

CHAPTER 12

.....

TRANSFERRED NAMES AND ANALOGY IN NAME-FORMATION

.....

STEFAN BRINK

OUR place-name corpus consists of two main types: *primary names* and *transferred names*. The former represents (we believe) the normal way of naming in early societies, the latter are predominantly to be found in the ‘New World’. This is, however, a qualified truth. That place-names were brought over from Europe to Australia, Canada, USA, etc., and reused there, is undeniable. But what about a transfer of place-names in early societies in Europe? We can see that this cannot have been a major principle in name-giving, but was this way of naming non-existing? Probably not.

In this chapter I will discuss the transfer of place-names, the different backgrounds to the transfers, and also the important role of analogy and patterns in name-formation. The cases to illustrate this are mainly taken from Scandinavia, but the motifs and forces lying behind these phenomena are general in all onymic cultures.

To fully understand why we have name transfers, we must introduce the concept of an *onomasticon*. Everyone who speaks a language has a *lexicon*, a set of words from which we choose when communicating (see e.g. Aitchison 2012). Each individual’s lexicon is, of course, unique for that person. In the same way, every individual has a unique *onomasticon*, the set of names to be used for geographical orientation and social integration. The former represents place-names, which we need to function spatially as a collective, the latter are the names of human beings and other (named) living creatures that we need for addressing and referring to other people and animals. An *onomasticon* is to be understood as a subdivision of a lexicon.

The term *onomasticon*, with this specific meaning, was introduced into onomastic research by the Scottish/German onomastician W. F. H. Nicolaisen. When analysing Scandinavian place-names in Scotland, he found that ‘the early Scandinavian settlers in the Scottish north and west brought with them, and used, in addition to a *lexicon* reflecting the vocabulary of the homeland, an *onomasticon* which was the product of the

onomastic dialect of that same homeland' (Nicolaisen 1978: 46), and on another occasion he stated that 'all speakers of any language have and use a discrete onomasticon or repertoire of names' (Nicolaisen 1982b: 211).

The term *onomasticon* has, of course, been used before, but then in a wider meaning as 'an inventory of names', as in *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* by W. G. Searle (1897), or 'the stock of names', as used by Hans Walther (1978: 6): 'Der Namenschatz, das Onomasticon'.

Hence, in the way Nicolaisen has defined *onomasticon*, the concept becomes a useful tool when discussing the frequent use of patterns and analogy in name-giving situations. When a name-giver forms a new name, her mind is, of course, not a total blank. In her onomasticon she has patterns which indicate how names for that particular feature should normally be formed. This framework may be called the individual's onomastic competence. And this is the reason why we find a palpable uniformity amongst place-names within a certain area. In these cases, when new names are formed, we can see that the name-givers are seldom adventurous and inventive. They accommodate to the toponymic standard used in that collective. However, when existing names are reused, hence transferred, we cannot talk about name-giving, but instead a choice of names.

There are two different ways of (re)using an onomasticon and one's onomastic competence when moving to an alien environment: to create names from the individual's repertoire of name elements, which are hence brought from the abandoned homeland, these names are by definition primary constructions, but result in new, alien types of names for the 'new' environment; to transfer already existing names.

The former we find in, for example, the Danelaw in England and northern Scotland, where Scandinavian settlers have created new names, congruent with and mirroring the actual landscape and settlement, but using their homeland's place-name elements, creating names such as *Sandwic* < *sand*—*vík* 'bay', *Lerwick* < *leira* 'clay'—*vík* 'bay', *Fladdabister* < *flati* 'flat'—*bólstaðr* 'farm', *Laimeseadar* < *Lambasetr* < *lamb*—*setr* 'farm', *Swansea* 'Sveinn's sær/ey', *Ashby* < *askr* 'ash tree'—*by* 'settlement' etc.¹ These are primary names.

An even earlier case concerns the question of whether the place-name (elements) may shed light on where the Anglo-Saxons came from when migrating to Britain in the Merovingian Period. A traditional view is that these settlers came from the Jutland peninsula, the area of modern Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark, but this has been questioned in recent years by several scholars, who claim that the Germanic tribes who invaded Britain during the fifth century did not come directly from Schleswig and Denmark across the North Sea, but rather from parts of Northern Germany, the Netherlands and Flanders across the Channel, and that this might be substantiated by toponymic evidence (Piroth 1979; Udolph 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 2006, 2012; Fellows-Jensen 1995).

¹ See for example Fellows-Jensen (2008) and the bibliography in Brink (2012: 47–51).

The latter case, the transfer of already existing names, we find in abundance when we go to the New World where we find names such as *Cambridge*, *Avon*, *Christchurch*, *Boston*, *York*, *Plymouth*, *Balmoral*, *Stockholm*, *Karlstad*, and so on, which are place-names that have clearly been transferred. These names could be described as *commemorative names*, names which have been reused to bring out some sentiment or nostalgia, to commemorate the settlers' old home environment.

An interesting case of name transfer is when the Scottish Free Church and the Church of England planned a new settlement on the south island of New Zealand (Matthews 1972: 270–2). The Free Church of Scotland drew up the plans for the southern region of the island, with a landscape very similar to the Scottish countryside. For the major settlement they wanted the name *Edinburgh* but chose to use the old Gaelic form *Dunedin*, and in the same spirit they named the river in the vicinity *Clutha*, the old name of the river *Clyde*. Oddly enough, they used a Maori name for the actual district, *Otago*, but it became scattered with names such as *Ben Nevis*, *Roslyn*, *Bannockburn*. A curiosity is the name *Mossgiel*, which was the name of Robert Burns' farm in Ayrshire. This name was actually given by the poet's great-nephew, who was one of the leaders of this resettling enterprise.

A special type of transferred commemorative name can be called the *vogue names*. There might be an original name bearer in these cases, but not always. The coining of these names relied on a kind of fashion that spread. In Sweden we have a couple of very frequent names of this kind in *Fridhem* and *Rosenhill*. Internationally we find names such as *Bellevue*, *Belmont*, *Athens*, *Frescati*, *Clairvaux*, etc. As we can see, many of these vogue names have a background in the Classical World, some in famous medieval castles or monasteries.

A big question in research has been whether this kind of name transfer is a 'modern' phenomenon or if we may expect the same or similar actions to have taken place in the past. It seems obvious that we cannot assume the same magnitude of transferred names in the past as in the nineteenth century, but there is the odd example which forces us not to exclude this possibility totally. One such example seems to be the name *Uppsala*, obviously given after the famous place in central Sweden, today *Gamla Uppsala* 'Old Uppsala'.² This enigmatic, and historically very contested, place was a regal seat for the early Swedish kings and saw the first Swedish archbishop's cathedral. There are hundreds of *Uppsala* names in Scandinavia and also two to be found in England. Many of them might be rather young, but there is a substantial group of names which seems to be old. The most probable explanation for this spread of the *Uppsala* name is the reputation the place acquired from its occurrence in Old Norse mythology, mentioned in many Old Icelandic sagas and also by the German clerical historian Adam of Bremen, where he describes a famous pagan temple in Uppsala and some sacrificial gatherings every ninth year.

² For a discussion of the *Uppsala* names as transferred names, see Brink (1996: 63), Vikstrand (2013), *pace* Sandnes (1998).

The scholarly term for the kind of name that constitutes the base for all these new *Cambridges*, *Uppsalas*, etc. is *eponym* ‘person (or place) that has given its name to someone or something’, and the new ‘namesakes’ may be termed *transferred* or *eponymized names*, and the act of renaming thus *eponymization*.³

It is to be noted that this eponymization has not always emanated from the Old World, going to the New World. There has been another direction as well, which can be illustrated by place-names in Europe such as *Lombok*, *Amerika*, *Jeruzalem* in the Netherlands, *Kaanaa* (*Canaan*), *Bethlehem*, and *Egypti* in Finland and so on. A special case here are the commemorative battle names, such as *Waterloo*, *Portobello*, *Krim*, *Transvaal*, *Lombok*, and *Korea*.

The transfer of names by a Church when resettling with an emigrating congregation, as described above for New Zealand, is rather unique. However, even more unique is when a whole set of names is transferred from one location to another. One such case we find in the province of Västergötland in western Sweden. In the ancient district of Falbygden we find names such as *Friggeråker*, *Lovene*, *Slöta*, *Holma*, *Synnerål*, and *Saleby*, which all seem to have a prehistoric origin (prehistoric in the Scandinavian sense of the concept, hence pre c.1100). We find this set of names c.50 km to the northwest of Falbygden, in the same province, just south of the city of Lidköping (Brink 1996: 66). It seems fairly obvious that these latter names are younger than the former, and they cannot be understood as primary formations, but must be looked upon as transferred names. But why transfer a whole set of names c.50 km? We have no idea!

A similar move of a set of names happened fairly recently when the United States unfortunately decided to use the Bikini atoll for nuclear tests. At that time, 1945–46, about 170 people lived on the Bikini atoll. The United States relocated these people, which took place in several steps, first to the nearby island of Rongerik, then finally to the previously uninhabited Kili Island. One notable thing with this forced and tragic relocation was that the inhabitants also brought with them their place-names from the Bikini Island to Kili Island, so that nearly all the Kili tract names were former names of Bikini tracts (Bender 1970: 183).

Sometimes we can see that names have ‘travelled’ over rather great distances, names that are odd birds in their new environment, hence cannot be understood or etymologized within their local language context. Such a case occurs in some place-names found in the north Atlantic: *Stóra* and *Lítla Dímun* in the Faroes, *de Dimons*, two standing rocks in the sea west of the island of Yell, Shetland, a place-name *Dímun* on Greenland, and in Iceland we have several occurrences of the same name, found in, for example *Dímundarklakkar* for two craggy islands at Breiðafjörður (Brink 1996: 67–8). This name, *Dímun*, comes from a Celtic/Irish compound containing *di* ‘two’ (in the feminine) and *muinn* ‘top, neck’ (Craigie 1897: 450; Bugge 1905: 355; Jakobsen 1957: 77). In this case we have an eponymized toponym, which has been used for similar topographical features, where the common denominator is that the natural feature should have two peaks, tops,

³ For the role of eponymization, see a case study from the Netherlands (Rentenaar 1984).

islands, or whatever. We cannot assume that the Celtic language was spoken over the whole of the north Atlantic, wherefore we must suppose that there has been a ‘progenitor’, which has been the prototype for this transferred name, a topographical feature with two peaks or two close-neighbouring islands. It is namely typical that all these names, containing a *Dímun*, have this characteristic feature, of two peaks, two small islands, etc.

I became aware of an illuminating case when visiting Australia, where Prof. Hank Nelson, Canberra, an authority on Papua New Guinea, told me of the following: In the highlands along the Sepik river, Nelson had noticed that the Biami people, when moving in unfamiliar territory, used their familiar place-names from back home for similar topographical features in the new territory. Nelson’s explanation for this odd behaviour was that by rattling these familiar names for ‘new’ natural features in (hostile) territory, they felt secure and safe in the new surroundings (Brink 1996: 68).

A really special case of a name transfer is the case of *Hawaiki/Hawai’i* in the eastern South Pacific (Brink 1996: 73–4). This is named for the ancestral homeland, *Hawaiki*, for the Polynesians in their mythology. The name is found on the biggest island of Samoa, *Savai’i*, as the name of one of the Hawai’ian islands, *Hawai’i*, as the name of an island in the Marquesas, *Havai’i*. The name is also known as some supernatural land in the Tuamotus (*Havaiki*), in the Cook Islands (*Avaiki*) and in Maori New Zealand (*Hawaiki*) (Orbell 1991). The common idea is that there must be one place of origin for all these names, and it is believed to be the island *Savai’i* in Samoa (Geraghty 1993). A similar idea is to be found in the western South Pacific, where the ancestral homeland is thought to be *Pulotu*, which is found in several cases in western Polynesia (Geraghty 1993). In these cases of *Hawaiki* and *Pulotu* we must reckon with some kind of transfer of name, which was a vital part of the mythology for the Polynesians.

When analysing these kind of aspects of the *onomasticon*, we must distinguish between a *name transfer* or *eponymization* or *renaming* (i.e. taking a place-name with one as one moves, calling a place after another place, or giving a place a name that has become fashionable) from the coining of new names according to a toponymic pattern or by analogy. The latter, *analogy*, has been understood to be perhaps the main driving force behind all naming (Nicolaisen 1991: 147) and has been a subject of some really interesting discussions and analyses by two Finnish onomasticians, Kurt Zilliacus (1966: 9) and Eero Kiviniemi (1973, 1974, 1991).⁴ The concept of *analogy* has, for onomastics, been defined as ‘Partial resemblance created through the imitation of models or patterns’ (Nicolaisen 1991: 148) or ‘a choice of name from the name-giver’s name repertoire or according to the name pattern they make up’ (Kiviniemi 1973: 4; my trans.). What Kiviniemi (1973) correctly describes is a situation within a more mature society where new names are coined within an existing name system, so that these new names were more or less a choice of names from among those known or modelled upon them, rather than primary formations from the appellative lexicon. We can substantiate this observation by looking at regional or local name corpora, which are remarkably similar,

⁴ See now also Leino (2007) for discussions regarding analogy found in the formation of Finnish lake names.

where certain name elements are predominant, while the appellative vocabulary could offer much more variety in the stock of names. And the answer to this is of course that analogy plays a vital role in a name-giving situation. Analogical name-giving is hence the choice of a name from amongst those which the name-giver knows of, that is, the corpus of her onomasticon. She can reuse an already existing name or form a new name according to a given toponymic pattern.

Kiviniemi (1973) makes a distinction between *analogically* transferred names, resulting from an association with or resemblance to the place; *metaphorically* transferred names, resulting from an association with or resemblance to the concept, for example the name *Siberia* for a distant farm; *metonymically* transferred names, resulting from an association by connection, such as a farm *Big Lake* beside a lake *Big Lake*; and finally *language associations*, which simply is a play with words, where a low-lying (wet?) meadow can be called *the Netherlands*. Closely associated to these cases are the *contrast names*, where we find a *Little Lake* beside a *Big Lake*, or a ridge name, *Neck*, beside a hill name, *Head*, etc.⁵

We find all these possibilities in name formation and I would like to add the case where a name has been reused for reasons of sentiment, instances which we saw were very common in North America, Australia, and New Zealand. This case could perhaps be called a *psychological* transfer of names.

I have (Brink 1996: 78–80) tried to systemize and structure different kinds of name formation reflecting the use of the onomasticon:

12.1 NAME FORMATION REFLECTING THE USE OF AN ONOMASTICON

- (1) 'New' name by analogy or association (i.e. renewal of a name):
 - (a) analogical transfer of a name;
 - (b) metaphorical transfer of a name;
 - (c) metonymical transfer of a name;
 - (d) psychological transfer of a name;
 - (e) socially conditioned transfer of a name.
- (2) New name by association or from a pattern:
 - (a) different kinds of association;
 - (b) homogeneous dialectical pattern;
 - (c) grammatical connection;
 - (d) patterns in word or name formation;
 - (e) partial eponymization;
 - (f) analogical affix formation.

⁵ For a discussion of analogy and patterns in name-giving, see for example Strandberg (1987); Albøge *et al.* (1991); Kiviniemi (1991); Pamp (1991); Nyström (1996); and Dalberg (2008).

The first case lists mostly ‘new’ names given by analogy or association, which, hence, is the transfer of a name or the reuse of an old name. Here we can distinguish the following types:

- (a) An *analogical* transfer of a name, due to association with or resemblance to a place, for example, the coining of a name *Dímun* for a two-peaked island, due to its resemblance to or association with some known ‘prototype’, some two-peaked island or natural feature.
- (b) A *metaphorical* transfer of a name, due to association with or resemblance to the concept, for example, the aforementioned case of calling a distant farm *Siberia*, or a low-lying meadow *the Netherlands* (cf. Nilsson 1987).
- (c) A *metonymical* transfer of a name, due to association by connection, which is a frequent and very normal case. For example by giving a railway station the name *Big Hill*, when it is located nearby a hill called *Big Hill*, or by using the name *Bear Lake* for a settlement by the lake *Bear Lake*. (This in its turn of course leads to the situation that a new name must be found for the actual lake, which in the Swedish onymic system results in a lake name *Björnsjön* ‘Bear Lake’s Lake’, where the last *-sjön* is an epexegetic addition. This example also reveals another interesting theoretical aspect in onomastics, namely the importance of a *name hierarchy*, where a settlement name is ‘higher’ up in the onymic system than a nature name, so that the former has a kind of precedence over the latter in the toponymic usage.)
- (d) A *psychological* transfer of a name, for example, out of sentiment, like the above-mentioned *Canterbury*, *Christchurch*, or *Avon*; or following the vital force of eponymization, commonly from a stock of vogue or fashion names, such as *Bellevue*, *Balmoral*, *Rosenthal*, or *Uppsala*; or for a feeling of security, as in the Papua New Guinea case, where the Biami people used familiar names in unfamiliar territory to feel more secure and safe.
- (e) A *socially conditioned* transfer of a name (or a name element), for example, where highly prestigious names are used for new settlements normally owned by a social elite, as was the case in, for example, Sweden with settlements and castles owned by the nobility, where these settlements or castles were often given a name in *-hus*, which was a loan from German *hus* ‘fortified house, castle’ (Mattisson 1982), or in *-holm*, where the word *holm* ‘island, peninsula’ was used with a new meaning ‘fortified house, castle’ (Mattisson 1986), or by using existing, well-known German castle or monastery names such as *Rosendal* (< *Rosenthal*), *Fågelsång* (< *Vogelsang*), *Landskrona* (< *Lantzcrona*), or *Raseborg* (< *Ratzeburg*) (Ejder 1950).

In the second case, in which we have new names made up on the basis of some kind of association or a well-known and well-used pattern for a region, we can distinguish the formation of names with the following origins.

- (a) Different kinds of *associations*, such as with a name, word, concept, or sound. For example, when a settlement is established by a lake called **The Box*, the name **The Lid* may be chosen; a small lake beside a larger lake may be given a name meaning ‘The Calf’ (which is very common in Sweden, Sw. *Kalven*); a play on words may result in a ridge being called *The Cat’s Tail*, etc.
- (b) The force of using a *homogeneous dialectical pattern* for a region, hence with similar names occurring within a local or regional toponymical context.
- (c) The possibility of *grammatical connection*, for example, in a region names may occur with stereotyped case suffixes (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, etc.). A most illustrative case are some Swedish simplex names, such as *Berg* ‘hill’, *Lund* ‘grove’, etc. which may occur in fossilized grammatical forms. In central Sweden the plural accusative seems to have been favoured, resulting in names such as *Berga(r)*, *Lunda(r)*, whereas in the province of Hälsingland very often we find fossilized singular dative forms, *Berge*, *Lunde*, while in the province of Ångermanland the plural dative is often found, *Bergom*, *Lundom*. In the same way it has been noted for Norway that regionally some place-names of feminine gender in the definite singular form have taken on the stereotyped ending *-(e)n*, which has become a kind of norm for those areas (Helleland 1991).
- (d) The use of *patterns in word and name formation*, for example, in the province of Skåne, Sweden, we have a river *Alma*. A short tributary to this river is called *Silma*, containing the stem *sil* ‘to flow slowly’, and this latter river has taken the ending *-ma* from the river name *Alma*, not as a regular and ancient *m*-suffix, but in association with *Alma* (Moberg 1987).
- (e) *Partial eponymization*, for example, the older name for *Bathford* (in Avon, England) was *Ford*, but some time before 1575 *Bath* was added from the town situated nearby (Room 1985: 7). A Scandinavian example is the town name *Borgholm* on the island of Öland. The name contains the word *borg* ‘castle’ (or a name *Borg*) and the ‘suffix’ *holm*, modelled on *Stockholm* (Mattisson 1986: 148–50; Pamp 1991: 159). A special case of partial eponymization is the adding of the prefix *New* to a place-name, such as *New York*, *New Jersey*, *New England*.⁶
- (f) An *analogical affix-formation*. It is a well-known fact that some place-name elements have decayed down to a suffixoid element, in which the etymological meaning has become obscured, as is the case with the Scandinavian *-vin* ‘(probably) meadow’, *-hult* ‘grove’, *-röd/-rød* ‘clearing’ and *-boda* ‘booths, sheds’, all of which have a secondary usage with a general meaning of ‘farm’.⁷

⁶ For a discussion of the concept and term *partial eponymization*, see Hallberg (1976: 5–6) and Rentenaar (1991: 173).

⁷ For a discussion of a secondary usage of toponymic generics, where the older meaning has been watered down to ‘farm, settlement’ etc., see Benson (1972); Ståhl (1976: 90); Kousgård Sørensen (1984); Brink (1988: 72–5); and Pamp (1991).

Name transfer has been a frequent phenomenon, especially in recent centuries, but it is also notable in earlier periods of history. Such name transfers may be the result of a migration of people, or in the case of eponymization, the desire of the name-giver to be fashionable or go-with-the-flow. The underlying motive may be a feeling of nostalgia for one's old home, resemblances to a well-known geographical feature, or simply a geographical misidentification. Also the role of analogy and patterns in name formation is very important. It is a rather romantic belief to assume that the name-giver in a society is totally unaffected by already existing onymic patterns. As in all human intellectual behaviour, we tend to associate and create from learned and acquired knowledge, patterns, and frameworks.