Field-Collecting in Onomastics

W.F.H. NICOLAISEN

WHETHER ONE PURSUES THE history of an individual name, is engaged in the establishment of a private collection of names of a certain kind or area, or is involved in the setting up of an official, central and comprehensive archive of names, such as the place-names of a county, a state, or a whole country, the process is likely to involve at least four, and possibly even five, stages which, more often than not, follow each other chronologically, although they may sometimes happen almost simultaneously: (1) Registration, (2) Documentation, (3) Identification, (4) Interpretation, and perhaps (5) Publication. In other words, the days of the "map-and-dictionary" method, which allowed the so-called place-name scholar to move from stage one (registration) to stages four and five (interpretation and publication), without due, or any, attention to the intermediate phases, are over. Only patient work on stages one through three will ultimately permit convincing interpretation (not simply etymologizing) of the onomastic material collected and studied, whether as part of toponymic or anthroponymic research; admittedly, the study of place-names requires usually more extensive work in the documentation phase with regard to both the scrutiny of written sources and collection "in the field."

This last statement makes it clear that we regard the activity described as "Field Collecting in Onomastics" mainly as one aspect of the stage of documentation in name studies, while at the same time recognising that this selfsame activity may very well contribute also to stages one (registration) and three (identification), and possibly even to stage four (interpretation). Certainly all four phases should always be borne in mind, whereas the main emphasis is obviously and generally going to be on the way in which fieldwork can help to increase and improve the documentation available for a name or group of names, thus laying a sound foundation for their proper and acceptable interpretation. As has become apparent in recent years, the onomastic sciences have proven to be so much more than a handmaiden of linguistics, and the reduction of a name to a lexical item, accompanied by the establishment of its "word

meaning," has ultimately to be considered to be the beginning and not the end of onomastic enquiry. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that the ascription of a name to the language(s) which coined it, and the discovery of its original lexical meaning are normally necessary prerequisites for any truly onomastic investigation one may have in mind. Notable exceptions to this basic rule are, as we shall see, likely to be the names which have been transferred as names in a cultural context and not created from lexical material in a primarily linguistic situation.

It should be clear from the foregoing that it is the task of onomastic documentation to provide, from both written and oral sources, such information as will allow the scholar to interpret fully and convincingly the etymology, meaning, historical development and current function of the name, or names, in question. With such an end in mind, the two main sources involved should be utilised in a complementary fashion. With regard to written sources, no type of document is barred as long as it is used with caution. Evidence may be culled from public or private documents, from national or local records, from printed or manuscript sources. There is literally no limit to the kind of record which may contain the required information, from a map published by a government agency to the most private diary. On the whole, written sources will, after the compilation of a basic name gazetteer, provide mainly historical evidence, especially earlier spellings of a name, and information regarding the place to which, or person to whom, it applied. In the case of place-names, earlier maps may help to pinpoint their original locations whether still extant or now "lost"; the appearance of a name in a datable document will also help to establish an absolute *terminus ante quem* in an otherwise relative chronology for the evolution of that name. The longer a name has been in existence, the more likely it is that the modern official spelling obscures its original form and meaning and, as a general rule, the earlier a spelling is, i.e., the closer it is to the time when a name was coined, the less changed, and therefore potentially misleading, it is concerning that form and meaning. Naturally, there is documentary evidence to show that there are individual cases of names not conforming to this rule, but the fundamental principle still remains. Frequently, indeed, research into the written history of a name may produce the very document in which that name was first used or in some way designated.

Ideally, this mostly diachronic documentation from written sources should be completed, or at least well advanced, before any field-work is undertaken which will of necessity be concerned chiefly, although not

exclusively, with the synchronic, contemporary aspects of name use and function. Oral tradition, even at its best, does not normally reach any further back than three or four generations in the area of name giving and meaning, at least not with any amount of accuracy. Oral tradition, on the other hand, is often able to round off a picture which written sources have left rather pale or skeletal. Field-work in onomastics should, therefore, address itself primarily to those aspects of names and naming on which oral tradition can comment best and it should also employ those methods which are best suited to gather systematically, reliably, and without undue delay particularly that sort of information. Again, exclusive concentration on oral tradition in field-work would be unwise since, as everybody who has even been "in the field" doing this kind of work will testify, oral questioning may easily lead to the discovery of private manuscript or pictorial material, relevant to the enquiry, thus filling gaps or supporting already known evidence in the written documentation. Field-work may, of course, also frequently result in the registration and oral documentation of names for which no written evidence of any kind is available. This is especially true of minor names.

It is therefore an erroneous supposition, although a widespread one, that the only, or at least chief, objective of fieldwork is the gathering of material which will somehow support, clarify, enlarge or check on knowledge already acquired from written, mainly printed, sources. While this may well be true with regard to "on-the-spot" tests concerning the validity of certain etymologies advanced on a purely theoretical basis (what German scholars have termed the *Realprobe*), many major aspects of "field-collecting" are likely to be neglected or ignored altogether if the field-worker simply sees himself in this supportive role. In particular, an activity which should have been complementary becomes largely supplementary, according to this philosophy. The notion that written documentation is so much more reliable and trustworthy than the collecting of evidence from oral tradition is still widespread and by no means confined to onomastic enquiry, as folklorists have discovered to their cost. The scholar who will write an article or a book on the place-nomenclature of a given area, without ever having ventured out of his study and his favorite library into his field-laboratory, so to speak, is by no means a rare relic of the past, and systematic field-work in toponymic research is a comparatively recent improvement on earlier, more confined, approaches. Fortu-

nately, acceptance of at least a measure of field-work as part of the investigation of names has rapidly become widespread.

The need for field-work as an essential ingredient of name studies is consequently widely recognised, but ideas regarding the nature and extent of such field-work tend to differ considerably. Not everyone is therefore likely to agree with all the "rules" and suggestions set forth in this paper although one can expect there to be more agreement about the quality than about the quantity of field-collecting needed. In order to understand this writer's position apropos the subject, it should perhaps be pointed out that this has evolved in more than a quarter century of extensive onomastic research, both out of private interest and on behalf of official archives, a period during which every one of the ideas proposed has been tested many times over in practice. The advice given is thus not of the "arm-chair" variety.

Common sense dictates that a young and developing discipline, or "inter-discipline," like onomastics should not attempt to establish a field-work methodology without reference to such other disciplines as have already considerable experience in this respect. Among the more closely allied scholars, students of archaeology, anthropology, sociology, folklore, geography, and linguistics have over many years devised and experimented with a great variety of general approaches and specific techniques, which it would be foolish to ignore as potentially applicable to onomastic field-work, as long as it is realised that not everything that "works" in one discipline will also be beneficial to another. Nevertheless, each one of the neighboring disciplines listed has, since they all have a share in the elucidation of names, something to contribute to onomastic research, and a scrutiny of their field-methods should therefore prove helpful. Perhaps methods developed as an integral part of linguistic dialect research can be expected to be especially useful in this respect. For that reason, much of what follows is derived from, or to a certain extent influenced by, what those experienced in field-work in some of those other disciplines recommend or warn against, with special emphasis on the guidelines contained in the relevant sections of the preliminary *Handbook for Establishing a State Center for a Survey of Place-Names*, issued by the Commission for a Place-Name Survey of the United States, of the American Name Society (for other important publications see the Bibliography at the end of this paper). The comments will attempt to cover four main areas: (1) The preparation for field-work; (2) the objectives of field-work; (3) the methods and

techniques of field-work; and (4) the follow-up after field-work.

Without a doubt the success of a particular field-work project, however extensive or limited, will greatly depend on the adequacy or inadequacy of the preparations. Sloppy and insufficient planning will almost always result in unsatisfactory work in the field. This, in turn, apart from the patchiness and potential unreliability of the information obtained, will usually necessitate further field-trips to the same areas in order to repair the defects, something which, especially in these days of shrinking monetary resources, is clearly bad financial management, in addition to being a waste of time for both the field-worker and the informants. Gone are the days when field-work could be undertaken in a romantic mood of discovery and in the hope that, by some miracle, fate might lead one to the extra-special informant who, for some reason or other, would be in possession of the facts in pursuit of which one had set out in the first place. This does not mean that the unusual discovery and the unique informant are no longer a possibility; on the contrary, diligent and thorough preparation is much more likely to produce them than an ill-planned expedition. What is important therefore, above all things, is that the prospective field-worker should know the size of his project, the resources he has available, the general background to the information he seeks, and the conditions under which he is likely to be collecting it. Indeed, even before these important considerations he should know exactly what he wishes to collect and from whom he wishes to collect it.

Since the present writer has considerably more experience in the area of place-name study than in anthroponymical research, the collection of toponymic evidence will be treated more extensively than the gathering of material relevant to the investigation of personal names, but it is hoped that much of what will be said about the former will also be, directly or indirectly, applicable to the latter. For both branches of onomastics it has become greatly apparent in recent years that nothing is more frustrating to the modern researcher than the superficial impressiveness of long name lists published as a result of onomastic collecting activities two, three or more generations ago, without any precise information as to the location of such names, in the case of place-names, or as to their bearers, in the case of personal names. Names are, after all, in spite of their connotative potential, not just lexical dictionary items, but have a primarily denotative function, meaning this place or that person, and it is the field-worker's task to gather as much relevant data about these denotative names as is available locally. There is no need to

demonstrate that abstract name lists will not serve that purpose; they can of necessity only have an organizing function, insofar as ultimately all the material collected will be linked to them.

What, then, is the field-worker supposed to collect? Focusing our discussion on the gathering of toponymic evidence, we might profitably look for some of the answers to this large and puzzling question in a check-list issued in 1970 by the American Name Society's Commission for a Place-Name Survey of the United States. Although this was, in the first place, intended as a questionnaire to help establish computer categories for the storage of onomastic material, it will, in the present context, provide us with an idea of the basic range of information which an archive of place-names might find not only helpful but essential. It is a range, by the way, which, one suspects, will show itself to be somewhat, or much, more extensive than a purely linguistically oriented approach to the study of names would have traditionally called for. The categories envisioned by this questionnaire are as follows:

(a) physical characteristics (elevation, extent, latitude and longitude, description of type of feature)
(b) geological data (surface, strata)
(c) linguistic information
(d) administrative status (type of government, etc.)
(e) agricultural information (soil, water)
(f) cultural data
(g) archaeological data
(h) economic data (natural resources, transportation)
(i) history (name origin, legends, discovery, explorations, post office information, etc.)
(j) bibliography

Naturally, the various aspects categorized provisionally in this list are sometimes more applicable to the feature named rather than to the name itself, but it appears to be a sound assumption that anything relevant to a feature may also be relevant to an interpretation of its name. Round mountains may have different names (including generics) from cone-shaped elevations; village names may differ basically from town names; the quality of one site may have favored the conservation or retention of an older name type whereas location on a main line of communication may have caused a name change or replacement; different phases of settlement may have preferred different kinds of shelter or slope values for their dwellings, while attaching name types fashionable at the time, etc. Quite clearly, onomastic field-workers

would therefore be neglecting a considerable amount of relevant information if they were to ignore such non-linguistic data. After all, the name scholar, even when "in the field" and away from his desk, does not cease to be interested in the name *as a name* and consequently will not regard it merely as a linguistic item. As a result, the purpose of his field-work will not be confined to recording the authentic local pronunciation and proper topographical ascription of a name with a view to establishing its correct spelling and location on the map (although this will be partially his concern); it will also not simply be extended to the inclusion of a quest for a linguistically satisfactory and topographically acceptable etymology. This means that he will not, for instance, neglect to obtain, or spurn as irrelevant, stories which, according to local oral tradition, explain the origin of certain names. "How such and such a place got its name" happens to be a recognized and recognizable folk-narrative genre which, whether it throws any light on the creation or development of a name or not, it is the duty of the field-worker to seek out and collect because it is just as important for the understanding of a name *as a name*, as the hitherto so strongly emphasized linguistic aspects. If, until recently, the name scholar regarded himself largely as a historical linguist or possibly as an onomastically oriented dialectician, then he will have to add to that self-image at least the designation of folklorist with a special knowledge of local legend. This will, at least occasionally, allow him to make a distinction between "fabulate" and "memorate"—toponymically speaking, between fictitious and factual event in the explanation of an "incident name"—and to gain an understanding of their interaction. Since a corpus of place-name legends may well signify the gradual emergence of what might be termed an onomastic mythology, our information about a name would certainly be incomplete without the collector's awareness of such legends and their value to name research. Similarly, the importance of local history as a source for the creation or elucidation of place-names demands that the field-worker be acquainted with the scope and methods of the study of oral/aural history, as well as its documentary aspects.

Although the ideal field collector should still have satisfactory training in phonetics and dialectology, such training, while equipping him for the assessment of names in a linguistic context and of their linguistic properties, no longer constitutes an adequate preparation for a successful field-trip in onomastics, and the prospective collector should be conversant with the impact which any of the data listed above (p. 167) may have on the naming process, and with the methods and techniques

of obtaining them. It cannot possibly be the purpose of this paper to provide detailed instruction as to what these methods and techniques are, but the point cannot be made too strongly that the success of field-work of any kind, not just in onomastics, may well depend on the way in which the field-worker has prepared himself for his task. Knowing the nature of names and of their many facets, he will therefore take care to learn in advance as much as he can about the socio-cultural conditions, as well as the natural habitat, of the area in which he intends to collect. Although a collector is always primarily a learner when "in the field," his stance should be one of "informed ignorance" insofar as it takes a certain amount of knowledge to ask the right question and to make occasional contributions to the interviewing process. In particular, of course, the field-worker should have at his disposal, and be well acquainted with, the most recent edition of the most detailed set of maps available. An onomastic field-trip without maps is an impossibility and should simply not be undertaken, since the map will have to be the basic item of reference to which all other evidence will ultimately have to relate.

It is also at this stage, well in advance of the actual field-trip, that contact with prospective informants should be made, for, if at all possible, the collector's arrival should never be a surprise event suddenly imposing an inquisitive stranger upon a community. Advance planning in this respect is vital and, an essential consideration, will shorten the field-trip and severely cut expenses. A highly successful way of finding the right informants is the seeking out of a responsible local contact person who may not be a prospective informant himself, but who, knowing the community to be visited, can pinpoint good informants and prepare them for the collector's visit. He may even do some advance work with the informants so that the collector will have a rough idea as to what kind of material to expect. In any case, the field-worker will then not arrive as a total stranger and without warning and may indeed be able to begin his field-work on the day of arrival, instead of spending a lengthy period getting acquainted with people, gauging their potential as informants and gaining in sensitivity with regard to the local "power structure." In bilingual communities and with informants whose native language differs from that of the field-worker, the contact person may also play the role of interpreter, should a linguistic intermediary become necessary. However, even if, for a variety of reasons, no advance contact can be made with people in the community in which field-work is to be conducted and if, as a result, informants have to be searched out after

the collector's arrival in the field, the recruiting of suitable and willing people is seldom an unpleasant task to be dreaded by the collector. There are always persons who are known by the members of the community in which they live to be good active tradition-bearers, and, once these have been located, the rest is usually smooth sailing. This does not mean that the field-worker should collect from such persons exclusively but their extensive knowledge will open up the traditional culture of the community and will lead him to a better understanding of the socio-cultural framework and attitudes in which names are given and retained. There is no limitation with regard to the occupation, sex, or educational background of such tradition-bearers, and no single informant is ever likely to be fully "representative" of his community. In all cases, adequate assurances must be given in advance, if necessary in writing, that the material recorded will not be made public or given access to in any way, without an informant's consent. This trust must be kept at all times. It is sometimes claimed that under ideal circumstances a collector would be working in his own culture or collecting information about his own dialect (or language). Those who dispute this assertion put forward the counter-claim that an outsider will obtain better results, if he knows how to put his "stranger value" to good use. Since names are part of the linguistic system of communication in any given community, total ignorance of the language of that community is, however, not recommended for the onomastic field-worker.

Besides the map, the tape-recorder is the most important tool in name collecting. Unfortunately, this statement is much more revolutionary than it should be, the implication being that most field-workers still employ the old "pencil-and-paper" method or, if they have graduated to the magnetic tape, use the recording device so badly that the result is far from perfect and therefore discouraging. Proper use of the most appropriate and most up-to-date equipment will always give the best results, whereas inept handling of poor equipment may make a field-trip practically worthless. It therefore goes without saying that the field-worker should be thoroughly trained in the handling of his recording devices unless, which is seldom possible, a recording technician can accompany him on his trip. He should seek advice as to the most appropriate recorders available for his purpose, the type of microphone to be employed, the best tape to be used, and the best speed at which to make his recordings under field-work conditions. He should, in fact, be so adept at handling his electronic equipment that it becomes practically unobtrusive during the interview with his informant. This is helped by

finding out in advance what the power supply is likely to be in houses in the area in which he intends to work, and by taking a sufficient number of batteries, and by knowing when and how to change them. The collector should always be a master of his technical aids and not their flustered slave. They will not totally replace human initiative, skill and method, but they will reduce the possibility of human error and will permit the repeated re-examination of a "permanent" record. In addition, they will allow the preservation of the audible portions of an interview as a process worth studying in itself, and the field-worker should consequently be aware of this new dimension and, as part of his training in field procedures, learn to conduct a structured interview rather than a casual conversation, even if the contents of both might be similar. Until he is a practised interviewer, a basic written questionnaire or its mental equivalent should be constructed in advance to ensure that the interview is consistent in all aspects of the information solicited.

On a less pragmatic level, no field-work project should be begun without a carefully worked out problem statement, since arbitrary procedure and unorganised guesswork will by definition produce unsatisfactory results. In part, this problem statement may well be developed from previous work done in the same area by other collectors. Field-work conducted elsewhere may also sometimes serve as a model. Once in the field, the collector may have the opportunity to modify his procedures in order to achieve his objectives more felicitously, but it will be too late for him to devise them perfunctorily and piecemeal from scratch. Although a field-worker should never be inflexible, improvisation should not be his key concept.

A collector who has defined his objectives clearly, has done his homework conscientiously, has familiarised himself thoroughly with the technical equipment he is going to use, has made advance contact, either directly or through a middleman, with potential informants, and—above all—knows all about names and name behavior, should have little difficulty in carrying out his field-work. His methodology will be influenced chiefly by his specific objectives derived from proper problem statements. Perhaps the narrowest aim of a toponymic field-work trip would be the verification of names already on the map, whereas its most extensive form would be the systematic and comprehensive collection of data for a place-name survey of a large area, such as a country or a state. For the former, not much more than a visit to local officials and repositories of relevant documents, augmented by a few interviews with selected representative informants may be necessary; for

the latter, an extended stay in the community making exhaustive use of as many sources as possible will be required, especially with regard to the recording of so-far unrecorded names. Most field-trips will probably aim at achieving some goal somewhere between these two extremes, i.e., they will not be satisfied with the mere verification of map names, nor will they plan total name coverage from every angle.

This means that an important part of each segment of field-work is likely to be the recording of the pronunciation of each name, a task about which, even if taken seriously, the collector should probably feel more comfortable than he normally does. If he is equipped with a reliable, durable, truly portable tape-recorder which will permit high-fidelity recordings on good quality tape, the chances of success are good. Ideally, all pronunciations should be recorded in context, i.e., the mere listing of names should be avoided, as should be the one-word answer to the reiterated question "What do you call this place?" or "How do you pronounce this name?" If more than one pronunciation for a certain name exists, all should be recorded, whether from different generations, from different educational levels, from different geographical varieties of a language, or from different languages altogether. As already indicated, the pronunciation should, of course, be treated as only one, albeit important, item in a whole range of other information about the name in question, a range whose potential extent was outlined on p. 168.

Although some of the information sought will emerge casually in the occasional conversations, most of it will have to be elicited through structured interviews which are without a doubt the most central features of each field-trip. If adequate results are to be achieved in such informant sessions, the field-worker should have at least minimal knowledge of the psychology of an interview, should have developed a sufficiently effective eliciting technique, and should be comfortable with a repertoire of words and phrases which has been termed an "elicitative (or field) metalanguage" (Samarin, 1967:137). Good rapport with his informant, tact, an awareness of personal and societal restraints, and bearing in mind that he is conducting an interview and not a conversation should put him well on the way to success. With regard to the last factor, a rule-of-thumb recommendation might be to structure the interview tightly if little time is available on a short field-trip, and to allow a looser texture to develop if the field-worker will have several opportunities to interview his informant. In all interviews, whether short or long, sufficient time should be set aside for checking which can usually be done by playing the recording back to the informant (and to any of the

members of his family or of his friends who happen to be present or close-by). In particular, field-workers should not choose too limited a range of questions since, on the one hand, they cannot fully know what future generations of scholars will be interested in and since, on the other hand, it is not known whether anybody will ever be able to record this body of information again. Apart from the most private of collecting activities, the resulting recordings will be a permanent record available to many, perhaps for some considerable time after the collector has ceased to be around to answer questions or explain ambiguous references on his tapes. A clear relationship between the names recorded and the map(s) on which they occur—either already in print or added as a result of the field-worker's activities—must therefore be established, perhaps best through a numbering system, pertaining to each map. If geographical features, whose names are being discussed, cannot be seen during the interview, an imaginary journey may be the best substitute. This may also serve best as a shaping component during the informant session which will, after all, have intrinsic value in itself—as a process, so to speak.

Ancillary to the tape-recorded interview are a number of activities which are undertaken according to need and circumstances, as the on-the-spot inspection of features whose names the collector has discussed or is about to discuss, visits to local libraries and archives where old maps and local histories or other books of regional significance may be found, and the keeping of a diary, whether in written or tape-recorded form. Such a journal should be obligatory unless special circumstances warrant its omission, as, for instance, may be the case when permanent residents act as part-time collectors. If the field-worker is relatively inexperienced, he may want to interrupt his stay "in the field" after a while to discuss his preliminary findings with colleagues back home or in some nearby academic institution, perhaps in the form of a seminar. This will give him an opportunity to stand back from his work and perhaps also view it through other people's eyes. Sometimes rest periods may serve a similar purpose during a lengthy period of intensive field-work, and one authority even recommends the reading of novels or hunting as suitable occupations during such leisure periods!

It cannot be stressed too much that the successful field-trip does not end with the collector's triumphant return to home base, with an armful of maps and notebooks and a case full of tape recordings. There are too many archives in this country, and around the globe, in which large numbers of notebooks and miles of tape have been untouched since they

were first deposited by their collectors many years ago. Indeed, in folklore circles the question has been raised very seriously whether a halt should not be called to all collecting activities to give scholars an opportunity to transcribe, evaluate and interpret the existing material. For some of the reasons outlined above, over-recording is certainly not yet a feature of name research, but, in order to nip the problem in the bud, the onomastic field-worker should be made aware of the importance of certain follow-up activities, with regard to the materials collected.

The first concern is clearly for the careful logging and systematic archiving of his materials, and for their proper storage. Far too many tapes, containing valuable information, tend to be left lying on window-sills, near radiators or near some electronic equipment which might distort or destroy their magnetic fields. In almost all such instances, the conditions regarding temperature and humidity are unsatisfactory and detrimental to the condition of the tapes. Even the most successful field-work becomes an exercise in futility if the resulting tapes are not stored properly and in such a way that they can be easily retrieved for examination or transcription. Place-name surveys, as well as individual researchers, should therefore make certain that suitable archiving facilities exist, even before they undertake any collecting and recording activities.

Assuming that the magnetic tape has been employed to record all informant sessions and that an appropriate archive (of oral tradition) is available, the task of transcription becomes the next important step, i.e., the reduction of audible material to written form. This is best done from copies of the original tapes and not from the originals themselves, because the risk of damage or erasure would be too great. Transcribing recorded interviews is much more time-consuming than most field-workers suspect, at least initially. It takes many times longer than the actual recording sessions and is subject to its own problems and procedures. Ideally, the field-worker should be his own transcriber, but this may not always be possible or advisable. If somebody else is employed to do the transcription, the transcriber should occasionally be given the chance to participate in, or at least observe, field-work activities, in order to understand and appreciate the conditions under which the recordings to be transcribed are made. The tape-recorder is, of course, the principal device which has made it possible to separate the transcription process from the recording sessions. Obviously, if his tape-recorder breaks down, or if the field-worker wishes to note down certain impressions with regard to unusual or persistent features of pronunci-

ation, transcription on the spot is a helpful aid, but it should never be the exclusive means anymore of recording such features, or any pronunciation.

Despite the undoubted value of information recorded concerning other aspects of names and naming, the most important single set of data gleaned from field interviews is unquestionably that of the local pronunciation(s) of all names collected. It is therefore essential that a uniform system of transcription be adopted and that fairly standard recording and transcription procedures be followed. The transcription should be done under favorable studio conditions by someone trained in phonetics and phonology; as already pointed out, this person may or may not be identical with the field-worker. It is, indeed, good policy to let a good field-worker who is not a good transcriber continue his fieldwork while an expert takes care of the transcription. For the transcriptions good playback equipment should be used, including some kind of repetition device like the tape-loop described by F.E. Kent in *Scottish Studies* 10 (1966) 108–112. The name should be transcribed as part of the sentence or phrase in which it occurs, not in isolation. From an onomastic point of view, the initial purpose of the recording and transcription of place-names is to establish the names in question as part of the spoken language, in addition to their written form. For most onomastic purposes, in contrast to the dialectologist's interests, for instance, a "broad" phonetic, or rather phonemic, transcription will suffice, since the name scholar will primarily want to know such things as whether the *-w-* in Norwich or the *-g-* in Long Island are ever pronounced and by whom, and on which syllable the stress falls in a name like Binghamton. Seldom will a "narrow" phonetic transcription be required for onomastic etymology or analysis.

The transcription should, on the other hand, be accessible to as many interested readers as possible, and it is advisable that, for this reason, a suitably modified version of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) be adopted, which would allow the use of one grapheme for one phoneme, within the range of internationally accepted symbols. Alternative or additional symbols are easily devised or readily available.

As we have said, the transcription process normally takes many times longer than the original recording. The field-worker, whether he is his own transcriber or not, should not be dismayed by this and should not delay further recordings, especially in areas in which the passing of an older generation may wipe out the memory of some of the local names. An untranscribed backlog of recordings can be quite a healthy thing, as

long as the situation does not get completely out of hand. Since transcriptions are verifiable, it is sometimes helpful to begin with a rough transcription which can be refined through repeated listening and with the help of others, particularly of those who know the feature of the relevant regional variety of the language well. Certainly all materials must be transcribed faithfully and without cosmetic "improvement"—exactly as heard. This basic role applies without exception to everything on a field-tape.

Without presenting a detailed review of archiving procedures, one can claim that the best storage devices are those which can accommodate a large quantity of data, permit data to be used in several ways, and contribute to the ease with which the data can be retrieved (Samarin, 1967:153). Differently colored cards, punch-card systems and, of course, computerized storage and retrieval are among the devices which may be of potential use to the name scholar. If questionnaires are employed both in the field and as long-distance auxiliaries to personal field-work, these should be devised with a particular storage system in mind, and the collector, too, while collecting should be conscious of the nature of the archiving facilities in which his materials will be housed. In fact, since field-work is only one aspect of the task of documentation, special care has to be taken to filter other kinds of materials from written sources into the same storage system, the whole process of documentation being, as we said above, but one phase, although perhaps an essential one, in the progress of name research from registration to interpretation. Its methodology and techniques should therefore never be isolated from the other phases of a research undertaking.

Although we have concentrated almost exclusively on the kind of field-work normally associated with the collecting of data concerning place-names, it has not been our intention to give the impression that field-work conditions and methodology regarding the study of personal names are radically different. Perhaps it might be said that anthroponymic research has so far been dominated by the use of written documentation; it is also not unlikely that the systematic search of written sources will always be of paramount importance to the student of personal names. Field-work may therefore well take the form of seeking out and utilising such sources, especially in societies in which fixed, inherited surnames predominate. Increased interest in the nature of given names, as well as research into genealogical, ethnic, aesthetic, religious and other facets of personal name giving, will require more and more concentration on oral tradition and aural history, and conse-

quently on field-work involving methodologies and techniques not dissimilar from those outlined for the study of place-names. Perhaps even greater circumspection will be required in the selection of suitable informants, perhaps even more tact and understanding will be needed during interviews, perhaps even more binding assurances must be given as to the restricted access to the recorded materials once achieved, perhaps even more careful preparation is called for with regard to potential local customs and restraints, but otherwise very similar conditions will obtain, and prospective collectors of anthroponymic materials should feel in no way discouraged from conducting systematic and penetrating field-work of the kind to which place-name scholars have gradually become accustomed. The equipment is available, appropriate problem statements can be worked out, and suitable interview and archiving procedures are at their disposal. A little imagination and perseverance will do the rest, and perhaps the day will not be far off when the study of personal names will match in proportions and comprehensiveness the goals at present attempted by the Place-Name Survey of the United States.

REFERENCES

Bennett, John W.
1948 "The Study of Cultures: A Survey of Technique and Methodology in Field Work," *American Sociological Review* 13, 672–689.

Cassidy, Frederic G.
1968 *Dane County Place-Names* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press).

Dundes, Alan
1962 "On the Psychology of Collecting Folklore," *Tennessee Folklore Society Bulletin* 28, No. 3, 65–74.

Goldstein, Kenneth S.
1964 *A Guide for Field Workers in Folklore* (Hatboro, Pa.: Folklore Associates).

Harvey, S.M.
1938 "A Preliminary Investigation of the Interview," *British Journal of Psychology* 28, 263–287.

Hoskins, W.G.
1967 *Fieldwork in Local History* (London: Faber and Faber).

Ives, Edward D.
1973 *A Manual for Field Workers* (Orono, Maine: The Northeast Folklore Society).

Kurath, Hans
1939 *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England* (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Learned Societies).

Lindgren, E.J.
1939 "The Collection and Analysis of Folklore," *The Study of Society: Methods and Problems,* ed. by Sir Frederic Bartlett *et al.* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), 328–378.
Macdonald, Donald A.
1972 "Fieldwork: Collecting Oral Literature," *Folklore and Folklife*, ed. by Richard M. Dorson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 407–430.
McIntosh, Angus
1961 *Introduction to a Survey of Scottish Dialects* (Edinburgh: Nelson).
Nadel, S.F.
1939 "The Interview Technique in Social Anthropology," *The Study of Society: Methods and Problems,* ed. by Sir Frederic Bartlett *et al.* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), 317–327.
Nicolaisen, W.F.H.
1961 "Field-Work in Place-Name Research," *Studia Hibernica* 1, 74–88.
1963 "The Collection and Transcription of Scottish Place-Names," *Atti e Memorie del VII Congresso In di Science Onomastiche,* Vol. II (Firenze: Tipografia Francolini), 105–114.
Oftedal, Magne
1968 "Some Sources of Error in Linguistic Field Work," *Celtic Studies: Essays in Memory of Angus Matheson 1912–1962,* ed. by James Carney and David Greene (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), 109–117.
Paddington, Ralph
1957 *An Introduction to Social Anthropology,* Vol. II (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd).
Richards, Audrey I.
1939 "The Development of Field Work Methods in Social Anthropology," *The Study of Society: Methods and Problems,* ed. by Sir Frederic Bartlett *et al.* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), 272–316.
Samarin, William Y.
1967 *Field Linguistics: A Guide to Linguistic Field Work* (New York: Holt).
Smith, A.H.
1954 *The Preparation of County Place-Name Surveys* (London: English Place-Name Society).
Wraight, A.J.
1954 "Field Work in the U.S.C. and G.S.," *Names* 2, 153–162.

The State University of New York at Binghamton