall, Wales, Man and Pictland. In their course, many older settlements were abandoned and more new ones came into being (in what archaeologists know as the 'mid-Saxon shuffle'), and indeed the whole perception of the landscape, the ways the land was used, the central places and routes of communication, underwent radical changes, reflected in the loss of countless earlier place-names and the coining of a great many new ones.

Throughout England, Cornwall, Wales and southern and eastern Scotland, the names that were lost were very largely P-Celtic. What took their places were names formed in the dominant language: in most of England, this was English (with the key terms for the new settlements being *tun* and *leah*), along with Norse in the Scandinavian-dominated regions (typified by Danish *bý*). Thus the toponymic geography recorded in Domesday Book is very largely a product of the previous three centuries, with relatively few names (of any kind) surviving from before the mid-eighth century.

In northern Northumbria, the change was rather later, and involved (in the early 10th century) new settlements in, and exploitation of, the upland regions. Older, northern P-Celtic, names were lost, and new names given in four different languages: late Northumbrian Old English remained dominant in Northumberland and the lower Tweed basin, and a major presence in Lothian and Cumbria;\textsuperscript{35} Anglo-Scandinavian had a significant presence in Cumbria and along the Solway coast; Gaelic (Middle Irish / early Scottish, with the typical habitative *baile*) became dominant in Strathclyde, Ayrshire and Galloway, and present further east and in Cumbria; and Cumbric (with its typical habitative *trev* along with *cair* in the sense of ‘stockade village’) enjoyed a late flowering, especially in the hill country.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} See Faith 1997, especially chapters 1 and 6; Fowler 2002, chapter 4; and Roberts 2008, especially chapters 2, 6 and 10: this last work, although focused on the northern counties of England, is of great importance for those studying the landscape history of southern Scotland.

\textsuperscript{35} See note 28 above.

\textsuperscript{36} From Lauderdale and the Moorfoots south across the upper Tweed basin and the central Border hills to the north Pennines and north-west Cumberland, and also from Tweedsmuir westwards to Galloway and thence north into the Ayrshire hills. See Jackson 1963 and James 2008.
geography reflected in the monastic and cathedral records of the 12th century is largely a creation of the previous three centuries (the Cumbric names giving a deceptive impression of ‘Celtic survival’).

If this is the case, it is doubtful whether a simple enumeration of the surviving genuinely early Celtic names tells us much about Anglo-Celtic relations in the fifth to seventh centuries in southern England or in Northumbria. Those that do survive are, however, not mere random survivals, and they are of considerable interest. But they need to be studied case by case and region by region, and interpreted in the light of comparative studies and sophisticated socio-linguistic models, if they are to provide clues to what was a complex and changing pattern of linguistic interaction. Coates is perfectly right to challenge the minimalist orthodoxy of the late 20th century, but the alternative need not be a return to Victorian visions of barbarian enslavement.

The Unknown Ones and the first Gaels

The most ambitious paper is that of Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel on ‘Pre-Celtic, Old Celtic layers, Brittonic and Goidelic in ancient Ireland’, a further instalment in the admirable work emerging from the multi-national Ptolemy Project. In it, she endeavours to locate the ethnic and place-names in Ireland recorded by Ptolemy in a chronological framework covering developments from ‘earlier non-Celtic languages’ (which may or may not be Indo-European) through to the separation between P- and Q-Celtic, and beyond to the emergence of Brittonic and the Gaelic languages. It is helpful to have reproduced in this article (albeit in the original Spanish) her systematisation of the isoglosses marking distinct stages in the evolution of Celtic. A parallel exercise applying this chronology to Ptolemy’s names in Scotland would doubtless raise some interesting questions. Students should be warned, though, that de Bernardo Stempel is inclined to write with assertive confidence about matters which are still very controversial among early Celtic philologists.

The author’s survey leads her to a series of conclusions of which two are especially striking. The first is that Ptolemy’s leet includes a residue of ‘earlier non-Celtic’ ethnic and place-names concentrated north-west of the Shannon. The discussion of the possibility, indeed likelihood, of some such relics of ancient linguistic history surviving in Ireland is excellent, dealing sensibly with some of the more extreme claims for survival of non-Indo-

---

37 Isaac 2005 lists and discusses these, drawing attention in particular to (apparently) non-Indo-European river names, but does not attempt a chronology of the (certainly or probably) Celtic names.
European dialects and tribes even into historical times, but demonstrating that the possibility of such traces cannot be ruled out a priori. The case for the specific geographical concentration is a little less convincing. It depends on the presence of four ‘Old European’ river names among those flowing westwards into the Atlantic – the geographical identifications of these are not beyond question, but the likelihood of ancient hydronyms surviving in the west is undoubtedly strong – along with two ethnic names and two ‘town’ names which she locates (again, not uncontroversially) in northern Connacht. Of these, the ‘town’ name Raiba could, as she admits, equally well be Celtic, and one wonders whether Nagnat(a)i ‘the Unknown Ones’ (with their headquarters at Nagnata, which she locates on Clew Bay overlooked by Croagh Patrick) were really a tribe – or did Ptolemy’s source take too literally a shrug of unknowing, or even an early Irish joke? These ‘Unknown Ones’ of the west are, perhaps, a little more misty than they appear on the brightly-coloured map that helpfully illustrates the article. The suggestion that the underlying theme of the Ulster Cycle is conflict between these ‘early non-Celtic’ speakers of Connacht and the Goidelic-speakers of Ulster may encourage enthusiasts to search the text of the Táin Bo Cuailgne for any hints of such a linguistic divide, but it may not win instant acceptance.

A second finding of particular Scottish interest concerns the origins of Q-Celtic, which de Bernardo Stempel sees as a dialectal variant within early Celtic that was emerging in Ulster at the time when Ptolemy’s information was recorded. Her case rests on Ptolemy’s forms of three names located in the north: the ethnic name Robogdioi, along with the headland Robogdion ákron (which she identifies as Fair Head), Isamnion (which she identifies as Cooley Point between Carlingford Lough and Dundalk Bay), and Vinderis, which she identifies as the Cully Water. The case is complex and detailed, and will probably not prove

38 See Toner 2000, 73–82, for a much more cautious approach; compare de Bernardo Stempel’s own contribution to the same volume, at 103–04 (and map, p. 112), also those rivers indicated in Koch 2007 on maps 14.1 and 14.2.
39 Toner 2000 is silent about the Nagnatai, and lists Raiba as unidentified; neither appears in de Bernardo Stempel 2000 at pp. 100–02, though Nagnata is on the map; however, Koch 2007, map 14.1 does show these tribal and ‘town’ names in much the same locations, marking Raiba as ‘uncertain’.
40 Perhaps Ballagan Point, the actual head of the Cooley Peninsula, would have been more prominent, though neither stands very high. Toner 2000 and Koch 2007 agree with her identification; Koch also agrees with her locations of Robogdioi and Robogdion ákron.
41 Though she also lists as Q-Celtic in form Labéros ‘a town in the centre [of Ireland] ostensibly on the banks of a river ‘Labéros’ (which she identifies as the R. Barrow flowing into Waterford Harbour: Koch 2007, map 14.2, agrees, but marks it ‘uncertain’). It should be noted that she regards the -ē- in this name as entailing epenthesis, seeing the early Celtic root as *labr- in Ptolemy’s Labrona (which she identifies as the R. Lee flowing into Cork Harbour), thus amending Nicolaisen’s treatment of Scottish stream-names of the ‘Lavern’ type (Nicolaisen 2001, 228).
decisive in settling the matter, but to regard the P/Q divergence as a matter of
dialectal differentiation rather than importation or chronological stratification
seems philologically sound (cf. the observations on Pritenic and Brittonic
above). A corollary of this position must be that there was, in the time of
Ptolemy’s sources, at least an emergent form of P-Celtic akin to Brittonic in
much of southern and eastern Ireland, but ‘[i]t was obviously thanks to the
political and social prestige of Ulster that its specific dialectal variety gradually
asserted itself over the whole Irish territory’.

Presumably the author would see a similar explanation accounting for the
spread of Goidelic into Scotland: interestingly, she includes Maleos, the Isle of
Mull, with this ‘Ulster’ group. On the other hand, she lists Epidion ákron], the
Mull of Kintyre, with a number of apparently P-Celtic names from Ptolemy’s list
in southern and eastern Ireland that she considers to ‘have been actually imported
from Britain or Gaul at a comparatively later date’. This is an awkward and
unconvincing step in her argument, especially as her footnote quotes Nicolaisen
(2001, 206) telling us that ‘the tribal names Novantae and Epidii, the latter with
Epidion ákron ... and the place-name Carbantorigon in Galloway ... make it clear
that p-Celtic was indeed the language spoken in Roman, and pre-Roman, times
in that part of Scotland in which Cumbric later developed’. Why the names
in her list must have been imported into southern Ireland but not into western
Scotland is not made clear, and in any case Ptolemy’s ultimate sources may well
have been Brittonic speakers who could have ‘corrected’ dialectal variants. The
Mull of Kintyre is only a short if sometimes risky crossing from Fair Head: the
possibility that Q-Celtic was emerging in, or had already arrived in, Argyll and
the Isles by the time of Ptolemy’s sources remains open.

Recommendation

So there is much in this volume of interest to a wide range of Scottish place-
name scholars. It is an admirable publication, painstakingly edited and typeset
– would that great university presses maintained such standards these days! The
hardcover cloth binding is sturdy if not beautiful, the price very reasonable. One’s
only complaint is that, in works of place-name scholarship, indexes (of subject-
matter and of place-names) should not be regarded as dispensable luxuries.

42 Her throwaway line, p. 155, ‘[p]ossibly a phonetically modified form of the island-name
[sic] Epidion are the Ebudai, sing. Ebuda, along the northern coast [of Ireland] (= the Inner
Hebrides excluding Skye ...)’ could set a hare running!
name Libnios, which she identifies with the Galway Leven/Leamhain, is of relevance to river
names of the ‘Leven’ type in Scotland and northern England.
44 The only notable slip is ‘Uist’ for ‘Unst’ on p. 115.
Notes on Pictish elements in Nicolaisen ‘Pictish to Gaelic’

aber
Northern P-Celtic, replaced by Gaelic inbhear.

Nicolaisen does not mention the form abbor, presumably from Indo-European o-grade. It is supported by the early Gaelic i[o]nbhar, and is probably from an early Celtic verbal noun. Jackson (1953, 413 and 545–48) explains the -bb- as *-db- surviving long enough for the -b- to escape lenition before becoming -bb-, and later -b-.

Occurs in Southern Scotland at:
Abercarf (= Wiston) LAN
Abercorn WLO
Aberlady ELO
Aberlosk DMF (Eskdalemuir)
Aberlessic lost, presumably in ELO
Abermilk (= St Mungo’s, Castlemilk) DMF

and possibly
Carriber WLO.

carden
Pritenic, adopted into Gaelic as a place-naming element.

The etymology is obscure, but the northern P-Celtic form seems to be distinct from Brittonic in the non-lenition in [-rd-], cf. Jackson 1955, 164.

Nicolaisen pursues his long-running feud with Andrew Breeze over the meaning of this element. Breeze was right to point out that the sense ‘thicket’ in the Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru arose as a result of a lexicographer’s misunderstanding, though he overstated the case against its involving some kind of vegetation. Nicolaisen insists that ‘fortress or enclosure’ is equally unreliable, and inappropriate to the place-names in question, especially those formed with Kin-, which (he argues) favour a natural feature. But this distinction between ‘natural’ and ‘man-made’ features is unhelpful: surely a copse (one of the meanings he favours) is a ‘man-made’ feature? An impartial reading of the citations in the

---

45 These notes are largely based on those in James (2007-), currently being digitised (as BLITON) to appear on the Scottish Place-Name Society’s website, <www.spns.org.uk>. These and other elements are extensively discussed in Taylor forthcoming. I am grateful to Dr Taylor for many helpful comments about these elements, though the views given here (and errors) are my own.

46 See Koch 1983, 214.

Geiriadur suggests that a cardden is somewhere difficult to get into or through. A meaning like ‘an enclosure surrounded by a thick hedge’ would seem reasonable. In any case, it was apparently adopted by Gaelic speakers as a place-naming element, and its meaning may have been modified in their usage.

Examples south of the Forth:
Cardoness KCB (Karden 1240 – doubtful).
Cardross DNB: Nicolaisen (2001, 204) says ‘nevertheless still north of the Clyde’, ignoring the not unimportant point that it is almost in the shadow of Dumbarton. A significant place, early mediaeval sculpture suggesting a possible monastic site.

dol
Northern P-Celtic. Nicolaisen says ‘this is easily confused with Gaelic dail’, but the latter is a loan from P-Celtic. In West Brittonic and Pritenic the word had acquired the meaning ‘a water-meadow, a haugh’. There may have been semantic influence later from Anglo-Scandinavian *dál ‘dale’, extending to the Gaelic-adopted dail (which could, of course, have been adopted from Brittonic / Cumbric as well from Pritenic).

Dail in Southern Scotland and the Solway region is usually combined with a Gaelic specifier, but in a few cases a Gaelicised form of a P-Celtic name may be suspected, e.g. Dalgleish SLK (+ lost stream-name *gleiss?). Dalleagles AYR might be the Gaelic equivalent of OE *eclēs-halh (Eccleshall STF, Ecclesall YOW), ‘a detached or reserved piece of land from an early Church estate’.

lanerc
Northern P-Celtic (in this form probably Pritenic), adopted into Gaelic as *lanraig etc., a common noun and place-naming element.
Nicolaisen refers to Cox’s examination of the Gaelic forms of this word as adopted from Pictish (Cox 1997), accepting that names showing metathesis in the second syllable reflect a Gaelic *lannraig. Neither Cox nor Nicolaisen pays attention to the group of lanrec (sic) names in the cartulary of Lanercost Priory. Beside Lanercost itself, and the derived English formation Lanerton, these include:

---

48 Note that Watson (in Watson 1926) frequently uses ‘dale’ to translate G dail, though he points out (p. 415) that the distributions of dalr and dail are more or less mutually exclusive (so adoption from ON is ruled out). *Dāl, dail and Anglo-Scandinavian *dāl do co-exist in the Solway region, but the Celtic elements are generally in first position as name-phrase generics, the Scandinavian in final position. Southumbrian OE dæl, though cognate with A-Sc *dāl, is unlikely to be involved.

49 See James 2009.

50 Lanercost Cart.; see also Armstrong et al. 1950, 72, and idem. 1952, xix–xx.
Lanrecaithin
Lanrecorinsan
Lanrekereini\textsuperscript{51}
Lanrequeithil

The specifiers are problematic, but very unlikely to be Gaelic, even if these names reflect twelfth-century colonisation from further north.\textsuperscript{52} Metathesis could have arisen without such influence. Moreover, the consistent single -n- and non-spirant -rc in these forms suggest that the word, though obviously related to Welsh llannerch, may have been a separate formation in northern P-Celtic.\textsuperscript{53}

Nicolaïsen gives it the modern Welsh sense, ‘clearing in a woodland, glade’, which may over-emphasise the woodland connotations. The suffix may be diminutive,\textsuperscript{54} and (assuming a secular sense for *lann), the meaning would be ‘a small (cleared, and possibly enclosed) area of (former) scrub, waste or fallow land’.

\textit{monid}
Northern P-Celtic *mönïð, adopted into Gaelic as monid > monadh, a common noun and place-naming element. Nicolaïsen misleadingly implies that these are cognates.

It is rarely possible to be sure whether a place-name in lowland Scotland has *mönïð, monadh, or mount – ‘mon’, ‘mont’ or ‘mount’ may disguise one of the Celtic forms.\textsuperscript{55} However, there are at least twenty place-names south of the Forth where one of these is combined with a (probable or possible) P-Celtic specifier, as well as simplex forms and forms of the ‘Kinmont’ type that may well have Brittonic antecedents.

\textit{pant}
Northern P-Celtic: South of the Forth, there are:

Pant, Stair AYR
Crossgill Pants, Alston CMB

\textsuperscript{51} Not a variant of Lanrecaithin, according to Todd 1997 ref. 49, contra Armstrong et al. 1952, xix–xx.
\textsuperscript{52} As suggested in James 2008, 200. For ingenious attempts to interpret the specifiers, see Todd 2005 and Breeze 2006.
\textsuperscript{53} Lanrecaithin occurs once (Todd 1997 ref. 6) as Lanrechaithin, but elsewhere in the cartulary it appears three times with -c- and three with -k-. See Jackson 1953, 571–72, and 1955, 164.
\textsuperscript{54} Cf. eMnW glosses llan = area, llannerch = areola, cited in Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru; see also Williams 1952.
\textsuperscript{55} However, there are at least twenty place-names south of the Forth where one of these is combined with a (probable or possible) P-Celtic specifier, as well as simplex forms and forms of the ‘Kinmont’ type that may well have Brittonic antecedents.

 Latin \textit{mont} was adopted into OE as early as the late 9th century (in the Alfredian \textit{Orosius} and \textit{Cura Pastoralis}), as \textit{munt}; it was later reinforced by OFr \textit{mont} > ‘mount’. Such forms might also possibly be from *mönju ‘bush, scrub, thicker’, see Breeze 2004.
Pentlant c.1150; Pentland(e) 1236; Penteland 1268; from Dixon 1947, 227.

However, pant is masculine, so the lenition in Panbart implies a close compound, ‘valley-thicket’, while its absence in the others suggests a name-phrase ‘thicket-valley’.

Few early forms are available, and those that are favour -p-, so maybe they are from a phrasal formation, ‘enclosure of (the) thicker’. In any case, the Norman-French personal name Lambert (< Continental WGmc *Land-bær) has doubtless influenced them, and may, in some cases, be the origin.

Pant and Pantend WML
R Pont (with Ponteland) NTB
Pont Burn DRH
and possibly:
Panlaurig BWK
Patefyn CMB
Old Pentland MLO and the Pentland Hills (if *pant-lann rather than *pen(n)-lann)\textsuperscript{56}

**pert**

Northern P-Celtic. Note that this can be singular or collective, and can refer to natural or human-managed ‘bush’.

Jackson (1953, 571–72) had considered that cases in Cmb (Parton, Solport) implied that [-rt] > [-rθ] occurred later or not at all in Cumbric, but in his chapter ‘The Pictish Language’ he regarded this non-lenition of [-rt] as a Pritenic feature (1955, 164). The toponymic evidence suggests it was also a feature of northernmost Brittonic, albeit with some variation (e.g. in early forms for Partick LAN and Larbert STL).

Other examples south of the Forth include Perter Burn DMF and Parton CMB, with possibly the ‘Pappert’ group (*pant-ber\textsuperscript{57} Panbart Hill ELO, Pappert Hill DNB, Pappert Hill LNK, Pappert Law SLK Pappert Hill DNB, Pappert Hill LNK, Pappert Law SLK), and doubtfully the ‘Lambert’ group (*lann-ber\textsuperscript{58} Lampart, Haltwistle NTB, Lampert Hills with Lambertgarth Farlam CMB, Lambert Ladd, a boundary stone in Askham WML, Pouterlampert, Castleton ROX).

**pett**

Pritenic, adopted into Gaelic as a common noun and place-naming element.

It should be noted that non-spirant [-tt] is distinct from the Brittonic [-θ] in Welsh peth, (Jackson 1955, 164) an example of Pritenic phonology?

The examples south of the Forth are all name-phrases formed with specifiers that are probably Gaelic: *Pitaskin (now Bantaskin) STL, Pitcon AYR, Pitcox ELO, Pittendreich MLO.

\textsuperscript{56} Pentlant c.1150; Pentland(e) 1236; Penteland 1268; from Dixon 1947, 227.

\textsuperscript{57} However, pant is masculine, so the lenition in Panbart implies a close compound, ‘valley-thicker’, while its absence in the others suggests a name-phrase ‘thicket-valley’.

\textsuperscript{58} Few early forms are available, and those that are favour -p-, so maybe they are from a phrasal formation, ‘enclosure of (the) thicker’. In any case, the Norman-French personal name Lambert (< Continental WGmc *Land-bær) has doubtless influenced them, and may, in some cases, be the origin.
pevr
Northern P-Celtic, probably in early use as a hydronym, naming the three Peffer Burns in Lothian, and cf. Peover CHE.

pòr
Adopted from northern P-Celtic into Gaelic as pòr > pùir, a common noun and place-naming element.

In Brittonic, ‘pasture, grazing land’, but Jackson (1972, 44, 68–69) thinks the Pritenic word must have meant ‘cropland’: an interesting case of a semantic difference between Brittonic and Pritenic.\(^59\)

Watson (1926, 372) regarded the four ‘Pardovan’ type names in southern Scotland as *pôr-duμn, but the first element might be *parth in the sense of ‘a portion of land’; either way the signification of the specifier would remain unclear.

*Pirihou, Perihou in the Lanercost Cartulary might be a plural *pôrjou:\(^60\) the Modern Welsh plural is pawrion, but plurals varied in Old-Middle Welsh.\(^61\)

pres
Adopted from northern P-Celtic into Gaelic as a common noun and place-naming element. It is relatively common south of the Forth, apparently being treated by Northumbrian OE speakers as a district-name:

Dumfries? D[r]unfres 1189 onwards favours Gaelic dronn- added to an Anglicised *Pres (with shortened vowel) from a Brittonic simplex *Prēs, the meaning of which would have been opaque to Northumbrian English speakers, though Gaelic speakers might have recognised it as cognate with early Gaelic pres.

Preese, with Preese Hall LNC
Preesall LNC
Presdall, Milburn WML
Press Castle, Coldingham BWK
Pressmennan, Stenton ELO
Priorsdale, Alston CMB

There are of course other P-Celtic elements that occur both north and south of the Forth that were adopted into Gaelic, at least as place-name elements (e.g. bad, gronn); of especial interest are the Gaelic usages of cair > car-\(^62\) and ecles > eglês > eglais.\(^63\)

---

\(^{59}\) For more discussion of this element north of the Forth, see Taylor 2008, 292–93.

\(^{60}\) A Walker, per. comm.

\(^{61}\) Evans 1964, §32, pp. 31–33.

\(^{62}\) For these and other such elements, see Taylor, forthcoming.

\(^{63}\) See James 2009.
ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRH</td>
<td>County Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNC</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STF</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WML</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOW</td>
<td>Yorkshire (West Riding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The BAR series of archaeological monographs, which was started in 1974, provides a vehicle for publication of scholarly work in progress, keeping readers abreast of research which might otherwise wait until the end of the archaeological or other related work for publication.

In light of this, it is worth drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that Kristján Ahronson’s work for this book was done under the auspices of the impressive multi-disciplinary *Papar Project*, led by Dr Barbara Crawford of the School of History, University of St Andrews. The *Papar Project* was made possible by two grants in 2001 and 2003 from the *Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland* to Dr Crawford, Professor Ian Simpson of the School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling and, in Phase 1 of the *Project*, Beverley Ballin Smith of Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division. Kristján Ahronson’s preparatory research for *Viking Age Communities: Pap-names and Papar in the Hebridean Islands* was funded by one of these Carnegie grants, but there is scant recognition of this over-arching *Papar Project* in Ahronson’s somewhat amateurish Acknowledgements on p. ii or, indeed, elsewhere in his book. He has chosen to publish the toponymic work that he undertook for the *Papar Project* in isolation and without clear reference to related material from other disciplines, now published on the *Project* website <www.paparproject.org.uk>, which is linked to the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS), and which was first launched in 2005, with the addition of the Hebridean material in 2008. I would encourage the reader to consult the *Papar Project* website which places in context the toponymic work conducted by various researchers, including Ahronson.

Having said that, Dr Ahronson, although perhaps not giving full recognition to the importance of working in partnership with scholars from his own and other disciplines, does introduce his text by making reference to Icelandic archaeological remains such as ‘sculpted stones and carvings in caves’ which whet our appetite for further research into ‘an unexplored facet of early Christianity’ and he focuses on place-names as his own vehicle for exploration in his ‘case study of Hebridean Pap-islands’ (p. 3). It would have been useful, at this early point in his book, to have these Hebridean islands identified by name and located on an adjacent map or, at the very least, to have a footnote indicating where, in his book, one could find such information. It would also have been useful to find some analytical comment on the fact that

*The Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 3, 2009, 159–62
the Pap-names appear to be absent from the southern Hebridean islands, at least given the present extent of our knowledge about the occurrence of these names. The relevant map does appear on p. 6 and the caption indicates that it is adapted from a ‘map circulated at 15 March 2003 Scottish Papar Project meeting in St Andrews’. One has the impression, from the References at the end of his book (pp. 74–76), that most of Ahronson’s reading and research relates to the period before that seminal meeting in 2003. For instance, as well as mentioning archaeology in his Introduction, Ahronson quite rightly draws attention to the study of medieval texts such as Adomnán, Dicuil and Ari fróði, all of which have been studied by earlier scholars and which can usefully be revisited. An exception to this concentration on material prior to 2003 is frequent reference to the important papers by the Danish place-name scholar, Peder Gammeltoft, which date to 2004. At risk of appearing petty-minded, I also wish to point out that more careful checking of the References by Ahronson, prior to publication of his book in 2007, would have led him to note that Arne Kruse’s paper which he describes as being ‘in press’ was, in fact, published in 2005, and that the editors were ‘P. Gammeltoft, C. Hough and D. Waugh’, not ‘J. Waugh’ as he states. This example of authorial carelessness, however minor, is not isolated and was a cause of some irritation throughout the book, wherever it occurred.

On the positive side, however, there is much to interest the place-name researcher in the place-name inventory recorded in Chapter Three, and further work could still usefully be done on its contents by a researcher with the opportunity to travel to the Western Isles. Ahronson culled his inventory from a variety of written sources, as well as from early maps of the region, and the resultant collection of names is potentially useful, both in the context of considering Pap-names, and in the broader context of collecting a database of Scottish place-names. Information from oral sources is included, but at one remove from the informant(s), in that it has been collected by someone other than Ahronson who uses the written, or occasionally taped, recording of the information. The hypotheses which he considered when interpreting the data are worth noting here because they incorporate much recent scholarly thinking about Pap-names. He outlines the various possibilities thus:

‘Working from the premise that a toponymic inventory refines ideas drawn from large-scale distribution studies, multiple hypotheses were considered when interpreting the data:

– The distribution of Pap-names reflects the settlement of early Christian Gaels before the Viking Age.
– The distribution of Pap-names reflects retrospective names given by
Old Norse speakers in either the late ninth and tenth century or the twelfth century.

- The distribution of Pap-names reflects the character of the earliest Norse settlement.’ (p. 21)

From consideration of the last point, in particular, one assumes that Ahronson arrives at the opening words of the title of his book (Viking-Age Communities) which intrigued me prior to reading his text, although the evidence presented therein for the existence of such communities is slight. One further comment is that he should have explained, for the reader fresh to the subject, why he omits the 11th century from his consideration.

Two personal names predominate as collectors in the inventory: Donald MacKillop (Harris) and Anke-Beate Stahl (Barra). In fact, it surprised me that Anke-Beate Stahl, in particular, did not receive mention in the Acknowledgements at the start of the book, because her PhD thesis entitled ‘Place-Names of Barra in the Outer Hebrides’ was completed in 1999 and she has an in-depth knowledge of the area. Like Ahronson, she produced an inventory of material for the Papar Project. It is worth pointing out that Kristján Ahronson’s discussion is based solely on the four sites which he surveyed and does not include the four sites surveyed by Stahl. His conclusions need to be viewed in the light of his partial coverage of the Hebridean material. Readers can now access all the material from the surveys undertaken by Ahronson and Stahl on the Papar Project website.

This review would be incomplete without recognising, along with Ahronson, the important contribution to Pap-name research, by the two scholars Aidan MacDonald and Peder Gammeltoft. Both are given full credit in the course of Ahronson’s discussion and relevant papers expressing their conclusions are included in References at the end. Ahronson’s own conclusion from the four sites which he surveyed and, no doubt, from his wider reading and thinking about the subject, is that ‘Pap-names are Old Norse (not Old Irish) names, and that Hebridean Pab(b)ay islands underscore the ill-defined – but real – relationship between the area’s Norse speakers and early Christian communities’ (p. 73). His sample of place-names may be smaller than one would wish but this seems a reasonable conclusion and certainly one to be borne in mind by future researchers. Ahronson talks here of ‘future work’ and, earlier in the book, of ‘place-name study on a wider front’ but does not make it clear who is to carry out this work. Many questions about the Pap-names do remain and we are grateful to Kristján Ahronson for planting thoughts in the minds of his readers, whether or not we agree with his conclusions.

Ahronson attempts to argue that the Hebrides is a ‘core area’ for Pap-names
Robert McColl Millar

and, therefore, presumably illustrative of all such areas, but his argument is not wholly convincing. Why should the Hebrides be any more of a ‘core area’ than, for example, the Northern Isles of Orkney and Shetland? Any comprehensive coverage of Pap-names should not be limited to the Hebrides but should include all the North Atlantic islands where these names occur, which is the approach adopted by the Papar Project, of which Ahronson’s survey material, presented in this book, forms a thought-provoking part.

Doreen Waugh, University of Edinburgh


Margaret Gelling’s scholarship has had a tremendous impact upon the field of place-name studies; as importantly, she has helped frame a connection with related fields – historical studies and historical linguistics in particular. This Festschrift is therefore in many ways long overdue.¹

The book is split into seven basic thematic units. In the first, Names and History, Steven Bassett discusses ‘Sitting above the salt: the origins of the borough of Droitwich’. This in-depth study of the ‘odd’ nature of the borough, which, in Domesday Book, had burgesses but no apparent centre, is connected to the ancient salt trade. Droitwich may either have been centred on three central brine ponds, in which case the borough would have been tiny, or it may have been much larger than most boroughs and might be more readily seen as a constituted industry rather than a place. In ‘An early boundary of the dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester’, Nicholas Brooks provides a most illuminating analysis of the topography of a most unusual boundary between the two dioceses, found in a 10th-century Irish psalter. In ‘Place-names and pottery’, Christopher Dyer demonstrates how the critical use of a set of modern and medieval names with potter, crocker and crock can be used to aid our understanding of the medieval pottery business. Joy Jenkyns, in ‘The litigious afterlife of an Anglo-Saxon charter: Wyke Regis, Dorset’, presents a witty and erudite discussion of how ancient documents can (and were) used for political and personal ends. S.E. Kelly’s ‘An early minster at Eynsham, Oxfordshire’ is an interesting and closely-argued analysis of one of the most celebrated Anglo-Saxon monasteries. It provides the little

¹ [It was in fact almost too late. The volume was presented to Dr Gelling at a conference in Edinburgh in late March 2008, and she died in April 2009. She did, however, read all the contributions, and wrote letters of appreciation to all the contributors. Ed.]
known fact that an earlier monastery had been sited in roughly the same place. Veronica Smart’s ‘Herthig the moneyer and Hearding of Bristol’ is a short but convincing discussion of the identity of Bristol moneyers and their (high) social rank.

The next thematic section, *Names and Language*, begins with Paul Cullen’s ‘*Vagniacis* and Winfield: the survival of a British place-name in Kent’. A strong, albeit sometimes inconclusive, case is made for the survival of a name through the Anglo-Saxon takeover and, indeed, down to our own time. In ‘The name of the Magonæte’, John Freeman provides an in-depth and erudite discussion of the problems involved in tracing the etymology of the Anglo-Saxon tribal name, along with the local toponym *Maund*. Despite a fair treatment of all sides in the debate, no final answer on these matters can yet be given. Donald Scragg, discussing ‘Late Old English “king”’, provides the manuscript distribution of variants of *cyning*, ending with an analysis of potential evidence for sound change. It is unfortunate that there was no discussion of rounded versus unrounded vowels and what this means in the alternation of *<i>* and *<y>* from line to line in some texts.

The third section, *Norse in Britain*, begins with Gillian Fellows-Jensen’s ‘Grimston revisited’. This essay provides a useful return to the discussion, turning to the idea that some Grimston hybrids are secondary, based upon settlers replicating what was there before. On this point, it is a pity that the essay does not connect its views on the spread of secondary usage in Scotland with the commonly held view that Scots was profoundly influenced by Scandinavian settlers, brought north as part of the country’s ‘Normanisation’ in the 11th and 12th centuries. Peder Gammeltoft focuses on ‘Freystrop: a sacral Scandinavian place-name in Wales?’ Ranging much further than this title suggests, Gammeltoft demonstrates that *thorp*-place-names can be used with the names of heathen deities. John Insley discusses ‘Onomastic notes on Cnut’s Slavonic connections’. In a short but informative essay, he analyses the Slavonic names of Cnut’s circle, as well as demonstrating direct connections between the westernmost Slavs and the English. Judith Jesch considers ‘Scandinavian women’s names in English place-names’. Most interesting, perhaps, is her discussion of the Cumbrian place-name *Langley* as *Langlif* + *ærgi* ‘Langlif’s shieling’, perhaps suggesting a specifically female role in transhumance, also reconstructed for Norway.

The fourth section is *Celtic Regions*. George Broderick considers ‘Pre-Scandinavian place-names in the Isle of Man’. In a fascinating essay, he demonstrates the co-occurrence of forms such as *slieve* with Scottish Gaelic, place-names which some scholars – by no means all – consider to be very early indeed in Scotland. Secondly, there is a surprisingly limited amount of
evidence for the survival of British place-names on Man, despite its probably being the original language of the island. Finally, there is evidence for Old European place-names on Man. Ian A. Fraser discusses ‘Letters from the Highlands: a toponym of steep slopes’. In a very brief note, the distribution of Gaelic leitir, now generally meaning a steep, even slope, is treated. In the past, however, it had connections with the dampness and with the linear lochs of the Scottish highlands. Fraser suggests that the original meaning of the name is becoming opaque. In a thought-provoking essay, Alan G. James suggests ‘A Cumbric Diaspora?’ This lengthy and well-argued essay demonstrates that at least some of the British place-names in Cumbria date not from the seventh century, but rather from the 9th or 10th centuries. He suggests that British people, migrating from elsewhere (perhaps as Strathclyde was Gaelicised), took advantage of the ‘opening up’ of the region caused by the Scandinavian settlement. In ‘Place-names in the Northern Marches of Wales’, Richard Morgan presents a fascinating analysis of the Welsh (and ‘Cymricised’) place-names of the northern marches, coming to the conclusion that the Welsh names (and cultural and agricultural traits) evinced east of Offa’s Dyke represent not a survival from British or early Welsh times, but date rather from expansion in the 13th century and later. Kay Muhr discusses ‘Some aspects of Manx and (northern) Irish monument names’, demonstrating, with considerable exemplification, that, with the use of Irish analogues, the previous view that Manx had and has a very limited number of terms for prehistoric monuments is misleading. Indeed, the place-names of Ulster and Man in particular share many similarities in coinage and use.

In ‘On river-names in the Scottish landscape’, W.F.H. Nicolsaensen revisits his greatest achievement: the establishment of an ‘Old European’ layer in the naming of Scotland’s rivers. He takes on directly the criticism that some of his examples are ‘too short’ and that therefore the name could not have survived long enough, by demonstrating that some of the ‘short’ names were known to Ptolemy, many were associated with a loch and a considerable number had been taken on as descriptive of an area. A good example of this can be found in the way the River Nevis had given its name to Loch Nevis, Glen Nevis and Ben Nevis. In ‘Place-names and the landscape of north-east Wales’, Hywel Wyn Owen presents a most engaging discussion of the origins and histories of some of the place-names of the area in question. Particularly interesting – to this reviewer at least – are the occasions where, given the long-term bilingualism of the region, English words have been Cymricised. Most attractively, Rhyl is traced back to an English watch hyll, with the Welsh article yr becoming attached to the obviously known but misunderstood term.

The next section is Microtoponymy. Jean Cameron presents a brief note
on ‘The distribution of whin, gorse and furze in English place-names’. She suggests that some *whin* forms may be found not only in the English Midlands – where the majority form is *gorse* – but also in the *furze* south. In ‘Three new elements in the minor toponymy of western Lindsey, Lincolnshire’, Richard Coates provides a fascinating glimpse into the problems of looking at small-scale naming phenomena, such as those for field names, even when the historical record is very helpful. Alexander R. Rumble looks at ‘Knightrider Street, London’, apparently solving a long-standing debate on why such an apparent tautology should have been coined. He suggests that the *knightriders* were relatively insignificant servants (*knight* in that sense), who lived in the poor housing of the streets and were bound to ride for their masters.

In ‘Pilkembare and Pluck the Craw: verbal place-names in Scotland’, Simon Taylor discusses this particularly Scottish phenomenon of using phrases as place-names, focussing on Fife. He suggests that the ‘gentle mockery’ of the practice by writers such as Sir Walter Scott put paid to the tradition. Diana Whaley goes ‘Watching for magpies in English place-names’, providing a most enjoyable discussion of the names of the bird as they are, and may be, sprinkled across the landscape.

The sixth section is entitled *Literary Onomastics*. In ‘The site of the battle of Brunanburh: manuscripts and maps, grammar and geography’, Paul Cavill demonstrates, using linguistic and palaeographical evidence along with onomastic and topographical, that the two main contenders for the site of *Brunanburh* – Burnswark in Dumfriesshire and Bromswald in Cheshire – cannot be absolutely certainly associated with the place described in the poem. Thorlac Turville-Petre considers ‘The Green Chapel’, convincingly discussing the ways in which the Gawain-poet, in his description of the Green Chapel, uses topographic imagery in line with the Peak District, where the Poet came from, thus making real for his audience the supernatural world the characters inhabit.

The final themed section is *Place-Names and Landscapes*. John Baker discusses ‘Old English *fæsten*’. This word is often considered by analysis of literary sources to represent a fortified place. In a highly nuanced essay, Baker demonstrates that place-name use of the root is more figurative, often having the meaning ‘inaccessible place’. In ‘*Weg*: a waggoner’s warning’ Ann Cole shows that when Old English *weg* was used as part of a place-name, it practically always referred to a place whose access routes were particularly steep. Interestingly, this particular meaning is hardly found outside place-name compounds. In a very brief note, ‘Dimmingsdale’, Barrie Cox shows that while earlier commentators were correct in seeing that name as dealing with darkening and darkness, it is a fact that any valley which has the name has
a steep west side, so that it quickly falls into darkness at nightfall. In ‘Butter place-names and transhumance’, the late Harold Fox argues convincingly that many ‘dairying’ place-names in less fertile high ground – most notably those in smeoru, but also butere and wīc – are associated with the practice of transhumance at a time when the owners of livestock were unable to leave lactating animals under guard in the low lands in the summer, instead taking the whole herd. In ‘Early medieval woodland and the place-name term lēah’, Della Hooke takes an in-depth look at the lēah place-names, demonstrating the development of the name from ‘wood’ to ‘wood pasture’ and eventually ‘pasture’. In ‘Freesford (Staffordshire)’, Carole Hough unties a small but enduring knot in our understanding of apparently ‘obvious’ place-names. After discussing several earlier interpretations, demonstrating why they are unlikely to be satisfactory, she suggests that the free in the name might mean not ‘free from charge’, but rather ‘free from service’.

In ‘Fog on the Barrow-Downs?’, Peter Kitson presents an excellent critique of Gelling and Cole’s views on the uses of Old English ‘hill’ place-names, in particular beorg. He raises questions over the extent to which the definite homogenisation of English place-name formation practices over the Anglo-Saxon period was due to the experience of travellers across relatively considerable differences. Peter McClure treats ‘Names and landscapes in medieval Nottinghamshire, with particular attention to Lindrick and lime woods’. He demonstrates how the varied geology, soils and topography of Nottinghamshire affected both the English settlement patterns and the names given in certain of the old divisions of the county. The final essay, Doreen Waugh’s ‘A hōh! My kingdom for a hōh!’ is largely autobiographical. It demonstrates the effect and importance of Gelling’s contributions both to place-name studies and the way they are appreciated outside the field.

Overall, the contributions to this Festschrift are worthy of the work and person it celebrates. It is very rare indeed to read a book of this length which covers so many topics in so many fields so well. The level of respect and affection felt for Margaret Gelling can be seen in the fact that some of the contributors have chosen to submit essays of some theoretical or practical importance.

It seems petty, therefore, to point out any failings in the volume. There are two such, however, which make it rather less user-friendly than it might have been. Two basic referencing systems are at work in the book, making it more difficult to run comparisons between essays. More importantly, there is no index: a great pity when so much is covered in the volume. These do not in any way detract from the volume’s importance, however.

Robert McColl Millar, University of Aberdeen

The English Place-Name Survey has been in progress since the 1920s, publishing its findings in a series of annual volumes based on the historical counties. As well as providing an exemplary model for younger surveys, it makes available an important body of comparative evidence for the study of place-names in other parts of the British Isles and beyond. A drawback from the point of view of Scottish name scholars has been the lack of coverage for the north-eastern counties of Northumberland and Durham. The latest contribution, the first part of the survey of Durham, will therefore be particularly welcome on this side of the border. It was in preparation by Victor Watts, the Honorary Director of the Survey, at the time of his death in 2002, and has been completed by Paul Cavill to the same high standard that characterises other volumes in the series.

*The Place-Names of County Durham* Part One deals with the 22 parishes of Stockton Ward in the south-east of the county, comprising a total of 58 townships. It is interesting to see Watts’s final thoughts on the controversial name Eglescliffe, geographically isolated from the main groups of formations from P-Celtic *eglēs* ‘church’ but sometimes considered to be an outlier (pp. 54–56). Drawing attention to the sparsity of early spellings in <l>, he supports a derivation from an Old English personal name Ecgi as opposed to the alternative interpretation ‘church-community cliff’ preferred in another posthumous publication, his *Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names* (2004, p. 210). Other entries reflecting a change of opinion include those for Low Dinsdale, Sadberge and Uray Nook. *CDEPN* (p. 188) explains Dinsdale as ‘Dyttin’s nook of land’ or ‘nook of land belonging to Deighton’, but the more extensive discussion presented here rules out an association with the township of Deighton in favour of the personal name (pp. 47–48); and whereas *CDEPN* (p. 517) accepts the traditional interpretation of Sadberge as ‘flat-topped hill’, Watts now challenges this and suggests that the first element may be OE sāt ‘lurking place, snare, gin’ (pp. 120–22). The earliest spelling of Uray (Lurlehou c. 1220) ‘possibly represents *Lurlan hlāw “Lurla’s hill or tumulus” + hōh* according to *CDEPN* (p. 639); but OE hōh ‘hill-spur’ is now taken to be the original generic, with subsequent confusion with hlāw (p. 56). Conversely, there are instances where Watt’s earlier view is endorsed more strongly, as with the derivation of Stillington from a personal name OE *Styfel* or *Styfela*. Gillian Fellows-Jensen’s suggestion of an -ing formation based on OE *still* ‘place for catching fish’, described as ‘unlikely’ in *CDEPN* (p. 575), has now become ‘impossible’ (p. 168).
As is increasingly the case in later EPNS volumes, much of the space is taken up by minor names and field-names, which provide the majority of new discoveries. Among them is an addition to the known corpus of names from OE *morgengifu* ‘marriage-gift’ (p. 42 Morrington), of particular interest as it extends the geographical range of the custom further north than other onomastic or documentary sources. Also worth noting are two occurrences of the name type Caldecote (pp. 122, 153), bringing the total so far identified in mainland Britain to nearly eighty. Although the compound is semantically transparent (‘cold cottage(s)’), its toponymic application is far from clear, so these have the potential to advance interpretation.

On the linguistic front, the field-name sections bring to light previously unrecorded terms such as *pider* ‘fen, marshland’ (p. 38 Pether or Pecherwelker 1357 × 8) and *thristeli* ‘thistly’ (p. 17 le Thristelyknoll’ c. 1375), as well as others not noted before in place-names. Some are more convincing than others. Alternative etymologies are to be preferred for both putative occurrences of *fussock* ‘a fat unwieldy person’ (p. 22 Fussack; p. 162 Fussic Beck); and an adjective *swemi* postulated as ‘perhaps a derogatory use of ME *swem* “grief, affliction, sickness”’ (p. 13 Swemyhall 1430, le Swemehall’ 1463) seems highly speculative. We are on firmer ground with antedatings of the Oxford English Dictionary entries for *cock* ‘heap’ (p. 93 Riecokes 1198 × 1204), *crooked* ‘bent’ (p. 93 Crokedeflattes 1198 × 1204), *paddock* ‘frog’ (p. 93 Paddoccnol 1198 × 1204), *scrog* ‘brushwood’ (p. 93 Scrogmerdene 1198 × 1204) and *quick* ‘ground readily yielding to pressure’ (p. 18 Quickefen c. 1230). The *OED* itself is currently in process of revision, and Watts’s comment that the first element of Quickefen is ‘first recorded in this sense in OED a.1340’ has been overtaken by the addition of a citation from a.1300 in the draft revision of September 2008. Nevertheless, the field-name remains the earliest occurrence.

Also striking is the number of field-names from *new-laid* ‘land newly put under grass’, a definition I do not find in *OED*; while Billingham parish contains the only instance known to me of *tooth* used in a topographical sense ‘alluding to a piece of land shaped like a prong’ (p. 17 Totheflat’ c. 1375). This is quite different from the anthropomorphisation reflected in names such as Carlin Tooth in Roxburghshire, but many other names provide direct parallels with Scottish toponymy through the use of distinctively northern vocabulary and morphology. Examples include the present participle suffix *-and* in forms such as hangandefurlanges 1268 (p. 75), and the term *tod* ‘fox’ in todholoflat 1316 (p. 37) and possibly Little Tod Field (p. 209). Another is *cuddy* ‘donkey’ in Cuddyfield (p. 188) and Caddy Close (p. 118), where the 1788 spelling Cuddy Close predates all but one citation in the *OED*.

Not all entries have a secure derivation. As elsewhere, it can be difficult to
distinguish between personal names and appellatives as qualifying elements, so that Girsby is interpreted as either ‘Gris’s farm or village’ or ‘pig farm’ (p. 199) and Whitton as either ‘Hwita’s estate’ or ‘at the white farm’ (pp. 93–94). Other names remain unexplained, as with the intriguing Fatherless Field in Norton (p. 159) and Neasless (Niecelss 1838 × 9) in Sedgefield (p. 194). Comparison with place-names north of the border might sometimes be helpful. No etymology is offered for Toddler’s Fleet in Cowpen Bewley (p. 21), but an association with the northern use of *toddle* ‘to purl, flow (of a stream)’, as in Toddle Burn, Midlothian, would seem to fit with the local topography. I resist the temptation to link it with Nurseryfield Wood (p. 43)!

The other side of the coin is that some of the names in the present volume may throw light on Scottish place-names previously considered problematic. Seafield in West Lothian is described as ‘a puzzle’ by John Garth Wilkinson (*West Lothian Place Names*, 1992, p. 30), presumably because, as Angus Macdonald noted (*The Place-Names of West Lothian*, 1941, p. 80), ‘This farm is miles from the sea’. A doublet Sea Field in the Durham township of Sedgefield is also a considerable distance from the coast (p. 197), and the same qualifying element in the field-name *Seflat* c. 1150 in the inland township of Elwick is attributed to OE *sæ* ‘lake, mere’ (p. 68). It seems reasonable to suggest that a similar interpretation applies to Seafield: not ‘field by the sea’, but ‘field by a lake’.

The indexes are particularly full and helpful, with a glossary of elements as well as indexes of personal names, surnames and place-names. The author’s untimely death leaves it uncertain how the Durham survey will proceed, but it is very much to be hoped that volumes for the rest of the county will continue to be produced.

Carole Hough, *University of Glasgow*
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**Scottish county abbreviations (pre-1975)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish County</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Scottish County</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>ELO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>ANG</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>FIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>Inverness-shire</td>
<td>INV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>AYR</td>
<td>Kirkcudbrightshire</td>
<td>KCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banffshire</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>Kincardineshire</td>
<td>KCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bute</td>
<td>BTE</td>
<td>Kinross-shire</td>
<td>KNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
<td>BWK</td>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>LAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness</td>
<td>CAI</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>MLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>MOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfriesshire</td>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>Nairnshire</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>DNB</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>ORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>DNB</td>
<td>Peeblesshire</td>
<td>PEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>FIF</td>
<td>Perthshire</td>
<td>PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness-shire</td>
<td>INV</td>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>RNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkcudbrightshire</td>
<td>KCB</td>
<td>Ross and Cromarty</td>
<td>ROS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincardineshire</td>
<td>KCD</td>
<td>Roxburghshire</td>
<td>ROX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross-shire</td>
<td>KNR</td>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>SHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Selkirkshire</td>
<td>SLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>MLO</td>
<td>Stirlingshire</td>
<td>STL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>SUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairnshire</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>Wigtownshire</td>
<td>WIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>ORK</td>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>WLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeblesshire</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>RNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross and Cromarty</td>
<td>ROS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxburghshire</td>
<td>ROX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>SHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirkshire</td>
<td>SLK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirlingshire</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>SUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigtownshire</td>
<td>WIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>WLO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If you are interested in Scottish place-names, wherever you live, this is the society for you. Founded in 1996, we have grown in numbers to over 350 members, comprising everyone involved or interested in Scottish place-name study, from academics to amateurs to those who are simply fascinated by place-names.

We publish two copies of the Newsletter a year, each illustrated in full colour and now 16 pages long, with articles summarising talks at our conferences and other material, including book reviews. We hold day conferences twice a year – one in spring, one in autumn – at venues all round Scotland, usually with a local theme to its four or five talks. We run a website with lots of pages about the Society, its past and future conferences, notes on place-names arranged by county, a bookshelf, and links to other websites; you can find it at http://www.spns.org.uk/.

Membership costs just £6 per year (£7 if you live outside the UK), and includes the two Newsletters, invitations to the conferences, voting rights at our AGM, which is part of the spring conference, and a discount on subscribing to *The Journal of Scottish Name Studies*.

You can contact us via the web site, or by writing to the Society, c/o Department of Celtic and Scottish Studies, University of Edinburgh, EH8 9LD, or by contacting the Treasurer, Pete Drummond, at peter.drummond@btinternet.com, or 8 Academy Place, Coatbridge ML5 3AX.

We look forward to welcoming you.
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AINM: Bulletin of the Ulster Place-Name Society has been relaunched as AINM: A Journal of Name Studies and two new volumes in the series, Volume IX (2008) and volume X (2009), were published earlier this year. AINM is devoted primarily to the study of Irish place- and personal names. Contributions on names in Scotland and the Isle of Man, are also welcome, particularly where they interface with areas of Irish interest, as are contributions on onomastics in general.

All articles submitted for publication are peer-reviewed and the membership of the editorial board reflects expertise in Irish, Manx and Scottish place and personal names in both the medieval and modern periods, and in related areas of language, literature and historical studies.

Articles for publication and books for review should be sent to the The Editor, AINM, Irish & Celtic Studies, School of Languages, Literatures & Performing Arts, Queen’s University, Belfast BT7 1NN.

Subscriptions should be sent to The Treasurer of the Ulster Place-Name Society (UPNS), c/o Irish & Celtic Studies at the same address. Volumes IX and X of AINM each cost £5 to members of UPNS, £10 to non-members and £15 to institutions.