

COPYING NAMES: A SCRIBE-CENTRIC VIEW  
OF THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF NAMES IN MEDIEVAL CARTULARIES<sup>1</sup>

JOANNA TUCKER  
*University of Glasgow*

Every instance of a name in a medieval manuscript has passed through the quill of a scribe. Scribal ‘agency’ in relation to text is a well established concern in manuscript studies. But how much freedom and choice did scribes have when it came to transmitting names in writing? Moreover, how can this question be explored for written names when we do not have the scribe’s exemplar text? What implications does the copying of names have for onomastics, and for our understanding of scribal copying practices more widely? This article addresses these questions by developing a ‘scribe-centric’ approach to copied names in a particularly important manuscript context: medieval cartularies (books mainly containing copies of charter texts).

The charter as a physical object is a single-sheet parchment document, usually authenticated with a seal and recording a ‘transaction’ of some kind, typically a gift, confirmation or agreement. Given their localised subject matter, medieval charters are often the earliest written representation of a place-name. This is particularly the case in Scotland where written records in contemporary manuscripts are virtually unknown before c.1100. Charter documents began to be produced by scribes in Scotland from the twelfth century (Broun 2005). According to the digital resource *People of Medieval Scotland* ([www.poms.ac.uk](http://www.poms.ac.uk)), over 450 ‘original’ documents relating to Scotland now survive from this century. From the thirteenth century, some communities in Scotland with large archives of charters – particularly the major monasteries

---

1. This is an expansion of a paper originally delivered in 2018 at the joint Scottish Place-Name Society (SPNS) and Scottish Records Association (SRA) conference, *Hence the Name: Sources for place-name and personal name research in Scotland*. I would like to thank Dauvit Broun, Oliver Padel and Simon Taylor for reading drafts of this article, and for offering such insightful feedback, and to the anonymous readers for their very helpful comments. This has been all the more welcome since I am not, by any stretch, an onomastician. All remaining errors or oversights are my own.

and cathedrals – began copying these documents into codices, now generally referred to as ‘cartularies’. Almost 1,500 twelfth-century charter *texts* now survive only as a copy, mostly in cartularies ([www.poms.ac.uk](http://www.poms.ac.uk)). As a result, cartulary manuscripts are a significant source for early place-names. In fact, for names, cartularies offer something qualitatively different from original documents: they represent a context in which names were repeatedly copied and read, sometimes for many centuries and by many different individuals, a context that was neither ‘central’ nor entirely ‘local’.

Three wider issues come into play in this study of names in cartularies: the influence of multilingualism; the relationship between speech and writing; and the status of ‘copies’ versus ‘originals’. First, it should be recognised that the scribes studied here – all of whom were members of monastic communities – operated within a society that was variously multilingual, with local usage including Scots, Insular French, Latin and, in some regions, Gaelic. Though the charter texts themselves are in Latin (which, by the central middle ages, had a relatively stable orthography), many of the names discussed here are non-Latin in their etymology. This is not the same as being a multilingual text, of course, a phenomenon which has been studied in detail by Laura Wright for late-medieval England in particular (e.g., Wright 2012; 2017). It may, however, be useful to imagine names in charter texts as typically non-Latin words slotted into a Latin environment and presented according to the occasion and the scribe’s individual preferences. This article explores this issue by shining a light directly onto the question of scribal preferences and influences when copying names in Latin charter texts.

Second, because this article focuses on scribes and their role in rendering names, the primary concern will be orthography, not the historical phonology or etymology of the names in question. It is important, however, to recognise that spelling is not divorced from speech. The relationship between speech and writing – especially the phoneme-grapheme relationship – is central to the study of any orthography (Kohrt 1986). Even for early medieval orthographers, writing was viewed as ‘a secondary artefact aimed principally at representing spoken language’ (Desbordes 1997, 118). Similarly, in onomastics the basic principle that orthography correlates with the spoken word has been dominant in how names have been studied (Hough 2009). Nevertheless, it has been acknowledged that the relationship between speech and orthography need not always be direct or straightforward. For Manfred Kohrt (1986, 92–3), their relationship is ‘determined by their respective contexts, and by virtue of such a

contextual dependence we cannot expect there to be a simple, bidirectional “correspondence” between the levels of spoken and written language.’ In relation to names in particular, Carole Hough has noted ways in which written names might diverge from contemporary speech, especially in relation to semantics and phonology (Hough 2009).

Malcolm Parkes (1994, 24) draws a useful distinction between a scribe’s ‘Spoken Language Profile’ (i.e., any textual elements which carry phonic information or implications for that scribe) and their ‘Written Language Profile’ (i.e., that scribe’s individual use of written conventions with no phonic implications, such as abbreviations or punctuation). Parkes’ study looked at Latin autograph texts (i.e., those written by the author themselves) where it is possible to get closer to the scribe’s Spoken Language Profile since the prose was written fresh. The subject of this article, by contrast, is *copied* text, meaning that we cannot assume any orthography correlates to the scribe’s own Spoken Language Profile – it may instead reflect the orthography in the exemplar text or, if the scribe was being dictated to, the Spoken Language Profile of the narrator. This article will therefore not speculate on individual scribes’ linguistic profiles, but instead will look at the nature of copied names and what they reveal about orthographic practices in relation to names in Latin charter texts.

Third, it is natural to regard the spelling of names in later copies as having ‘deteriorated’ etymologically as a result of their distance from the original creators of the name (Nicolaisen 2001, 42). This sentiment also chimes with an insecurity which historians tend to hold about charter copies in particular, given the potential for errors or alterations in the copying process (Tucker 2020b, 23). For names specifically, ‘problems of scribal practices’ are generally acknowledged, including concerns about copying errors (Ó Maolalaigh 1998, 16). It can be difficult to navigate these issues when equipped with only an abstract notion that scribes might modify or even modernise a name-form when copying. Here it is argued that, while there can be no general rule for what a scribe might do, developing a deeper awareness of a particular manuscript and its scribal profiles, enhanced by a new methodology, can help us to understand and contextualise the potential range of orthographic variation.

This article will first examine charters and cartularies as sources for names. It will show that cartulary scribes often, but not always, varied the spelling of names in the process of copying them. As a result, the orthography of a name found in a cartulary cannot be assumed to be a mirror of the text in the original document. Instead, names in cartularies must be viewed principally as a source

for the cartulary scribe, who was often writing much later than the date of the charter itself. While this issue has been generally recognised, it has been difficult to deal with directly because dating the entry of texts into cartularies can present a major challenge. The next part addresses this by introducing a methodology for dating the work of cartulary scribes. This will then be applied to a sample of names in one particular medieval cartulary from Lindores Abbey, a Tironensian monastery in Fife founded c.1190. This manuscript was initially created in the mid-thirteenth century, but it is somewhat typical in containing the work of dozens of scribes working for generations after this, some as late as the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries. By comparing the spelling of particular names across this cartulary, it is possible to examine the range of orthographic variation that could exist within a single manuscript.

These insights will provide a deeper understanding of the status of name-forms found in medieval cartularies and the role of the scribe in relation to them. Rather than viewing cartularies as simply 'copies', these manuscripts can be read as sources in their own right and their scribes as 'active' agents. As such, they can lead to a fresh understanding of orthographic practice and the transmission of names. While the example here is a cartulary from Scotland, the ubiquity of charters and cartularies across Ireland, Britain and indeed Europe means that the same challenges and methodologies are applicable beyond Scotland's cartularies.

#### MEDIEVAL CHARTERS AS A SOURCE FOR NAMES

In order to illustrate the value of charters as a source for local place- and personal names an example is given below, in translation from the original Latin. The document is London, British Library Add. Ch. 66568. It is a charter in the name of Swain son of Thor, who is gifting lands in Perthshire to the abbey of Scone. The text itself is undated but is datable to '1 October 1182 × 31 December 1194' (the parameters here being taken from the appearance in the witness list of John Scot as 'bishop of Dunkeld', and the date of the royal confirmation, which must have been in existence by the end of 1194).<sup>2</sup> The names have been modernised where possible.

---

2. This dating is taken from the text's record in *PoMS*:  
<https://www.poms.ac.uk/record/source/5458/> (accessed 17/05/21).

To all sons of Holy Mother Church, Swain son of Thor sends greeting. Know me to have given, conceded, and by this my charter to have made firm, to God, to Saint Michael at Scone, and to the canons serving God in that place now and in the future, 'Ahednepobbel', by the same boundaries that Robert the chaplain held it; and one toft in Tibbermore, that is, the one that the goldsmith held. Also a meadow that is above the Lochty on the southern side, from the point where to the east it adjoins the land of the peasants, as far as it stretches through its breadth and length towards the west, with common pasture and easement of the wood for what things so ever they shall have need, in free and everlasting alms, for the soul of Earl Henry, and of all my ancestors as well as my successors, and for my own soul. Wherefore I will that the aforementioned canons hold and possess the aforementioned land with everything written above by everlasting right of me and my heirs who shall succeed me in perpetuity, so freely and quitly, fully, and honourably as any religious house in the whole kingdom most freely and quitly, fully and honourably, holds from any baron. With these witnesses: John, bishop of Dunkeld; Robert of Berkeley; Hugh of Calder; Macbeth, judex of Gowrie; Geoffrey, chaplain of Perth; William, clerk of Forfar; Henry the chaplain; Philip 'Uvieth'; James of Perth, Andrew and William, brothers of the same; Geoffrey fitz Martin, David and Henry his sons; Walter of St Edmunds; and many others.<sup>3</sup>

Descriptions of lands and their boundaries are an especially fruitful source for local toponyms, while lists of charter witnesses provide an abundance of personal names (some of which also incorporate place-names). Charter texts like Swain son of Thor's can, therefore, provide a snapshot of a particular landscape and a single group of people at a given moment.

As a source for names, charter texts have the advantage of generally being dated or datable. What makes them tricky is that the identity of the scribes themselves is nearly always obscure. The nature of the handwriting might offer some clues as to their background, such as whether they were in the employ of the 'beneficiary' or the 'donor'. Swain son of Thor's charter, for

---

3. This translation follows the recent edition of this charter by John Reuben Davies, available alongside a digital image and Latin transcription at: <https://www.modelsofauthority.ac.uk/digipal/manuscripts/700/> (accessed 17/05/21).

instance, was evidently penned by a scribe familiar with handwriting found especially in contemporary papal documents, and was therefore likely to have been a member of the community at Scone Abbey (the beneficiary) rather than a clerk in the retinue of Swain (the donor).<sup>4</sup>

It is also important to consider whether a charter scribe might have been familiar with a place-name itself. Typically, this might be conceptualised in terms of whether or not the scribe was 'local' to the place. In relation to English documents, Kenneth Cameron has highlighted the distinction between those produced locally as against those produced 'centrally': 'the evidence from such [central] sources will be less valuable for etymological purposes, because they would tend to be spelt in what might be called the "conventional Westminster manner"' (Cameron 1996, 22). In Scotland, centrally produced charter rolls from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries do not survive, though plenty of scribes in contemporary documents can be described as 'royal'. It is worth cautioning, however, against too much of a binary distinction here: any charter scribes' knowledge or otherwise of a particular place, and most importantly how it was pronounced there, can only ever be assumed, given our limited knowledge of who the scribes were in the first place.

While it is true that, for reconstructing the etymology of a name, the earlier and the more local the source the better, for understanding the textual transmission of names it could be said that all instances of a name have something valuable to contribute. The crucial consideration is not whether the scribe was 'central' or 'local', but whether the scribe displays a knowledge of vernacular orthographic practice. To take Gaelic as an example, in Irish royal charters the scribes routinely rendered Gaelic names according to established spelling conventions (Flanagan 2005). In Scotland, however, it is striking how uncommon this is for Gaelic names. Dauvit Broun has brought to light one scribe of Inchaffray Abbey whose Latin charter reveals, in its rendering of personal and place-names, familiarity with some aspects of Gaelic orthography (Broun 1998, 194–6). (Other forms of text from Scotland in this period, such as royal genealogies, do reveal an awareness of new conventions for Gaelic: see Broun 2015.) Scottish charter texts typically contain a mixture of names, therefore: some rendered in their routine Latin equivalent, others in an

---

4. Note the widely spaced lines and 'ruching' embellishment at the top of long s. For a discussion of papal palaeographical features and their adoption in twelfth-century English charters, see Webber 2007.

orthography potentially unique to that scribe or text. The latter cannot be easily categorised as either 'local' or 'central' versions of that name. They are therefore worthy of further exploration.

#### MEDIEVAL CARTULARIES AS A SOURCE FOR NAMES

The majority of charter texts survive today only as a later copy in a cartulary manuscript. For medieval Scotland, around 82 ecclesiastical cartularies (broadly defined) and ten 'lay' cartularies survive.<sup>5</sup> Assumptions have tended to be made about the function of cartularies, sometimes crudely divided into categories such as 'administrative' or 'memorial'. We can now step back from these classifications, however, and recognise that most cartularies were designed primarily for personal reading, consultation and study (Tucker 2020b). A cartulary scribe expected their work to be read in future. This has important implications for contextualising the orthography of the names. From the central middle ages, 'silent reading' had become a well established practice for private study (Saenger 1997), and was likely the main form of interaction with cartularies. This again means that it is important to think about the orthography of names in its own right, separate from how the names might have sounded and any other phonic implications.

There is limited evidence for how cartulary scribes actually worked. It is not clear, for example, whether they copied their exemplar by sight or whether the texts were dictated to them. Cartulary copies tend to arouse suspicions among historians about how 'faithfully' the scribe reproduced their exemplar – whether they modified the text and if so whether this was intentional.<sup>6</sup> Only a handful of studies have been able to undertake comparisons between original charters and their respective cartulary copies, mostly due to the large-scale

---

5. The main catalogue of cartularies is G. R. C. Davis' *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain and Ireland* (2010), based on an earlier 1958 'Short Catalogue'. It is perhaps worth pointing out that Davis' initial criteria for inclusion were somewhat broad, and have been broadened further still in the more recent edition, resulting in a 'corpus' of medieval cartularies that is rather amorphous in its character: see Tucker 2019, 149–56.

6. To date, the broadest study of document transcriptions in cartularies is Morelle 1993. He asked what 'information' cartulary scribes 'transferred' from the original to the copy. In doing so, Morelle was attempting to expand the idea of a transcript's 'quality' beyond just accuracy, to include the scribe's awareness of, and replication of, the look of the physical document as well as its text. On matters such as punctuation and orthography, he noted a variety of practice among cartulary scribes.

losses of archives or cartularies or both.<sup>7</sup> Where comparisons have been undertaken, most have arrived at precisely the same conclusion: that cartulary scribes were reasonably faithful copyists, with the exception of abbreviations, punctuation and, most significantly, the spelling of names. The consensus, in other words, is that one of the main areas of variation in cartulary copies is in the rendering of names.<sup>8</sup> This issue has also been brought to the fore by prominent names scholars: 'The spellings found in such [cartulary] manuscripts are not always accurate copies of the spellings of the originals and some can certainly be shown to have been "modernized" by later scribes. Of course, such forms are less reliable than those from originals or early copies, unless they can be shown to have been made by careful copyists' (Cameron 1996, 16). Unfortunately, a 'careful copyist' can only be identified where their exemplar survives.

Charter texts can, therefore, be seen as a microcosm of attitudes towards name-forms: there is a natural value placed on the earliest source – the 'original' charter – with later copies in cartularies treated with some suspicion. But it cannot be ignored that cartulary copies supply a very large corpus of medieval name-forms. How, then, are we to interpret the dubious orthographies of names in cartularies?

In order to appreciate the potential range of orthographic variation in cartulary copies some examples will be examined from different institutional and manuscript contexts. The first example comes from Lindores Abbey. Its earliest cartulary (now kept at Caprington Castle, Ayrshire) contains 154 texts, only two of which survive as an original single sheet, both in the name of the founder, David, earl of Huntingdon (d. 1219). One, currently in Lincoln, has been badly damaged with around half of its text unfortunately lost (*Lind. Cart.*, no. 13;

---

7. For a summary of this work, see Tucker 2020b, 23. One other context for textual collations between originals and copies is the production of editions. In a Scottish context, this includes most notably the *Regesta Regum Scottorum* and *Scottish Episcopal Acta* series of royal and episcopal charters. While these editions dutifully present any significant textual variants in the notes to each charter, it is difficult to understand through these editions what is happening across a particular manuscript or at the level of an individual scribe.

8. Another feature of cartulary copies is that sometimes the scribe might omit or abbreviate the charter witness lists. This obviously affects the transmission of personal names and any place-names used in a person's occupation or surname. It also has the effect of making it more difficult to date those undated texts.



Stringer 1985, no. 38). The other, now in Edinburgh, survives with its text intact (National Library of Scotland, Adv. MS 15.1.18, no. 40; printed as *Lind. Cart.*, no. 3, and Stringer 1985, no. 51). It is datable to '1202 × 1203', and was copied as part of a large batch of texts when the cartulary was first created in the 1250s (the large batch covers ff. 28r to 62v in the manuscript; this text appears at ff. 30v–31r). The cartulary copy contains only six lexical differences:<sup>9</sup>

- (i) where the charter scribe had *frater regis scocie* ('brother of the king of Scotland'), the cartulary scribe wrote *frater regis Scott'* (an abbreviation of *Scottorum*, thus 'brother of the king of Scots');
- (ii) the cartulary scribe omitted the name David (but kept *regis*) in the phrase *DD regis aui mei* ('of King David my grandfather');
- (iii) the cartulary scribe replaced *ad predictam ecclesiam* ('to the said church') with *ad eandem ecclesiam* ('to the same church');
- (iv) the original stated *in perpetuam et puram elemosinam* ('in perpetual and pure alms') whereas the cartulary scribe changed this to *in liberam et puram et perpetuam elemosinam* ('in free and pure and perpetual alms');
- (v) Robert Basset is two places down the witness list in the cartulary copy; and
- (vi) the cartulary scribe omitted *constabulario de inuerurin* ('constable of Inverurie') to describe the witness Norman, son of Mael Coluim.

To put these observations into some context, the original charter itself is thirty lines of text and it is 42 lines (one and a half pages) in the cartulary. Proportionally, therefore, these six lexical differences are relatively minimal. They also have little impact on the text's meaning. Collectively, however, they reveal that the scribe was not simply a passive copyist. For instance, while there is very little difference in meaning between *predictam* and *eandem*, this substitution does raise questions about the scribe's copying process. There are

---

9. The following is an updated discussion from Tucker 2020b, 175.

no other instances of *eandem* in the text that might have caught the eye of the scribe (or narrator). This does not necessarily indicate a conscious intervention by the scribe, but it still appears to be a sign of a distinct thought process. The change to *in liberam et puram et perpetuam elemosinam* is notable in that it represents a more 'standardised' formulation of this common phrase.<sup>10</sup> Before jumping to conclusions about the cartulary scribe 'updating' the charter scribe's archaic language, it should be noted that this more standard phrase also appears earlier in the original charter itself. This example therefore serves as a reminder of the relative flexibility of these 'stock phrases' in the context of charters, both for the charter scribes themselves and for cartulary copyists.

Overall, in the eyes of a charter scholar, these six variants do not exactly amount to the abbey 'tampering' with the text for material gains. For a names scholar, however, the picture is different. Table 1 presents every instance of a name in this text. They are arranged according to their order of appearance in the original charter (in one instance – Robert Basset – the cartulary's ordering is different). The witness list begins with 'William' at no. 29, as can be seen by the fact that most of the personal names from this point are in the ablative case. Many of the places in the text, by contrast, are in the genitive case (church 'of Dundee', abbot 'of Kelso'). An attempt has been made in Table 1 to follow each scribe's capitalisation. However, it is notoriously difficult to interpret a scribe's intention in this regard. While it can be clear for some letters (especially where the actual grapheme is different, such as A, D, H, T, R, B, G, N, E), for many others where the distinction is based mostly on letter size it is genuinely difficult to tell (such as M, K, S, W, F, P). Abbreviations have been expanded with italics where the meaning is unambiguous. The bold draws attention to those names which underwent an orthographic change in copying, but not including capitalisation variation or those cases where an ambiguous abbreviation is the only difference.

The first thing to point out is that many of the names in Table 1 have retained the same orthography. This includes Anglo-French and Biblical names (which tend to have a common Latin equivalent in this period, such as *Henricus*, *Maria*, *Galfridus*, *Radulfus*, *Matheus*, *Dauid*, *Simon* and *Andreas*), but also some vernacular names (such as *Culsamuel*, *Durnach*, *Dunde* and *Inchemabanin*). It is

---

10. The development of such charter phraseology (or 'diplomatic') can now be searched and visualised thanks to the digital research tool, *Models of Authority*: <https://www.modelsofauthority.ac.uk>.

**Table 1:** Names in the original charter (1202 × 1203) and cartulary copy (1250s)<sup>11</sup>

	<i>Original charter</i>	<i>Cartulary copy</i>	<i>Modern form</i>
1.	<i>DauīD</i>	<i>dauid</i>	David
2.	scocie	<i>Scottorum</i>	Scotland (original); the Scots (cartulary)
3.	<b>londors</b>	<b>Lundors</b>	<b>Lindores</b>
4.	<b>kelchoensi</b>	<b>kelkoensi</b>	<b>Kelso</b>
5.	marie	Marie	Mary
6.	andree	andree	Andrew
7.	<i>DauīD</i>	—	David
8.	henrici	henrici	Henry
9.	ade	ade	Ada
10.	malcolmi	Malcolmi	Malcolm/Mael Coluim
11.	willelmi	<i>Willelmi</i>	William
12.	<b>armegard</b>	<b>armengard</b>	<b>Ermengarde</b>
13.	matildis	Matildis	Matilda
14.	<i>DauīD</i>	Dauid	David
15.	<b>londors</b>	<b>Lundors</b>	<b>Lindores</b>
16.	<b>londors</b>	<b>lundors</b>	<b>Lindores</b>
17.	thomas	Thomas	Thomas
18.	dunde	Dunde	Dundee
19.	fintrith	<i>fintrith</i>	Fintray (ABD)
20.	<b>inuerrurin</b>	<b>Inuerrurin</b>	<b>Inverurie (ABD)</b>
21.	<b>munkegin</b>	<b>Munkegyn</b>	<b>Monkeigie (Keith Hall, ABD)</b>
22.	durnach	Durnach	Logie Durno (ABD)
23.	<b>prame</b>	<b>prameth</b>	<b>Premnay (ABD)</b>
24.	<b>Radmuriel</b>	<b>Rathmuliel</b>	<b>Rathmuriel (Christ's Kirk, ABD)</b>
25.	inchemabanin	Inchemabanin	Insch (ABD)
26.	culsamuel	culsamuel	Culsalmond (ABD)
27.	kelalcmurd	kelalcmund	Kennethmont (ABD)
28.	scotie	Scocie	Scotland
29.	<b>londors</b>	<b>lundors</b>	<b>Lindores</b>
30.	<i>Willelmo</i>	<i>Willelmo</i>	William

11. The original is Edinburgh, NLS Adv. MS 15.1.18, no. 40; the cartulary copy is Ayrshire, Caprington Castle, Fergusson-Cuninghame muniments, ff. 30v–31r. For the text's record in *PoMS*, see <https://www.poms.ac.uk/record/source/872/> (accessed 17/05/21).

31.	scotie	Scocie	Scotland
32.	Johanne	Johanne	John
33.	aberdonensi	Aberdon'	Aberdeen
34.	Radulfo	Radulfo	Ralph
35.	<b>brehinensi</b>	<b>Brechinien'</b>	<b>Brechin</b>
36.	Osberto	Osberto	Osbert
37.	kelchoensi	kelchoen'	Kelso
38.	henrico	henrico	Henry
39.	<b>aberbrudoc</b>	<b>Aberbrodoc</b>	<b>Arbroath</b>
40.	Simone	Simone	Simon
41.	aberdoen	Aberdoen'	Aberdeen
42.	Roberto	Roberto	Robert
43.	aberdoen	aberdoen'	Aberdeen
44.	Waltero	Waltero	Walter
45.	Matheo	Matheo	Matthew
46.	aberdoen	Aberdoen'	Aberdeen
47.	Dauid	Dauid	David
48.	<b>lindeseia</b>	<b>Lindesei</b>	<b>Lindsay</b>
49.	Waltero	Waltero	Walter
50.	olifard	olif	Olifard/Oliphant
51.	Roberto	Roberto <sup>12</sup>	Robert
52.	basset	Basset	Basset
53.	Walkelino	Walkelino	Walkelin
54.	stephani	Stephani	Stephen
55.	Willelmo	Willelmo	William
56.	wascelin	Wascelin	Wascelin
57.	Galfrido	Galfrido	Geoffrey
58.	watervile	Wateruile	Waterville
59.	<b>Normano</b>	<b>Normanno</b>	<b>Norman</b>
60.	<b>malcomi</b>	<b>malcolmi</b>	<b>Malcolm/Mael Coluim</b>
61.	inuerurin	—	Inverurie (ABD)
62.	henrico	Henrico	Henry
63.	<b>beuile</b>	<b>Beyuile</b>	<b>Boyle/Boiville</b>
64.	Matheo	Matheo	Matthew
65.	Simone	Simone	Simon
66.	<b>flamang</b>	<b>flammang</b>	<b>Fleming</b>

---

12. Robert Basset is two places down the witness list in the cartulary copy (i.e., after William Wascelin)

notable that a large proportion of names include an abbreviation of some sort. Although this may not indicate a different pronunciation, orthographically there has not been an attempt by the cartulary scribe to replicate the names exactly. Abbreviations were used not only in common names like *Johannes* or *Willelmus* but also in less common Latinate or vernacular names, such as for Olifard (*olif*<sup>o</sup>), Brechin (*Brechinien*<sup>o</sup>) or Kelso (*kelchoen*<sup>o</sup>).

A number of the names in Table 1 do, however, exhibit some level of orthographic variation. The seventeen names in bold represent 27% of the total (excluding the two names omitted in the cartulary). The variants found in these names can be grouped as follows: sometimes additional letters have been added by the cartulary scribe, as in *Arme(n)gard*, *Be(y)uile*, *Bre(c)hin(i)en*<sup>o</sup>, *Flam(m)ang*, *Inuer(r)urin*, *Malco(l)mi*, *Norman(n)o* and *Prame(th)*; on another occasion, *Lindesei(a)*, a letter has been removed; and sometimes alternative graphemes have been used, as in *Aberbrudoc/Aberbrodoc*, *Kelchoensi/Kelkoensi*, *Londors/Lundors*, *Munkegin/Munkegyn* and *Radmuriel/Rathmuriel* (the alternated graphemes are *u/o*, *ch/k*, *o/u*, *i/y*, *d/th* and *r/l*). Very few if any of these textual variants necessarily represent differences in pronunciation. Some may be accidental scribal errors (especially the *l* rather than *r* in the cartulary scribe's *Rathmuriel*). Other instances are examples of standard graphemic variants (notably *i* and *y*). The general picture, therefore, is one of relatively low level intentionality in relation to orthographic variation. The case of Premnay is less trivial, however. It is a striking example in which the cartulary copy (*Prameth*) appears to have an older version than the original (*Prame*) where the spelling is closer to the modern form (Premnay).<sup>13</sup> Despite being a singular example, this serves as a warning about assuming any change in a later copy was automatically a 'modernisation'.

The overall patterns emerging from this example suggest that the Lindores cartulary scribe, while a relatively proficient copyist generally, was not as a rule trying to replicate for his readers the orthography of names exactly as found in the original document. Neither is it clear, however, that the cartulary scribe

---

13. The cartulary contains other examples of the name: *Lind. Cart.*, no. 2 (f. 29r, *Pramet*), no. 15 (f. 34v, *Prameth*), no. 93 (f. 64v, *Prame*), no. 94 (f. 66v, *Prame*), no. 138 (f. 11v, *Prame*), and no. 139 (f. 12v, *Prameth*). In a lease written by the vicar of Premnay himself on 27 January 1579, the name is spelled variously as *Pramoth*, *Pramay* and *Premnaucht* (Robertson 1857, 399–400). In other sources, it is always spelled with a final fricative, and once with *-cht* (Alexander 1952, 355).

(working in the 1250s) was necessarily updating the orthography of all the names in the original text (datable to 1202 or 1203). Instead, the scribe had choice in how to represent names. The most useful way to conceptualise all of these differences is as textual ‘variance’, rather than necessarily chronological development. ‘Variance’ is also preferable over ‘adaptation’ or ‘modification’ which might imply that the cartulary scribe was being deliberate and consistent.

Let us look at another example in a different institutional context. For this we can return to Swain son of Thor’s late-twelfth-century charter given in translation above. The text of this original charter also appears in Scone Abbey’s earliest cartulary manuscript, datable to the mid-fourteenth century. The only lexical difference between the two is that *quantumcumque* (‘to whatever extent’, ‘as far as’) has become *quandocumque* (‘whenever’) in the cartulary copy. Table 2 presents all the names in this text, following the same approach as Table 1 above. The witness list here begins with ‘John’ at no. 10.

**Table 2:** Names in the original charter (1 Oct 1182 × 31 Dec 1194) and cartulary copy (mid-fourteenth century)<sup>14</sup>

	<i>Original charter</i>	<i>Cartulary copy</i>	<i>Modern form</i>
1.	Svanus	Swanus	Swain
2.	thorii	Thori	Thor
3.	Michaeli	michaeli	Michael
4.	Scona	Scona <sup>15</sup>	Scone
5.	Ahednepobbel	Ahednepobbel	—
6.	Robertus	Robertus	Robert
7.	tubermure	Tubermore	Tibbermore (PER)

14. The original is London, BL Add. Ch. 66568. An image, transcription and translation of this document will soon be available to view via <https://www.modelsofauthority.ac.uk>. The cartulary copy is Edinburgh, NLS Adv. MS 34.3.29, ff. 21v–22r. It is printed as *Scone Lib.*, no. 21 (this is taken from the cartulary copy, not the original). For the text’s record in *PoMS*, see: <https://www.poms.ac.uk/record/source/5458/> (accessed 17/05/21).

15. Ordinarily this abbreviation might be ambiguous. The scribe has probably contracted the name in this case because he was at the end of the line and close to the page’s inner margin. In other instances of ‘Scone’, he always renders it *Scona*.

8.	Lochethin	Lochethin <sup>6</sup>	Lochty Burn
9.	henrici	Henrici	Henry
10.	Iohanne	Iohanne	John
11.	Dunkeld'	Dunkeldens'	Dunkeld
12.	Roberto	Roberto	Robert
13.	b'kelei <sup>17</sup>	B'clay	Berkeley/Barclay
14.	hugone	hugone	Hugh
15.	kaled'	kaleder	Calder
16.	Macbeth	Macbeth	Macbeth
17.	gouerin	Gouryn	Gowrie
18.	Galfrido	Galfrido	Geoffrey
19.	pert	perth	Perth
20.	Willelmo	Willelmo	William
21.	forf	Forfar	Forfar
22.	henrico	henrico	Henry
23.	Philippo	philipo	Phillip
24.	Vuieth	vuieth	Uvieth
25.	Iacob <sup>18</sup>	Iacobo	James
26.	pert	perth	Perth
27.	Andrea	Andrea	Andrew
28.	Willelmo	Willelmo	William
29.	Galfrido	Galfrido	Geoffrey
30.	martini	martini	Martin
31.	Dauid	Dauid	David
32.	henrico	henrico	Henry
33.	Waltero	Waltero	Walter
34.	eadmundo	Ed<mun>do <sup>19</sup>	Edmund

---

16. There is a small chance the scribe might have intended *Lochethni*: there are three minims after the *th*, but the dot for the *i* is suspended above the space between this and the next word on the page, making its intended target ambiguous. However, the *-in* suffix is common in place-names and so *Lochethin* is almost certainly the intention.

17. Because of the abbreviations, it is not clear whether *Bar-* or *Ber-* is intended in each case.

18. The charter scribe has omitted to indicate the *o* which should be included to make the name (which is in the witness list) ablative.

19. There are actually six, rather than seven, minims between the *d* and *d*, making the spelling here ambiguous.

In this example, ten names (29%) have been subject to some level of textual variance – a similar rate to the Lindores example (27%). Again, the orthographic variation is mostly at a low level of intentionality. Strikingly, the first of the lands being given here – ‘Ahednepobbel’, an unidentified place – has been transmitted precisely in the cartulary. As a more unusual name, this raises the possibility that in this case the scribe copied its form more closely, in contrast to more familiar places (e.g., Perth, Dunkeld and Scone) which could be written without having to depend on the exemplar’s orthography. For vernacular names, instances of non-variance can be as notable as those of variance.

The comparisons made here are two isolated examples in a corpus of thousands of texts. Future work comparing names in originals and cartularies would undoubtedly deepen our understanding of orthographic variation in other scribal contexts. As has been mentioned, however, very often the original charter itself has been lost and so any variations in transmission cannot be demonstrated or tested. The preceding examples indicate that cartulary copyists did not necessarily represent the original spellings of all of the names in the charter itself. This pattern can also be demonstrated in one final example, which looks at the same text across different cartulary copies.

It is not uncommon for a single institution to have multiple cartularies, and therefore multiple copies of the same text from their archive. A good example in a Scottish context is Arbroath Abbey, which has three principal cartularies: one in Dundee (Dundee City Archives GD 130/25/17, known as the ‘Ethie MS’), one in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh (Adv. MS 34.4.2, known as the *Registrum Vetus*) and one in the British Library (Add. MS 33245). All three have suffered losses of folios, but it is possible to still identify eleven texts which appear in all three.<sup>20</sup> In one mid-thirteenth century charter, Abbot Walter gave Philip of Feodarg lands called Auchnieve in Tarves, Aberdeenshire. There are very few lexical differences between these three copies, though there is one example of ‘eye skip’ in the BL cartulary leading to an omitted clause, including one name.<sup>21</sup> Table 3 presents all of the names in this text across the three

---

20. I am grateful to Hilary Stevenson for providing this figure, which is from her study of these manuscripts as part of her PhD at the University of Glasgow. The texts are *Arb. Lib.*, i, nos. 98, 101, 104, 121, 143, 144, 256, 257, 264, 266 and 271.

21. The scribe of the BL cartulary skipped a line after *qui vocatur*, therefore omitting: *Kertheny versus orientem et sicut ille riuuulus descendit in alium riuuulum qui vocatur*. Other differences between these three texts are as follows: the BL MS scribe replaced one *illum*



manuscripts. In this text, the witness list does not contain any names, it being witnessed ‘by our chapter’ (*capitulum nostrum*).

**Table 3:** Names in a charter of Abbot Walter across three Arbroath Abbey cartularies<sup>22</sup>

	<i>Ethie MS</i> (late 13 <sup>th</sup> or early 14 <sup>th</sup> cent. scribe) <sup>23</sup>	<i>Registrum Vetus</i> (14 <sup>th</sup> cent. scribe)	<i>BL MS</i> (16 <sup>th</sup> cent. scribe) <sup>24</sup>	<i>Modern form</i>
1.	Walterus	Walterus	Walterus	Walter
2.	Abirbrohoc <sup>25</sup>	Abirbr’	ab’br’	Arbroath
3.	Philippo	Philippo	philippo	Philip
4.	Fedarg’	Fedarg’	fedarg’	Feodarg (Meldrum, ABD)
5.	Tarvays	Taruays	tarwes	Tarves (ABD)
6.	Achatnaneue	achathnaneue	auchneue	Auchnieve (ABD)
7.	blarbury	blarbury	blarbury	—
8.	Kertheny	kertheny	—	—
9.	Louchlony	lochlouny	louchlony	—
10.	Philippi	Philippi	philippi	Philip
11.	Philippo	Philippo	philippo	Philip

with *alium*; the BL MS scribe omitted *nostris* in the phrase *successoribus nostris libere*; the *Registrum Vetus* scribe has *heredes sui vel* where the other two have *heredes vel*; and the *Registrum Vetus* scribe has *regis seruicium quantum* where the other two have *regis quantum*. The rubrics also differ in each case.

22. The text is published as *Arb. Lib.*, i, no. 257. It is datable to 21 June 1246 × 15 December 1261: <https://www.poms.ac.uk/record/source/2258/> (accessed 17/05/21). It appears in the *Ethie MS* (Dundee City Archives GD 130/25/17) in the seventh gathering on f. 5v; in the *Registrum Vetus* (Edinburgh, Adv. MS 34.4.2) on f. 20r; and in the BL MS (Add. MS 33245) on f. 183r.

23. This is not the work of the ‘main scribe’ in this cartulary (who appears to be working in the mid-thirteenth century). It is a later addition by a scribe whose form of ‘Anglicana’ handwriting indicates probably the second half of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century.

24. Many of the proper nouns in this manuscript are given a red highlight. Capitalisation here does not take this into consideration.

25. The scribe has seemingly tried to change the second *o* (possibly to a *t*). In the text following this one he renders it: Aberbroth’.

There is a close relationship between the Ethie MS (originally created in the mid-thirteenth century) and the *Registrum Vetus* (originally created probably in the third quarter of the fourteenth century), with the central core of the Ethie MS seemingly used as a source for the central core of the *Registrum Vetus*. This particular text, however, was a later addition to the Ethie MS. It is probable that the *Registrum Vetus* scribe used the Ethie MS as his source; on the other hand, the nature of the textual variance might suggest that both scribes used the original charter as their exemplar – it cannot be proven either way.<sup>26</sup> The BL MS (originally created some time after 1531) is quite different from the other two, so it is probable that this scribe used the original document as his source.

Table 3 indicates some unsurprising consistency in relation to the names *Philippus* and *Walterus* across the three cartularies. Variance can be found, however, especially in the vernacular names such as Auchnieve and Tarves. These also appear in some of the rubrics as well, where the spellings diverge from the texts themselves: *achnaneue* (Ethie MS rubric), *achineue* (*Registrum Vetus* rubric) and *authnuf* (BL MS rubric). The BL MS alone has Tarves in its rubric, rendered *taruas*. This example from Arbroath reinforces the notion that cartulary copies are ultimately texts that were the product of a particular scribe writing at a particular moment. Orthographic variants are not uncommon in this context, especially in relation to vernacular place-names. This variability must to some extent reflect the scribe's own understanding of orthographic conventions as well as the particular context of their work.

Cartulary scribes therefore seem to have had some freedom and flexibility in how they rendered names. It seems likely, from the examples here, that all charter texts would have undergone some textual variance in copying, even if only at a low level and only in a proportion of the names. There is, unfortunately, no way of telling how much variance has occurred from the cartulary copy alone. How, then, can these copied names be used most effectively in the study of early forms? As a starting point, it is necessary to have confidence in the date of the name-form. To achieve this, the names must be viewed through the lens

---

26. The order of the texts is the same in the Ethie MS and *Registrum Vetus*, suggesting the latter followed the former. However, the *Registrum Vetus* scribe has two additional words in his text (those in brackets have been included by him but not by the other two scribes): *heredes (sui) vel*, and *regis (servicium) quantum*. The former is perhaps less significant, but the latter in particular might suggest that he was working independently of the Ethie MS.

of the individual scribes. This is especially important since a single cartulary manuscript can contain the work of multiple different scribes all working independently and often at different periods. Only once the individual scribes have been distinguished can their work be accurately dated. The process of dating a cartulary scribe's work is, however, not always straightforward.

#### DATING NAMES IN MEDIEVAL CARTULARIES

Cartulary scribes almost never explicitly reveal when they were working. Only in a few instances where the manuscript was drawn up by a notary public can we be confident about its date of creation. In a Scottish context, prominent examples are Cambuskenneth Abbey's cartulary drawn up by the Lord Clerk Register in 1535 (Edinburgh, NLS Adv. MS 34.1.2) and Coldstream Priory's cartulary drawn up by a notary public in 1434 (London, BL Harley MS 6670). In most cases, to date the scribe's work we are reliant on a combination of the look of their handwriting (which can be analysed for datable palaeographical features) and the date of the material they copied (which can provide a *terminus post quem*, a terminal date after which they must have been working). Where a scribe has copied a large number of texts, it is usual to look to the latest text in their batch as a *terminus post quem* for their work. In the case of cartularies, it is all too easy to assume that the scribe was likely to have been working very soon after the date of that latest text. This was not necessarily the case. The scribes were often selective in what they chose to include and usually did not treat the manuscript as a 'register' for all of their charters. Palaeographical analysis is therefore an important accompaniment to any such study for honing the date of the scribes' work.

Any dating method is complicated all the more by the fact that many cartularies contain the work of multiple different scribes working across many decades or even centuries in a piecemeal fashion. How can these scribes' work be dated?<sup>27</sup> Table 4 presents a portion of Lindores Abbey's cartulary notable for its sequence of multi-scribe, single-text additions (ff. 5v–10v). The 'real time date' column presents the date of the charter texts themselves. The texts are internally dated in all but one instance where only a date range can be established, based on its contents: the charter was produced no earlier than 1 January 1257 but no later than 28 April 1264. Fortunately, firm dates for

---

27. This is a summary of a methodology more fully laid out in Tucker 2020b, chapter 2, esp. 76–84.

Scotland's charter texts (up to 1314, and royal charters up to 1371) are provided via *PoMS* ([www.poms.ac.uk](http://www.poms.ac.uk)). These dates can then be used to build a series of 'relative dates' for each contribution: the *earliest* possible moment that the cartulary scribe was copying their text into the cartulary. These dates are 'relative' because they depend on the texts that come before them in a sequence of additions. The methodology attempts to separate out these two distinct moments in a cartulary text's production: the moment that the text itself was created (the 'real time date'), and the moment it was copied into the cartulary manuscript (the 'relative date'). The information in Table 4, including the scribe numbers and relative dates, have been extracted from Tucker 2020b where the entire manuscript's scribes and dates are given.

**Table 4:** A section of the Lindores Abbey cartulary

<i>Scribe</i>	<i>Folio</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>'Real time date'</i>	<i>'Relative date'</i>	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>
Scribe 9	ff. 5v–6r	Charter of John de Mowbray	22 Jan 1301	After 22 Jan 1301	no. 133
Scribe 10	ff. 6v–7r	Instruction of King David II	29 Mar 1342	After 29 Mar 1342	no. 134
Scribe 11	f. 7r–v	Charter of Roger de Quincy	1257 × 28 Apr 1264	"	no. 135
Scribe 12	ff. 8r–9r	Charter of Helen, lady of Kinloch	24 Aug 1302	"	no. 136
Scribe 13	ff. 9r–10v	Charter of Roger de Quincy	8 Mar 1248	"	no. 137

This 'relative dating' methodology can have some significant implications for understanding the work of the individual scribes and the active life of the manuscript as a whole. Despite copying a text dated 8 March 1248, for example, Scribe 13 can be shown to be working certainly after 29 March 1342, after the

instruction copied by Scribe 10 had come into existence. This is because of the basic physical sequence of texts on the page: Scribe 13 must have added his text to the manuscript after Scribe 10. Scribe 13 could have been working much later than this still, of course. Relative dates such as ‘after 29 March 1342’ are simply a *terminus post quem* – the absolute earliest date that the cartulary scribe could have been copying their text(s) based on the sequence of preceding texts. To hone each scribe’s date of working further we can look to datable features in their handwriting, though usually such palaeographical analysis only narrows the date to within a quarter century at best. In this particular case, the handwriting of Scribes 9–13, simply taken on its own, points to the mid- or late fourteenth century.

In some cases, the resulting relative date can be very complex if it is based on undated charters with large date ranges: for example, a cartulary scribe’s relative date might be ‘after (12 July 1253 × 31 December 1273)’. What this means is that the cartulary scribe was working sometime after a particular moment in this date range (inclusive of the outer extremes). Despite their convoluted construction, such precision in dating is vital for maintaining a firm grasp over the multi-scribe portions of these manuscripts. Other factors must also be born in mind when applying this methodology. Mostly notably, it must be clear what the sequences of texts are, how these map onto the individual gatherings in the manuscript, and whether the texts were all added consecutively. Some scribes, for example, might have squeezed their text into a space at a later date, and therefore they would be excluded from the relative dating sequence.

Relative dating essentially formalises a methodology for reading texts in their ‘manuscript context’. What is significant about relative dates is that they provide firm earliest dates for each individual scribe’s contribution, offering an element of precision in what can otherwise seem like a haphazard assortment of scribal activity. Once these foundations are laid, it is possible to build a more robust understanding of each scribe’s work and, ultimately, to more precisely date each name-form which appears in the cartulary. We are now equipped to explore this in practice.

#### EXAMPLES OF PLACE-NAMES IN LINDORES ABBEY’S CARTULARY

Lindores Abbey’s earliest cartulary provides an apposite case study for examining datable name-forms in a medieval cartulary. Its scribes have recently been systematically analysed with their relative dates established and

palaeographical analysis completed (Tucker 2020b).<sup>28</sup> The abbey itself (founded c.1190) is situated in Fife. This means that many of the abbey's properties are found in a region of Scotland where extensive topographical analysis has been undertaken by Simon Taylor and Gilbert Márkus (*PNF*, 5 vols). The cartulary manuscript was created by one scribe in the 1250s. The remaining spaces, and then fresh gatherings, were added to in a piecemeal way by dozens of scribes across the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and possibly sixteenth centuries. The manuscript, which measures approximately 18cm × 12cm, now comprises ten gatherings (87 folios) which were bound into their current form sometime in the late fifteenth or sixteenth century. It is a multi-layered object which can be used to track how individual copyists from a single community in the late middle ages responded to particular place-names. A sample of these names have been assembled in the appendix where they are given in their manuscript form along with their scribe and dating information. The discussion here draws out key points of interest from this sample.

#### *The sample of names in the appendix*

Nine examples of place-names are given in the appendix. These were primarily selected because they have been copied by multiple different scribes and therefore offer an insight into a range of orthographic practices. The cartulary contains many more names that meet this criterion that could be analysed in future. The nine names, with their pre-1975 counties, are Clashbenny (PER), Collessie (FIF), Exmagirdle (PER), Inchtute (PER), Inverbervie (KCD), Kinloch (FIF), Makerstoun (ROX), Muthill (PER) and Tillykerrie (ABD). They identify churches (Collessie, Exmagirdle, Muthill), fisheries (Clashbenny), villas, tofts or other lands and settlements (Collessie, Exmagirdle, Inverbervie, Kinloch, Tillykerrie), surnames (Adam of Makerstoun) and occupational titles (Thomas Rossy, vicar of Inchtute).

The individual scribes' knowledge of these places would have been mixed. It is likely that they would have been more familiar with those places in which the abbey had explicit rights or held lands or churches. This covers all of the sample except for the two place-names that feature only in a surname or title (Makerstoun and Inchtute), which may or may not have been known to the scribes. The appendix allows all of the orthographies to be compared across the

---

28. For much of the analysis here and in Tucker 2020b, I have used private digital images of the manuscript.

cartulary, across different dates and scribes as well as different written contexts – within the body of a text and in rubrics. Each table attempts to list the entries chronologically by scribe, though it is not always possible to be absolutely precise about this.

### *The cartulary scribes*

The cartulary's 35 scribes have been numbered according to their order in the manuscript today (which reflects the gatherings' late-fifteenth- or sixteenth-century binding), not their chronological order of working: the earliest, for example, is 'Scribe 21' since he does not appear until f. 28.<sup>29</sup> There are also a number of later scribes who added rubrics or small notes in the margins. They have been identified here with letters (Rubric scribe A, Rubric scribe B, etc.).<sup>30</sup>

The first thing to point out is that the appendix reveals examples of scribes who were potentially working soon after the date of the text's creation as well as scribes who were demonstrably working much later than the original text they were copying. Scribe 16, for example, has a relative date of 'after 7 January 1278 × 28 May 1279' but his handwriting includes features which clearly locate him in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, roughly a century or more after the date of the charters he copied. For Scribes 11–13, by contrast, the palaeography on its own is less diagnostic but the relative dates are unambiguous in exposing that they were working many decades or even a century after the date of their texts (see Table 4, above). Scribe 21, who was the earliest scribe and who copied 102 texts into the cartulary, can be dated quite precisely to after 12 July 1253 but before 27 March 1260 (Tucker 2020b, 174–5). This means that many of his texts were demonstrably a number of decades old at the time, but some were more recent. Those scribes who only added rubrics to the manuscript were all working much later than the texts themselves, especially Rubric scribe A who was certainly working after 24 May 1457 and potentially as late as the sixteenth century.<sup>31</sup> This does mean that many texts

---

29. The 35 scribes are identified and discussed in Tucker 2020b, 146.

30. The rubric scribes are identified here for the first time: they are not included among the numbered scribes (as explained in Tucker 2020b, 61–2).

31. The latest text to which this scribe added a rubric was *Lind. Cart.*, no. 152 (at f. 26r), which is dated 24 May 1457. Due to the limited nature of his contributions, Rubric scribe A's handwriting cannot be narrowed further than the second half of the fifteenth or the sixteenth century. This scribe added rubrics to the following folios: ff. 3r, 3v, 4r, 5r, 5v, 8r,

existed in the manuscript without a rubric for a long time, sometimes for well over a century.

### *Orthographic consistency and variation*

The place-names themselves exhibit a spectrum of orthographic variation. Some scribes, for example, display a level of consistency when writing a name multiple times. The only variation, if any, might be in their use of a general abbreviation mark at the end of the word. Scribe 9 was consistent in his spelling of *Eglismagril* (five instances in one text). Scribe 16 regularly represented Collessie as *Cullessyn* (fourteen instances across six different texts, five with an abbreviation mark at the end, nine without); Rubric scribe D consistently opted for *Cowlessy* (three instances) or *Cowless'* (two instances); and for Rubric scribe A it was always *Cullessi* (three instances). Without the original documents to hand, it is impossible to know whether this consistency reflects the scribe's exemplars or their own orthographic practice.

It was also possible for a scribe to vary how they spelled a name, often only slightly. Scribe 21, for example, wrote Exmagirdle as *Eglesmagril* on twenty occasions, but twice he opted for *Eglesmagrille*. A name's spelling might even vary within a single text. Scribe 15 switched between *Culessin'* (three instances) and *Coulessin* (twice) in the same text. In Scribe 13's text, he was almost consistent with *Kyndeloch* (four times) except for one instance of *Kyndoloch*. Tillykerry exhibits particularly striking variations, with Scribe 21's *Tholachker'* (in the rubric) and *Tolaukery* (in the text), and Scribe 6's *Tholankery* and *Tolankeri*. The choice of graphemes might also vary. There are cases where these were clearly viewed as interchangeable, such as *c* and *k* in Scribe 16's Makerstoun (*Malcarston'*/*Malkarston'*), and *y* and *i* in Scribe 21's Clashbenny (*Glesbanin*/*Glesbanyn*). While this variation may not be surprising, and they may make no difference to the pronunciation or meaning of the name, the use of alternative graphemes is notable from the perspective of the scribe's copying practice.

Some names appear at first sight to be relatively 'stable'. Muthill, for example, did not vary greatly. Scribe 21 opted for *Mothel* (on seventeen occasions across nine texts), as did Scribe 9. There were, however, other options. Scribe 34, for example, has *Moethel*. Scribe 21 included one instance of *Methel*,

---

11r, 12r, 12v, 13v, 15v, 16r, 17r, 17v, 26r, 35r, 35v, 36r, 49v, 57v, 58r, 58v, 60v, 61r, 62r, 62v, 63v, 72r, 72v, 73v, 74r, 75r, 78v, 79v, 80r, 80v, 81r, 81v, 82r, 82v, 83v, 85r, and 86v.



found in a list of signatories which, notably, also included an example of *Mothele*: Luke, vicar of *Methel*, and Murdoch, prior of the céli Dé of *Mothele* (*Lind. Cart.*, no. 51). It is tempting to imagine that Scribe 21's *Methel* was not a mistaken *e* for *o* and might instead truly reflect the way this name was recorded in the original charter, which in turn imitated the way that the charter scribe heard the name uttered at the time.<sup>32</sup> Without the original document, however, this cannot be tested.

Another notable case of variation is Scribe 16's rendering of Makerstoun. This he wrote multiple times when copying a series of documents relating to Adam of Makerstoun's resignation of the church of Collessie to the abbey. In his first three texts it appears as *Malcarinston*' (*Lind. Cart.*, nos. 141–3); in the next three it changes to *Malcarston*'/*Malkarston*' (*Lind. Cart.*, nos. 144–6). (The *-in-* form of the name will be discussed further below.) This variance equates to a shift from four to three syllables, bringing the name closer to its present-day form. There is no particular distinction in the date or content of the texts themselves at this point that would explain the shift. The documents are all datable to the 1260s and 1270s, though Scribe 16 was writing a century later in the third quarter of the fourteenth century. On balance, this seems most likely to be a case in which Scribe 16 updated the form of the name as he wrote, potentially allowing his own familiarity with the place to influence his copying practice. It may be significant to note that Scribe 16 also ceased to add a suspension stroke at the end of *Cullessyn*' at the same moment, although he remained consistent in his rendering of Kinloch (*Kyndeloch*'). If the analysis here is correct, then this would be one of the few examples in the sample where

---

32. It is not possible to compare the rendering of Luke's title in any other texts since, according to *PoMS*, this is the only instance where he is identified as vicar of Muthill (he was also archdeacon of Dunblane, dean of Dunblane, and possibly a clerk of Bishop Abraham of Dunblane and a clerk of William del Bois, the chancellor): <https://www.poms.ac.uk/record/person/3764/> (accessed 17/05/21). Angus Watson (2002, 418–19) lists one example of *Metthel* in an original charter datable to c.1272. The other original charters he lists have *Mothele* 1172 × 1173; *Mothele* 1195 × 1198; *Muothle* c.1200; and *Mothele* 1234. Watson did not consult the published edition of the Lindores cartulary (*Lind. Cart.*), though he does pick up Scribe 34's instance of *Moethel* via Neville 1983, Add. Chrs., no. 2. There is an example of *Meothill* in the sixteenth-century register of Cambuskenneth Abbey in a text datable to 1200 × 1203 (*Camb. Reg.*, no. 217; also *SEA*, i, no. 37).

it is relatively clear that the scribe moved from an existing written form to a more familiar form as he worked.

Further examples of orthographic variation and consistency can be found in the appendix. The examples highlighted here serve as an illustration of the kinds of patterns that can be observed. It is worth reiterating that these patterns cannot be read as a direct reflection of the original exemplar texts; instead, many may have originated with the cartulary scribes themselves as they copied. What also emerges is that if cartulary scribes did vary name-forms, they may not have done this consistently, even when they copied the same name repeatedly within a single batch of texts.

### *Names in rubrics*

The cartulary's rubrics introduce an additional layer of copied names. These were often written by the 'text scribes' themselves, but sometimes a later scribe has added one either in addition to, or usually in the absence of, the text scribe's rubric. Later rubrics are a common phenomenon in cartularies generally. It can probably be assumed that these later scribes were not looking at the original charters but were responding only to the text in the cartulary itself. The function of the rubric was to draw a reader's attention to a text and its content. Rubrics therefore present a distinctly valuable context in which to examine how scribes rendered names.

An eye-catching phenomenon is where the text spelling differs from that scribe's own rubric spelling. This might suggest that the scribe was following the old form in the text but using an updated form in the rubric to more clearly signpost the name for contemporary readers. In both the texts and the rubrics for documents relating to Exmagirdle, Scribe 21 was relatively consistent in his spelling (*Eglesmagril*). In his documents relating to Clashbenny, however, Scribe 21 opted for *Glesbanin*/*Glesbanyn* in the four texts themselves but *Glasbani* in the rubrics. Rubric scribe A, on the other hand, later added a rubric where the name mirrored the text (*Glesbanin*), not Scribe 21's rubric. Scribe 24 and Scribe 7 both adopted a spelling of Collessie in their rubrics that differed from that in their own copied texts (in both cases the rubric was *Cullessy*). There are also particularly pronounced examples of later rubric scribes varying the spelling of Collessie, opting for *Cullessi* (Rubric scribe A), *Cullessy* (Rubric scribe

B), *Cullessi* (Rubric scribe C) and *Cowlessy* (Rubric scribe D). Rubric scribe D's five instances of *Cowlessy* are particularly distinctive, as well as consistent.<sup>33</sup>

Rubric scribes, especially later rubric scribes, did not, therefore, necessarily replicate the spellings of texts themselves. They were more than capable of changing the orthography. Given the variation that can be witnessed in the rubrics, it seems possible that scribes felt freer to 'modernise' the names to reflect their own understanding of its visual, and possibly phonological, identity. It was, after all, the function of a rubric to act as a signpost for readers. It is striking, however, to find an example where modernisation was likely not happening: Rubric scribe A's spelling of Clashbeny in the later fifteenth or sixteenth century as *Glesbanin* (including an *-in* suffix) appears to be an older form than *Glasbani* in the rubric by Scribe 21, the earliest cartulary scribe (this name and the *-in* suffix will be discussed further below). Rubrics did, therefore, offer an opportunity for some flexibility and scribal choice.<sup>34</sup>

A remarkable feature of Scribe 21's work (the earliest scribe) is that, as well as his red-ink rubrics in the body of the text, he has also written black-ink notes in the lower margins of some folios. Many of these correspond to the red-ink rubrics in the text block. A conceivable explanation is that these black-ink notes were the endorsements on the reverse side of the original documents which Scribe 21 noted in the lower margins of the cartulary for when he returned later

---

33. The name Collessie has a complex origin. Simon Taylor (*PNF* 4, 211) has pointed out that Collessie (the parish) and Colzie (earlier *Culesin*, later part of Abernethy parish) both originated from the same name. At some point a distinction led to a divergence in the stress (Colzie on the first syllable, Collessie on the second).

34. Another example can be found in Cambuskenneth Abbey's cartulary (produced and authenticated in 1535) where names in rubrics sometimes differ from what appears in the text itself. On occasion, this may be an updating of the name-form: for example, in *Camb. Reg.*, no. 192 (24 May 1153 × 1174) the text reads *Petcorthyn* where the rubric reads *Petcorthy* (Pitcorthie, FIF). The rubrics might also show a knowledge of the modern place by referring to a name not actually mentioned in the text itself: for example, the text of *Camb. Reg.*, no. 190 (also *CDI*, no. 213) describes David I's grant of easements in his wood of *Keltor*, which in the rubric has become *Torwod* (Tor Wood). The rubric also mentions *Mobbiscroft* which does not appear in the text at all. The cartulary scribe did not, however, update or standardise all names in the rubrics: a single name often appears with varying orthographies in different rubrics. I am grateful to Simon Taylor for drawing my attention to the variation in rubric names in this cartulary. I have only checked the names in the printed edition, not the manuscript itself.

with the red ink. Cropping of the folios means that only a handful of these black-ink notes are still visible. Significantly for our purposes, however, a few names are visible in these cropped notes. These provide yet another context for copying names, and are therefore worthy of some attention.

Ten different names can be discerned in the lower margins of eight different pages (ff. 31v, 32r, 32v, 33r, 34r, 35r, 57r and 71r). (Only one of these names, Clashbenny, features in the sample in the appendix.) In four instances, the red-ink and black-ink names are identical: *Lundors* (Lindores), *Rugesablun* (probably now Mugdrum Island),<sup>35</sup> *Wissinden'* (Whissendine), and *Witheston* (Whitestone). In the other six examples, however, there has been a change in the orthography. These variations are as follows, moving from Scribe 21's black-ink notes to his red-ink rubrics: *Cusamuel* > *Culsamuel* (Culsalmond); *Munkegyn* > *Munkegin* (Monkeigie); *Redinche* > *Redinch* (now Mugdrum Island); *Neutyle* > *Neutyl* (Newtyle); *Glesbany* > *Glasbani* (Clashbenny); *Cuningoton'* > *Cunington'* and *Cunigton'* (in this case there are two red-ink rubrics on the same page, each with a different spelling of Conington). Overall, these are relatively minor orthographic variations. Even so, they further illustrate that scribes seem to have had a free hand in how names were transmitted in the context of rubrics, even when the 'exemplar' for the rubric was on the same page.

#### *Evidence for linguistic developments?*

The preceding discussion has looked at variance in names across the manuscript. But how far can the information in the appendix reveal phonological changes in the pronunciation of these names across time? For this question, the firm dating methodology is essential. Some initial observations will be offered here, but further and more detailed analysis in future would be welcome.

Exmagirdle appears to exhibit an orthographic change in its first element from *Egles-* in the 1250s (Scribe 21's texts) to *Eglis-* in the second or third quarter of the fourteenth century (Scribe 9's text), though this may not be so significant phonologically. In the case of Inverbervie, there is evidently a chronological

---

35. This name is discussed in *PNF* 4, 63, n. 7 and *Lind. Cart.*, p. 260. Mugdrum Island appears as *Redinche* in the cartulary. Both elements in *Rugesablun* are French: *rouge* (red) and *sablon* (fine sand). *PNF* 4, 64 rightly points out that this shows French was spoken at the monastery in the early thirteenth century, even though it did not make a lasting impression on the local toponymy.

development in relation to its generic element *inbhir* (Gaelic ‘mouth of (a river)’, OG *inber*): from Scribe 21’s *Inuerberuyn* in the 1250s to Scribe 29’s *Inirberuyn* in the later thirteenth or early fourteenth century and Rubric scribe A’s *Inirberwyn* in the later fifteenth or sixteenth century. This may reflect a sound change from ‘Inver’ to ‘Inner’, one that might also be observable in other *inbhir*- place-names as well.<sup>36</sup>

All of the spellings of Makerstoun in the Lindores cartulary retain a medial *l*. This suggests the first element is likely derived from a personal name containing the Old Gaelic *mael*, ‘servant, devotee’, possibly *Maelgarb* (Berwickshire Place-Name Resource 432, ‘Mellerstain’, 2021) or \**Maelcærf* as suggested by May Williamson (1942, 23). As already mentioned, it is possible to map the loss of a medial syllable throughout the period of the cartulary, essentially from ‘Mal-car-e-ston’ to ‘Mal-car-ston’, though this lost syllable is rendered variously in the manuscript as *wi*, *ui*, *ue*, *e*, and *in*. (The *in* variable may look here as though it could easily be a scribal error for *ui*. The scribe in question – Scribe 16 – is certainly deliberate and consistent in this *in* spelling five times, so if it was a misreading the scribe did not realise it.) It was noted above that Scribe 16 changed from the four-syllable to three-syllable spelling in the middle of his stint of six texts. If this does indeed reflect the scribe updating the name-form midway through his work to a more familiar rendering, then we might posit that the syllable was lost sometime between the third quarter of the thirteenth century (when Scribe 16’s exemplar charters were drawn up) and the third quarter of the fourteenth century (when Scribe 16 himself was writing).<sup>37</sup>

---

36. Looking at examples containing *Inbhir*- in *PNF* (and also being equipped with a knowledge of the date of the manuscript sources to which they refer), it is apparent that a number of cases follow a pattern whereby early on the preference was for an ‘Inver’ spelling, which then developed into ‘Inner’ in the later middle ages (fourteenth or fifteenth centuries), but then sometimes returning to an ‘Inver’ spelling in the early modern period: see *PNF* 1, Inverkunglas, Inverkeithing, Invertiel and Innerleven; *PNF*, iii, Innergellie and Inverie; and *PNF* 4, Inverdovat.

37. The fact that the name’s stress now falls on the first syllable appears odd. I am grateful to Dauvit Broun for sharing the following thought (pers. comm.). It could be that the name *Maelgarb* was borrowed into English as *Maelcarf* (or *Maelcærf* / *Malcærf* / *Malcarf*), with stress on the first syllable, as in English (cf. *Malcolm*). A parallel would be *Manderston* which, it has been suggested, could include the name *Maldred* which in turn could be an English name borrowed from Gaelic *Mael Doraid* (Berwickshire Place-Name Resource 392, ‘Manderston’, 2021; Woolf 2007, 250).

One linguistic feature that can be detected in a few names in the sample is the *-in* suffix, common in early place-names given its possible meaning 'place of' or 'place at' (*PNF* 5, 407–11). This element has often been replaced by *-ie* or *-y*. There are many possible reasons for this development, discussed by Ó Maolalaigh 1998 (30–8) who suggests that *-in* endings began to disappear in the fourteenth century, though in some cases as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the Lindores cartulary, the evidence is complicated. Inverbervie, for example, always appears with this suffix: in the 1250s (Scribe 21's *Inuerberuyn*), in the second half of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century (Scribe 29's *Inirberuyn*'), and in the later medieval period (Rubric scribe A's *Inirberwyn*). The *-in* or *-yn* ending appears in some versions of Collessie, though the name's chronological progression is complex: the suffix was absent from Scribe 21 and Scribe 24's writing in the thirteenth century (*Culessy*, *Colessy*, *Cullessy*); it was then present in Scribe 15's work in the thirteenth or fourteenth century (*Culessin*', *Coulessin*); it was also present across the fourteenth century in the work of Scribe 7, Scribe 8 and Scribe 16 (*Culessin*, *Culessyn*, *Cullessin*, *Cullessyn*', *Cullessyn*); and it was then absent in the work of the later Rubric scribes A, C and D (*Culessy*, *Cullessi*, *Cowlessy*, *Cowless*', *Cullessi*). If Scribe 16 was indeed inclined to opt sometimes for updated forms of names (as with Makerstoun, discussed above), it is notable that his version of Collessie was spelled with the *-in* suffix as *Cullessyn* or *Cullessyn*'. This does not mean that the *-in* forms of names were coming in and out of speech at the abbey, of course. Instead, it reflects scribes who may have been more or less comfortable with copying older forms of a name. The inclusion of the *-in* suffix ultimately appears to reflect individual scribal choice.

Another example which seems to include this suffix is Clashbenny, which can be found with or without a final *-in* or *-yn* (*Glesbanin* and *Glasbani*). It can be shown that the first element of this name was originally *\*eglēs*, as found in original thirteenth-century charters.<sup>38</sup> The element later seems to have assimilated to Gaelic *clais* ('ditch, trench'; *dil.ie*/9383), with the scribes confusing the initial sound of /k/ for /g/ (for a discussion of this phenomenon,

---

38. It appears once as *Ecclesdouenanin* in a royal confirmation of 5 March, 1217 × 1219 (*RRS*, iii, no. 33; *Spalding Misc.*, ii, 'Errol Charters', no. 6); and once as *Egclisbanyn* in 1258 (*Spalding Misc.*, ii, 'Errol Charters', no. 9). The first reading is taken from *RRS*, iii; the *Spalding Misc.* version incorrectly has *Ecclesdouenauin*.

see *PNF* 5, 161).<sup>39</sup> It is notable that these two forms – with *\*eglēs* and with *clais* – could exist simultaneously in the mid-thirteenth century (in original charters and in Scribe 21's cartulary copy). As for the second element, it is thought to be the saint Beinén/Beinian/Benignus.<sup>40</sup> It is not, therefore, originally an *–in* place-name. Nevertheless, the name appears to have been assimilated to an *–in* name (for the phenomenon of personal names being treated as if they had an *–in* suffix, see *PNF* 5, 409). In this instance, perhaps the second element became *bán* ('white, fair, bright' or 'unoccupied land'; *dil.ie/5318*). Thus, the name may have developed from *\*eglēs Beinén* ('church of St Beinén) to *clais bán-in* ('place of the white trench'), with the final *–n* then dropped.<sup>41</sup> Through the Lindores cartulary, these developments can be said to have happened by the thirteenth century. Again, we can look at the work of Scribe 21 in the 1250s, who notably opted for different suffixes in discrete contexts: within the texts themselves the final *–n* was included (*Glesbanin/Glesbanyin*) but in the rubrics and a cropped note it was not (*Glasbani/Glesbany*). Not only might two forms of a name be current in charters produced within the same broader society, they could even be current in the same 'text'. It might be tempting to argue that Scribe 21 was opting for a more recognisable, even modernised, form of the name in his rubrics while retaining the original spelling in the texts themselves. That would make this an early case of dropping the *–in* suffix at Lindores by the 1250s. Scribe 21 himself was not working much later than the moment when the texts themselves relating to Clashbenny were drawn up.<sup>42</sup> Unless the *–in* suffix was dropped at Lindores in a short window of time (say, during the 1240s), the most compelling explanation is that multiple orthographies were available and acceptable to scribes, even if they represented different pronunciations. Indeed, pronunciation may not have been a concern at all, given that the primary function of a cartulary was to allow the texts to be read. Even more strikingly, in

---

39. Simon Taylor (pers. comm.) has suggested that the *clais* here might refer to the navigable 'trench' in the Tay called North Deep, part of which forms the southern march of the lands of Clashbenny.

40. *Saints in Scottish Place-Names*:

[https://saintsplaces.gla.ac.uk/place.php?id=1345207155&name\\_id=28448](https://saintsplaces.gla.ac.uk/place.php?id=1345207155&name_id=28448) (accessed 17/05/21).

41. I am very grateful to Dauvit Broun (pers. comm.) for offering his thoughts on the development of this name.

42. The texts are datable to '29 May 1198 × 18 Apr 1241', 'May 1237 × 19 Mar 1263', and 'after May 1237'.

the second half of the fifteenth or sixteenth century Rubric scribe A returned to the *-in* suffix version of the name (*Glesbanin*), possibly taking his cue from the texts themselves. While some orthographic updating could have occurred, therefore, this does not necessarily apply to all or even most of the cartulary scribes' work.

The *-in* suffix therefore fades in and out of use across the lifetime of the manuscript itself. While the general trend may point towards its demise in speech, it should be remembered that as late as the fourteenth, fifteenth or even sixteenth centuries (in the case of Scribe 16's *Cullessyn*, Rubric scribe A's *Glesbanin*, or his *Inirberwyn*), scribes were content to write names including this suffix.<sup>43</sup> It may be too simplistic to assert that these scribes regarded this as an old fashioned rendering of that name. What is clear is that they had a choice: they did not necessarily have to conform to what they read in the original charter, or to what they saw written elsewhere on that page of the cartulary, or to what may have been the current pronunciation or recognised spelling. In order to use cartularies to map more general phonological developments in names, therefore, it is imperative to understand all of the influencing factors, including different scribes and their (in)consistencies or potential preferences for particular forms, their relative dates of working, the context of their work (whether a rubric or a text), and the presence of the name elsewhere on the page.

The analysis here has provided an initial sketch of the potential opportunities when cartulary scribes' writing is individually identified and precisely dated. Cartularies like Lindores Abbey's are a significant resource for the orthography of place-names, partly because they contain multiple references to the same place in the hands of different scribes, but also because of the simple fact that the scribes themselves, who were members of the monastic community, would have been familiar, sometimes intimately familiar,

---

43. There are other place-names in the Lindores cartulary that might include this element and could therefore be pursued. Examples that are explicitly noted as containing this element in *PNF* 5, 410–11 and that appear in the Lindores cartulary are Abernethy, Craigie, Dairsie and Lundin. A browse of the index to *Lind. Cart.* (which often gives some of the manuscript spellings) can also provide a guide to the potential prevalence of this element. Some possible examples up to letter D include *Balhagerdyn*, *Boverdyn*, and *Dunberdyn*.



with most of these places. Further work could certainly be done to extend and deepen these insights in relation to Lindores Abbey's or other cartularies.

### *Printed editions and digital images*

A final warning ought to be issued in relation to printed editions. Historians remain reliant on editions produced largely in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by antiquarian clubs and societies. While there is no doubt that these publications have been an asset to scholarship, it is now widely recognised that they present their own set of issues. For cartularies in particular, often the manuscript's contents have been rearranged for printing, and limited information is provided about the manuscript's scribes and codicology (Ross 2006; Tucker 2019). It is therefore difficult to reconstruct the manuscript from these publications alone. There can also be specific problems for names studies insofar as the transcriptions might, on occasion, be incorrect. Relevant misreadings in the 1903 Scottish History Society publication of the Lindores cartulary include, for example, *Cowlessy* in the manuscript being printed as *Collelessy* (mistaking *w* for *lle*); *Kyndeloch* printed as *Kyndloche* (removing a medial *e* and adding a final *e*); and *Kyndelouh* printed as *Kyndeloich* (reading the grapheme *u* as *ic*).<sup>44</sup> These misreadings can end up in other resources which in turn rely on these printed editions, including *PoMS* and *PNF*. It is also worth being aware that, in general, the 1903 edition silently expands abbreviations (one common example being *-er* abbreviations).

In most cases, the transcriptions in these editions are correct. The sample in the appendix includes around 150 instances of a name in the manuscript; only three of these were misread by the editor (the examples just given above). The printed publications can also be a substantial aid in reading the text in cases where the ink is now faded, for example. But they are not substitutes for the original manuscripts. Printed editions, for example, typically hide the physical features of the manuscript – including the scribes, their handwriting, the gatherings, and the order of the texts – which are so important for establishing a scribe's relative date of working.

This is where digitisation has serious potential for changing how we conduct research into manuscripts and their texts. It may very soon become normal to begin any study with the digital images of the manuscript or document in

---

44. These examples are, respectively, *Lind. Cart.*, no. 140 (rubric, f. 12v); *Lind. Cart.*, no. 137 (rubric, f. 9r); and *Lind. Cart.*, no. 114 (f. 78v).

question, rather than solely starting with its printed edition. For this study of Lindores Abbey's cartulary, private digital images have been essential in allowing for sustained and detailed analysis of the scribes and texts. The National Library of Scotland's 'digital transition' is set to make digital images of most of its medieval manuscripts freely available online, which happens to include a large proportion of Scotland's cartularies (Tucker 2020a). Such mass digitisation certainly has the potential to fundamentally influence the research process. Digital images will also make the complex, multi-scribe nature of these manuscripts, and their varied orthographies, all the more apparent.

## CONCLUSION

Written names are first and foremost the product of a scribe's hand. This discussion has shone a light on the orthographic variation that can be found in cartulary copies of charters. The emphasis has primarily been on how the names appear in writing, not how they might have sounded in speech. This recognises the centrality of the scribe's hand as the primary conduit for all early spellings of names, and also the reader as the intended audience of the text itself.

The variation has been viewed through the prism of a single cartulary manuscript from Lindores Abbey. Studying one cartulary allowed for a precise, nuanced analysis which kept as a constant the manuscript context and the scribal community. Cartularies also encourage us to break free from any rigid framework which contrasts local/informal writing with central/formal writing. The same methodology could be applied to other cartularies, whether they comprise the work of a few or many scribes.

A number of crucial issues have come to the fore. It will be useful to begin with some of the more basic points. First, in the process of being copied, the orthography of names in charters might change. Cartulary copies are not, therefore, a direct window onto the original documents. Second, as a result, any name spelling found in a cartulary should not be dated according to the date of the original document text, especially in multi-scribe cartularies that 'grew' in stages. The article provided a framework for establishing clearer dates for these entries, referred to as 'relative dating'. This is chiefly concerned with allowing multi-scribe additions to be more precisely dated. For names research, what is clear is that the *scribal date* (and this concept is preferable over manuscript date) is more significant than the *text date*, though both would ideally be provided in any given discussion or edition. Of course, it is impracticable to assume that all cartulary scribes might be the subject of relative dating analysis

in the near future, or at all. The core principle of the 'scribal date' ought, however, to be at the heart of dating all name-forms. Third, different kinds of variation were found across the Lindores manuscript, across the work of an individual scribe, and within a single text. Collectively, this evidence suggests that the names in the cartulary should not be viewed as principally sources for local or current pronunciation of names. It encourages us to recognise that the textual variance we find in name-forms can originate not just from speech but also from quills.

The fact that cartulary scribes varied the orthography of names is not necessarily a surprising revelation, especially to those at home in onomastics where variation is the engine that powers the study of name-forms. In wider discussions of early orthographies too, it has been recognised that 'plurality of written forms is made possible through a *word writing system*, which will accommodate quantities of variants so long as the meaning does not change' (Desbordes 1997, 125, original emphasis). Variation in medieval Latin texts is nothing extraordinary: the challenge is how to develop a clearer understanding of this. Much of the article has therefore attempted to paint a more refined picture of what this variation might look like, especially once the individual scribes' work is more closely dated. What emerged from studying the sample of nine place-names is different kinds of orthographic variation. Though the variance itself may often be 'low level' from a linguistic or etymological point of view, the detailed analysis has provided a more rounded picture of medieval scribes' approaches to copying the text of a name. We can now map out some of the dynamics that influenced scribal agency.

First, any cartulary scribe copying a charter (whether by sight or by dictation) would be influenced by what was found in their exemplar. Even then, we have seen that the cartulary scribe evidently had some flexibility here. This might be minimal, such as their choice of graphemes, including routine equivalents such as *i* and *y*. Nevertheless, the writing involved a distinct thought process, informed by scribal choice. (This might be compared with the scribe's choice of letter forms, such as 'long *s*' versus 'round *s*' or 'kidney-shaped *s*'. These palaeographical choices – what Parkes (1994) might call the 'Written Language Profile' – may be said to reflect even more low level scribal agency, given that they might be governed by the relevant script or register.) Second, though this is difficult to trace, any scribe's orthography might be influenced by how familiar they were with that name already – whether in a written, or perhaps also spoken, context. This is particularly important for vernacular names

without Latin equivalents. Rubrics are a useful test case here, given that the 'exemplar' is usually the main written text itself on the page. Sometimes, the rubric scribe appears to have copied the name as found in the text; on other occasions, they have opted for a different orthography, suggesting there was another influence on their rendering of that name. Rubrics have therefore emerged as a particularly distinct and potentially more flexible context, allowing us to glimpse individual scribes' familiarity with a name. This leads to the third important factor: the context of the cartulary scribe's writing. Multi-scribe cartularies can be particularly rich in this regard, whether the individual scribe was copying a name repeatedly as part of a series of texts, or just once in a single text, or as part of a rubric either at the time or much later to draw attention to that text's content. Fourth and finally, each scribe can be said to have their own individual inclinations and approaches to copying which would influence their orthography, including their tendency towards variation or consistency within their own body of work. The appendix reveals examples of both in the Lindores cartulary. Such scribal preferences could also be adaptable, however: scribes were also readers of cartularies, and so they were responsive to the material they read on the page at any given time (Tucker 2020b, 211). Each of these dimensions were potentially involved when a cartulary scribe was working. Identifying and dating the scribes, as well as considering their entire body of work in its original context, can help to assess whether a particular dimension was more or less likely, or more or less intentional, in a particular case.

The reader of names in cartularies will come up against two other factors. First, legibility can vary among medieval scribes and can lead to ambiguity for the reader trying to decipher the letter forms (especially in the case of multiple successive minims). It is worth bearing in mind that this is not just a modern reader's experience – medieval readers even from the same community might just as likely have squinted at an unfamiliar name trying to discern its orthography. Second, we must allow for unintentional errors in writing and copying, a spelling that the scribe did not intend and did not correct. While it is possible to find cases of, for example, a scribe accidentally skipping a portion of a text, when it comes to names genuine mistakes are very difficult to confidently diagnose.

By adopting a scribe-centric approach and focusing primarily on the written context, rather than the spoken, this analysis draws our attention in new ways to orthography in its own right as a primary concern in the transmission of

names. It allows us to consider scribal choices, responses and individual agency for the first time. It also widens our view of the context of names in relation to cartularies – particularly in thinking about reading as an important part of their transmission. Cartularies, then, are direct sources for the range of orthographic forms that could be written at a particular time; they are not, principally, sources for how a name was spoken at that date and place. The Lindores cartulary has provided a test-case for this kind of analysis; future research could build our understanding of orthographic variance in other manuscript contexts. Because of the scribal dating method, even a single manuscript can provide a wealth of information about the orthography of one name where it appears repeatedly. For any individual name, in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of its etymology or historical phonology, a wider consideration of other manuscript contexts would be required.

There are also implications here for charter and cartulary studies. If names are the moment in a charter text where the scribes had the most individual choice, then they are an important context for better understanding the writing and copying of charter texts. It could even be said that written names offer an opportunity to peek behind the formulaic Latin text of charters and glimpse something of the scribe's individual preferences and agency. This applies to original charters as much as to cartulary texts. (In fact, in this context, the term 'original' is weighed down by the notion of 'authentic' name-forms as against later 'contaminations'.) Names are a fruitful context for cartulary scholars to probe some rudimentary questions about the copying of charters, many of which are difficult to answer. How did cartulary scribes reproduce their exemplar? How did later scribes understand the function of an older cartulary: as a repository of historic material, or as a current point of reference for recognisable places? Questions such as these could ultimately contribute to a more refined, more scribe-centric view of the act of copying text in the medieval period. Instead of valuing a charter text according to how accurately it has been copied, or treating name-forms as direct reflections of pronunciation, a fresh starting point can be to understand the primary role of scribal agency and the contexts of their orthographic practices.

## APPENDIX: PLACE-NAMES IN LINDORES ABBEY'S CAPRINGTON CASTLE CARTULARY

Most of the information in the tables has been extracted from Tucker, *Reading and Shaping Medieval Cartularies* (2020b, 263–86). This includes the scribe numbers (though the rubric scribes have each been given a unique letter to distinguish them here), the text dates (which in turn are mostly taken from *PoMS*), the cartulary scribe 'relative dates', and the palaeographical notes (although some extra palaeographical analysis has been undertaken in the case of rubrics scribes). *Lind. Cart.* is the published edition of the manuscript (produced by John Dowden for the Scottish History Society in 1903). Manuscript references are to the most recent foliations, added to the manuscript in 2014.

Where a date is separated by a multiplication sign this indicates earliest  $\times$  latest possible dates (either for the production of that text or for a scribe's date of working). For example, a text datable to '29 May 1198  $\times$  18 April 1241' could have been produced any time between these two extremes, inclusive. Alternatively, Scribe 21's 'relative date' is '12 July 1253  $\times$  27 March 1260', meaning he was definitely working on the cartulary after 12 July 1253 but before 27 March 1260. For all other scribes, their relative date is simply 'after' a certain date or date range – the date range in this case representing the date of a text or a combination of text dates, and therefore placed in brackets: e.g., after (12 Jul 1253  $\times$  31 Dec 1273).

The manuscript spellings represent the scribe's original orthography. Best attempts have been made to distinguish between c/t and u/v, as well as to follow capitalisation. Abbreviations have only been expanded (with italics) in a limited number of cases, where the intention is clear (such as with *er* or *ir*). Names which appear in a rubric have been placed in {curly brackets}. Line breaks in the middle of a name have not been indicated. Palaeographical dates are given in whole (s.xiii), half (s.xiii<sup>2</sup>) or quarter (s.xiii<sup>3/4</sup>) centuries, or as mid-century (s.xiii *med.*). Within each table, an attempt has been made to order the scribes chronologically (i.e., in order of entry to the cartulary manuscript), but it is not always possible to be absolutely precise.

## Clashbenny (PER)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 76	f. 57r	[Glesbany] <sup>45</sup> {Glasbani} Glesbanin Glesbanyn	29 May 1198 × 18 Apr 1241	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
	no. 77	ff. 57r– 57v	{Glasbani} Glesbanin	29 May 1198 × 18 Apr 1241		
	no. 78	ff. 57v– 58r	Glesbanyn	May 1237 × 19 Mar 1263		
	no. 79	f. 58r	Glesbanyn	After May 1237		
Rubric scribe A	no. 77	f. 57v	{glesbanin}	Rubric for text datable to 29 May 1198 × 18 Apr 1241	After 24 May 1457	s.xv <sup>2</sup> /s.xvi

## Collessie (FIF)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 64	f. 53r– 53v	Culessy	11 May 1253	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
Scribe 24	no. 91	f. 63r– 63v	{cullessy} Colessy Colessy Colessy	Feb 1235 × 25 Apr 1264	After (12 Jul 1253 × 31 Dec 1273)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup>

45. This is the sole example in the appendix of a 'cropped note'. It appears in the lower margin of f. 57r.

Rubric scribe B	no. 91	f. 63r	{Culeussy}	Rubric for text datable to Feb 1235 × 25 Apr 1264	After (12 Jul 1253 × 31 Dec 1273)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> /s.xiv <sup>1</sup>
Scribe 15	no. 140	ff. 12v–13v	Culessin' Culessin' Coulessin Coulessin' Culessin'	Unknown	After (25 Apr 1227 × 21 Nov 1232)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> /s.xiv <sup>1/4</sup>
Scribe 7	no. 131	ff. 4v–5r	{Cullessy} Culessin Cullessyn	1 Jan × 5 Jun, 1262	After 1 Mar 1291	s.xiv <sup>2/4</sup>
Scribe 8	no. 132	f. 5r	Cullessin	25 Dec 1263	After 1 Mar 1291	s.xiv <sup>2/4</sup>
Scribe 16	no. 141	ff. 13v–14r	Cullessyn' Cullessyn'	1 Jan × 5 Jun, 1262	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
	no. 142	f. 14r–14v	Cullessyn' Cullessyn'	5 Jun 1262		
	no. 143	f. 15r	Cullessyn'	17 Jun 1262		
	no. 144	f. 15r–15v	Cullessyn Cullessyn Cullessyn	11 Jun 1262		
	no. 145	ff. 15v–16r	Cullessyn Cullessyn	7 Jan 1278		
	no. 146	f. 16r–16v	Cullessyn Cullessyn Cullessyn Cullessyn	15 Oct 1273 × 28 May 1279		
Rubric scribe C	no. 141	f. 13v	{Cullessi}	Rubric for text datable to 1 Jan × 5 Jun, 1262	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup> or later



Rubric scribe D	no. 140	f. 12v	{Cowlessy} <sup>46</sup>	Rubric for text of unknown date	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup> or later
	no. 142	f. 14r	{Cowless'}	Rubric for text dated 5 Jun 1262		
	no. 143	f. 15r	{Cowlessy}	Rubric for text dated 17 Jun 1262		
	no. 145	f. 15v	{Cowlessy}	Rubric for text dated 7 Jan 1278		
	no. 146	f. 16r	{Cowless'}	Rubric for text datable to 15 Oct 1273 × 28 May 1279		
Rubric scribe A	—	f. 13v	{Cullessi}	Running header	After 24 May 1457	s.xv <sup>2</sup> /s.xvi
	—	f. 15v	{Cullessi}	Running header		
	—	f. 16r	{Cullessi}	Running header		

## Exmagirdle (PER)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 42	ff. 44r–45r	{Eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	8 Dec 1211 × 17 Jun 1219	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
	no. 43	f. 45r–45v	{eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	8 Dec 1211 × 1223		

---

46. *Lind. Cart.*, no. 140, has 'Collelessy'.

	no. 44	f. 45v	{eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	4 Sept 1233 × Aug 1244		
	no. 45	ff. 45v– 46r	{eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	1210 × 1220		
	no. 46	f. 46r	{Eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	1210 × 1225		
	no. 47	f. 46r	{Eglesmagrīl}	1210 × 1225		
	no. 48	f. 46r– 46v	{Eglesmagrīl} Eglesmagrīl	1210 × 1225		
	no. 50	ff. 46v– 47v	{Eglesmagrīl}	16 Apr 1235		
	no. 51	ff. 47v– 48r	{Eglesmagrīl}	7 May 1235		
	no. 52	f. 48r– 48v	{Eglesmagrīl}	16 Apr 1235 × 17 Jun 1239		
	no. 53	ff. 48v– 49r	{Eglesmagrīl}	7 Apr 1239 × Spring 1258		
	no. 68	f. 54v	Eglesmagrille	Before 1247		
	no. 70	f. 55r	Eglesmagrīl	1210 × 12 Jan 1226		
	no. 71	f. 55r– 55v	{[ ]gl[ ]smag[ ]il} <sup>47</sup>	After 1210		
	no. 72	ff. 55v– 56r	Eglesmagrīl eglesmagrīl	1210 × 1247		
	no. 95	f. 68r– 68v	Eglesmagrille	23 Jan 1215		

---

47. The ink is very faded here. The printed edition (*Lind. Cart.*, no. 71) gives 'Eglesmagrill' in the rubric.

Scribe 9	no. 133	ff. 5v–6r	Eglismagril Eglismagril Eglismagril Eglismagril Eglismagril	22 Jan 1301	After 22 Jan 1301	s.xiv <i>med.</i>
----------	---------	-----------	---	----------------	----------------------	----------------------

## Inchture (PER)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 38	ff. 42v–43r	Inchethor	4 Dec 1214 × 17 Jun 1219	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
Scribe 2	no. 153	f. 2r–v	Inchthur	26 Mar 1479	After 26 Mar 1479	s.xv <sup>4/4</sup> or later
Scribe 19	no. 151	f. 25r–25v	Inchestur	7 Feb 1479	After 7 Feb 1479	s.xv <sup>4/4</sup> / s.xvi <sup>1/4</sup>

## Inverbervie (KCD)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 18	f. 36r	{Inuerberuyn} Inuerberuyn	21 Nov 1232 × 6 Jun 1237	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
Scribe 29	no. 115	f. 79v	Inirberuyn'	13 Jun 1266	After 13 Jun 1266	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> / s.xiv <sup>1/4</sup>
Rubric scribe A	no. 115	f. 79v	{Inirberwyn}	Rubric for text dated 13 Jun 1266	After 24 May 1457	s.xv <sup>2</sup> / s.xvi

## Kinloch (FIF)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 24	no. 91	f. 63r–63v	Kindeloch <sup>48</sup>	Feb 1235 × 25 Apr 1264	After (12 Jul 1253 × 1273)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup>
Scribe 28	no. 114	ff. 78v–79v	Kyndelouh Kyndelouh <sup>49</sup>	12 Nov 1261	After 12 Nov 1261	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> / s.xiv <sup>1/4</sup>
Scribe 15	no. 140	ff. 12v–13v	Kyndeloch	Unknown	After (25 Apr 1227 × 21 Nov 1232)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> / s.xiv <sup>1/4</sup>
Scribe 16	no. 142	f. 14r–14v	Kyndeloch'	5 Jun 1262	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
	no. 146	f. 16r–16v	Kyndeloch'	15 Oct 1273 × 28 May 1279	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
Scribe 11	no. 135	f. 7r–v	Kyndelohc'	1257 × 28 Apr 1264	After 29 Mar 1342	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
Scribe 12	no. 136	ff. 8r–9r	Kyndeloch Kyndeloch Kyndeloch Kyndeloch Kyndelohc'	24 Aug 1302	After 29 Mar 1342	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>

---

48. The *e* is very hard to make out: it could even be an *o* or a mistake.

49. *Lind. Cart.*, no. 114, has 'Kyndeloich' but the *ic* is in fact a *u*.

Scribe 13	no. 137	ff. 9r– 10v	{Kyndeloch} <sup>50</sup> Kyndoloch Kyndeloch Kyndeloc' Kyndeloch	8 Mar 1248	After 29 Mar 1342	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
Rubric scribe A	no. 136	f. 8r	{Kynd[ ]loch} <sup>51</sup>	Rubric for text dated 24 Aug 1302	After 24 May 1457	s.xv <sup>2</sup> / s.xvi

**Makerstoun (ROX)**

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cart- ulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeo- graphy
Scribe 21	no. 64	f. 53r– 53v	M[ ]lkarueston <sup>52</sup>	11 May 1253	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
Scribe 24	no. 91	f. 63r– 63v	Malcharwiston'	Feb 1235 × 25 Apr 1264	After (12 Jul 1253 × 1273)	s.xiii <sup>2</sup>
Scribe 26	no. 110	f. 75r– 75v	Malcaruiston'	20 Dec 1259	After 20 Dec 1259	s.xiii <sup>2</sup> / s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
Scribe 7	no. 131	ff. 4v– 5r	Malcarreston' Malcarreston'	1 Jan × 5 Jun, 1262	After 1 Mar 1291	s.xiv <sup>2/4</sup>

50. *Lind. Cart.*, no. 137, has 'Kyndloche'.

51. *Lind. Cart.*, no. 136, has 'Kyndloch'. In the manuscript, the missing letter(s) seem to be scored through.

52. The second letter is a splodge of black ink, perhaps a mistake corrected to an *a*.

Scribe 11	no. 135	f. 7r–v	Malcarueston'	1257 × 28 Apr 1264	After 29 Mar 1342	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
Scribe 16	no. 141	ff. 13v –14r	Malcarinston' Malcarinston'	1 Jan × 5 Jun, 1262	After (7 Jan 1278 × 28 May 1279)	s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>
	no. 142	f. 14r– 14v	Malcarinston' Malcarinston'	5 Jun 1262		
	no. 143	f. 15r	Malcarinston'	17 Jun 1262		
	no. 144	f. 15r– 15v	Malcarston'	11 Jun 1262		
	no. 145	ff. 15v –16r	Malcarston' Malcarston'	7 Jan 1278		
	no. 146	f. 16r– 16v	Malcarston' Malkarston' Malcarston'	15 Oct 1273 × 28 May 1279		

## Muthill (PER)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeography
Scribe 21	no. 42	ff. 44r– 45r	Mothel Mothel Mothel	8 Dec 1211 × 17 Jun 1219	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
	no. 43	f. 45r– 45v	Mothel	8 Dec 1211 × 1223		
	no. 47	f. 46r	Mothel	1210 × 1225		
	no. 50	ff. 46v– 47v	Mothel	16 Apr 1235		
	no. 51	ff. 47v– 48r	Mothel Methel Mothel	7 May 1235		

	no. 52	f. 48r– 48v	Mothel	16 Apr 1235 × 17 Jun 1239		
	no. 53	ff. 48v– 49r	Mothel Mothel	7 Apr 1239 × Spring 1258		
	no. 54	f. 49r– 49v	Mothel Mothel Mothel Mothel	7 Apr 1239		
	no. 94	ff. 66r– 67v	Mothel	20 Mar 1199		
Scribe 34	no. 127	f. 87v	Moethel	8 Mar 1195 × 20 Mar 1199	After (1306 × 1318)	s.xiv <sup>1</sup>
Scribe 9	no. 133	ff. 5v– 6r	Mothel	22 Jan 1301	After 22 Jan 1301	s.xiv <sup>2/4</sup> / s.xiv <sup>3/4</sup>

## Tillykerrie (ABD)

Cartulary scribe	<i>Lind. Cart.</i>	Folios	MS spelling	Text date	Cartulary scribe 'relative date'	Palaeo- graphy
Scribe 21	no. 57	f. 50r– v	{Tholachker} Tolaukery	27 Jun 1252	12 Jul 1253 × 27 Mar 1260	s.xiii <i>med.</i>
Scribe 6	no. 130	f. 4r	Tholankery Tolankeri	12 May 1278	After 1 Mar 1291	s.xiv <sup>2/4</sup>
Rubric scribe A	no. 130	f. 4r	{t[ ]lankery} <sup>53</sup>	12 May 1278	After 24 May 1457	s.xv <sup>2</sup> / s.xvi

53. The light ink and folds in the manuscript make this rubric difficult to read. The illegible letters may be *tho* or *to*. (The printed edition does not supply a rubric.)

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, W. M., 1952, *The Place-names of Aberdeenshire* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club).
- Arb. Lib.* =, *Liber Sancte Thome de Aberbrothoc*, 2 vols, ed. C. Innes and P. Chalmers (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1848–1856).
- Berwickshire Place-Name Resource = *Recovering the Earliest English Language in Scotland: evidence from place-names*, 2021, B. Aitken, D. Grannd, C. Hough, S. Taylor and E. Williamson (Glasgow: University of Glasgow); online at <<https://berwickshire-placenames.glasgow.ac.uk>>.
- Broun, Dauvit, 1998, 'Gaelic literacy in eastern Scotland between 1124 and 1249', in *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies*, ed. H. Pryce (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 183–201.
- Broun, Dauvit, 2005, 'The adoption of brieves in Scotland', in *Charters and Charter Scholarship in Britain and Ireland*, ed. M. T. Flanagan and J. A. Green (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 164–83.
- Broun, Dauvit, 2015, 'The most important textual representation of royal authority on parchment 1100–1250?', Feature article for *Models of Authority: Scottish Charters and the Emergence of Government, 1100–1250*; online at <<http://www.modelsofauthority.ac.uk/blog/royal-authority-on-parchment/>>.
- Camb. Reg.* = *Registrum Monasterii S. Marie de Cambuskenneth*, ed. W. Fraser (Edinburgh: Grampian Club, 1872).
- Cameron, Kenneth, 1996, *English Place Names* (London: Batsford; new edition).
- CDI = *The Charters of King David I: The Written Acts of David I King of Scots, 1124–53, and of his son Henry Earl of Northumberland, 1139–52*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999).
- Davis, G. R. C., revised by C. Breay, J. Harrison and D. M. Smith, 2010, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library).
- Desbordes, Françoise, 1997, 'The notion of orthography: a Latin inheritance', in *Writing Development: an Interdisciplinary View*, ed. Clotilde Pontecorvo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 117–28.
- dil.ie = eDIL, 2019, *An Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language*, based on the Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1913–1976); online at <[www.dil.ie](http://www.dil.ie)>.
- Flanagan, Marie Therese, 2005, *Irish Royal Charters: Texts and Contexts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).



- Hough, Carole, 2009, 'The role of onomastics in historical linguistics', *Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 3, 29–46.
- Kohrt, Manfred, 1986, 'The term "grapheme" in the history and theory of linguistics', in *New Trends in Graphemics and Orthography*, ed. Gerhard Augst (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), 80–96.
- Lind. Cart. =, *The Chartulary of Lindores Abbey, 1195–1479*, ed. Dowden, J. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1903).
- Models of Authority: Scottish Charters and the Emergence of Government, 1100–1250*, 2019, S. Brookes, D. Broun, J. R. Davies, G. Noël, P. A. Stokes, A. Taylor, J. Tucker and T. Webber; online at <<https://www.modelsofauthority.ac.uk>>.
- Morelle, Laurent, 1993, 'De l'original à la copie: remarques sur l'évaluation des transcriptions dans les cartulaires médiévaux', in *Les cartulaires: Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'école nationale des chartes et le G.D.R. 121 du C.N.R.S. (Paris, 5–7 décembre, 1991)*, ed. O. Guyotjeannin, L. Morelle and M. Parisse (Paris: École des chartes), 91–104.
- Neville, Cynthia J., 1983, 'The Earls of Strathearn from the twelfth to the mid-fourteenth Century, with an edition of their written acts', 2 vols, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Aberdeen.
- Nicolaisen, W. F. H., 2001, *Scottish Place-Names: Their Study and Significance* (Edinburgh: John Donald; new edition).
- Ó Maolaláigh, Roibeard, 1998, 'Place-names as a resource for the historical linguist', in *The Uses of Place-Names*, ed. S. Taylor (Edinburgh: Scottish Cultural Press), 12–53.
- Parkes, Malcolm B., 1994, 'Latin autograph manuscripts: orthography and punctuation', in *Gli Autografi Medievali: Problemi Paleografici e Filologici, Atti del convegno di studio della Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, Erice, 25 settembre – 2 ottobre 1990*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Pinelli (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo), 23–36; reprinted in M. B. Parkes, 2012, *Pages From the Past: Medieval Writing Skills and Manuscript Books*, ed. P. R. Robinson and R. Zim (Farnham: Ashgate/Variorum), no. V.
- PNF = Taylor, Simon, with Gilbert Márkus, 2006–2012, *The Place-Names of Fife*, 5 vols (Donington: Shaun Tyas).
- PoMS = *People of Medieval Scotland: 1093–1371*, 2018, A. Beam, J. Bradley, D. Broun, J. R. Davies, M. Hammond, N. Jakeman, M. Pasin and A. Taylor (with others); online at <<https://www.poms.ac.uk>>.
- Robertson, Joseph, 1857, *Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff*, vol. iii (Aberdeen: Spalding Club).

- Ross, Alasdair, 2006, 'The Bannatyne Club and the publication of Scottish ecclesiastical cartularies', *Scottish Historical Review* 85 (2), 202–233.
- Saenger, Paul, 1997, *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Saints in Scottish Place-Names*, M. Barr, R. Butter, T. O. Clancy and G. Márkus; online at <<https://saintsplaces.gla.ac.uk/index.php>>.
- Scone Lib. = Liber Ecclesie de Scon*, ed. C. Innes (Edinburgh: Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs, 1843).
- SEA, i = Scottish Episcopal Acta, volume 1: the twelfth century*, ed. N. Shead (Woodbridge: Boydell and Scottish History Society, 2016).
- Stringer, Keith J., 1985, *Earl David of Huntingdon, 1152–1219: A Study in Anglo-Scottish History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Tucker, Joanna, 2019, 'Understanding Scotland's medieval cartularies', *The Innes Review* 70, 135–170.
- Tucker, Joanna, 2020a, 'Medieval cartulary manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland', *Scottish Archives* 25/26, 23–41.
- Tucker, Joanna, 2020b, *Reading and Shaping Medieval Cartularies: Multi-scribe Manuscripts and their Patterns of Growth* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer).
- Watson, Angus, 2002, 'Place-Names, Land and Lordship in the Earldom of Strathearn', unpublished PhD thesis, University of St Andrews; online at <<https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/11331>>.
- Webber, Teresa, 2007, 'L'écriture des documents en Angleterre au XIIe siècle', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 165, 139–65.
- Williamson, May G., 1942, 'The Non-Celtic Place-Names of the Scottish Border Counties', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh; online at <<https://spns.org.uk/resources>>.
- Woolf, Alex, 2007, *From Pictland to Alba, 789–1070* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Wright, Laura, 2012, 'On variation and change in London medieval mixed-language business documents', in *Language Contact and Development Around the North Sea*, ed. Merja Stenroos, Martti Mäkinen and Inge Særheim (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 99–115.
- Wright, Laura, 2017, 'On non-integrated vocabulary in the mixed-language accounts of St Paul's Cathedral, 1315–1405', in *Latin in Medieval Britain*, ed. Richard Ashdowne and Carolinne White (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 272–98.