

*THE PLACE-NAME SURVEY OF WALES: AROLWG ENWAU-LLEOEDD
CYMRU*

Considerable progress in the matter of the inauguration of the Place-Name Survey of Wales can be reported. As noted in the last issue of *Nomina*, the Board of Celtic Studies of the University of Wales met in May 1988 to consider proposals submitted to it. These were referred to a joint-committee for detailed discussion in July, and upon receipt of a favourable report by that committee the Board agreed to initiate the Survey at its meeting in October. Its authorized bilingual title appears at the head of this note.

The Survey will be administered by a small Survey Committee which will be responsible to the Board. The members of the Committee are Professor D. Ellis Evans, Dr Margaret Gelling, Professor R. Geraint Gruffydd and Dr Prys Morgan. Professor Emeritus Gwynedd O. Pierce was appointed Director of the Survey, with Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones as Associate Director. The Board was also as generous as it could afford to be at the time of financial stringency in its support of the project with a subvention of £3,000 per annum for the first three years. Ways and means of further financial support will obviously have to be sought once the project gets off the ground.

The Survey Committee has already met to consider its priorities and future plans. Indications are that some projects which are capable of being completed at a reasonably early date will be commenced forthwith.

Whilst contact with either of the two Officers or with members of the Committee is welcomed, the formal address of the Survey is:

Place-Name Survey of Wales
Board of Celtic Studies
University of Wales Registry
Cathays Park
Cardiff CF1 3NS

Arolwg Enwau-Lleoedd Cymru
Bwrdd Gwybodau Celtaidd
Cofrestrfa'r Brifysgol
Parc Cathays
Caerdydd CF1 3NS

G.O.P.

CUSOP NAMES IN A PAPAL DOCUMENT FROM CANTERBURY

Mark Bateson

Canterbury, on the face of it, is an unlikely place to find records concerning medieval Herefordshire. Nevertheless, the Dean and Chapter Muniments, in the cathedral there, contain much material of this kind, the reasons for its current location lying in Canterbury's history as an archiepiscopal see. The archbishop possessed a jurisdiction which extended over the whole of the southern ecclesiastical province, and included control of the Canterbury provincial tribunal: through it, he derived the right to receive, and respond to, appeals from the province's church courts, however lowly their status, however remote their situation.¹

Appeal of a case to the Court of Canterbury (as the provincial tribunal was known) sometimes led to its records being transferred there,² for the information of the appeal judge.³ In the course of the thirteenth century, there was a long-running dispute over who should control this court, as well as other aspects of provincial jurisdiction, on behalf of the archbishop during vacancies of the see. The pressure applied by rival claimants to this power led the prior and chapter, who were exercising it at the time, to have the Court of Canterbury records preserved: their intention was that the archive they created would support their claim by showing that they had actually exercised the disputed jurisdiction.⁴ A considerable amount of this material has survived. A separate class was created for it – the Ecclesiastical Suit Rolls (or ES Rolls), of which there are some 375 in all; a few were printed recently by the Selden Society,⁵ but there is possibly little awareness, except among legal historians, of the collection's existence. Students of onomastics should be interested in it, however, as a potential source of name forms: there is material here for many of the counties within the southern province in medieval times; though just which ones, and whether they contain many names, are questions that will have to await the production of an adequate catalogue.⁶ Lack of space restricts the present discussion to the evidence of a single roll; yet even a cursory glance such as this suggests that the ES Rolls, and other ecclesiastical court rolls, are potentially useful to onomastics – both as a source which supplements the documentation already searched for name-forms, and as one which might actually be superior to other sources in certain respects.

ES Roll 94 is a contemporary record of a case concerning tithes, heard in 1292 by a papal judge-delegate at Abergavenny [Gwent], between David de Merthyr, rector of Cusop [Herefordshire]⁷ on the one hand, and the prior and

chapter of Clifford, a Benedictine monastery in the parish of Clifford, which adjoined that of Cusop, on the other. The roll records how David once leased out some tithes to the Clifford monks in return for an annual payment. But the arrangement had gone wrong. Clifford Priory, David claimed in his submission to the papal delegate, had defaulted on the payments, yet had gone on enjoying the fruits of the tithes; he had, therefore, petitioned the pope about the matter, and had come away from Rome with a papal mandate enjoining the prior of Abergavenny to hear and decide the case on apostolic authority. The documents generated by the prior's proceedings were copied up on ES Roll 94. The next year, 1293, saw Clifford's appeal to the Court of Canterbury; the transference of the suit to the archiepiscopal jurisdiction; and a request by the appeal court for the record of proceedings up to that point.

Names, both of places and persons, occur throughout ES Roll 94, but two of the documents whose texts it contains have a particular onomastic interest. The first of these, chronologically and sequentially, is the mandate of Pope Nicholas IV to the prior of Abergavenny. Up to now, papal documents have been regarded as a suspect source by collectors of name-forms because of the remoteness of their composition; yet they have occasionally to be used, to make up for the patchy survival of secular administrative and legal records before the later thirteenth century. Distant it may have been from the places which its bureaucracy administered, but the papal curia could still reach the smallest and least significant places with its letters. The necessity of utilising the evidence generated by this local involvement was stressed memorably by C.R. Cheney:

'No medievalist can get away from the papacy, whether he is an ecclesiastical historian or not. The popes were involved in both other-worldly and worldly concerns. They were at once a universal and an Italian power, and so their activities crop up everywhere.'⁹

The difficulties of papal records when used as an onomastic source are not, perhaps, rooted in the distance factor; they seem rather to be connected with the 'disinterest' of the Roman curia's scribes in reproducing proper names correctly. As an extreme example of what could happen, when the scribes had no incentive in this regard at all, F.W. Maitland drew attention to the spelling of English place-names in canon law. He took his examples from the Gregorian Decretals, a collection of papal letters incorporated in the *Corpus Iuris Canonici* in 1234.⁹ Those who were responsible for the selection of letters, he shows, chose items for their legal interest; dates, and the identities of places and people were of little concern to them; as a result, many place-names in the Decretals are garbled beyond recognition.¹⁰ Fortunately, toponymists do not have to rely on canonical

texts; and the papal sources they do need to use, notably pontifical registers and monastic cartularies, contain letters which have not been through the canonists' hands: indeed, such letters would have been criticised for inaccuracies, at the curia, during the drafting stage, by the parties petitioning for them. In spite of these reassuring observations, however, it seems that no type of papal letter, even in the original or contemporary copy, was immune to garbling. In the Introduction to his calendar of the letters of Innocent III concerning England and Wales, C.R. Cheney remarks on the 'grotesque misrepresentation of proper names' in some examples.¹¹

At this point, it is necessary to distinguish between those papal letters which granted or confirmed rights and privileges, or made provisions to benefices, and those which settled litigation or delegated others to do so.¹² The remarks made so far are relevant to both types. But lack of space must limit further discussion of letter-forming procedure to that used for letters of justice. This is the category to which the papal mandate in ES Roll 94 belongs.

First the plaintiff made representations at Rome, either in person or through a proctor: whoever actually attended at this stage brought along a written petition, setting out the name of the plaintiff, the nature of his grievance, the identity of his adversary, and the name(s) of the judges he preferred.¹³ This document was 'normally' re-cast by curial officials;¹⁴ abbreviators turned the revised version into a 'minute'; the minute was examined by a notary and passed on to a scribe; the scribe drafted a mandate, in the name of the reigning pope, by combining the details of the petition, including all its proper names, with the routine legal phraseology available in his formulary books; the draft was either checked by the papal vice-chancellor or read out in the audience of contradictory letters – an airing which petitioner and defendant alike could attend to check for mistakes; finally, an engrossment was made, scrutinized by correctors, and sealed.¹⁵

The above process of forming judicial letters clearly allowed scope for copying errors: there were the various drafting stages, and (during the first half of the thirteenth century at least) these seem to have been carried out by scribes who were mostly of Italian origin.¹⁶ They cannot all have been familiar with English and Welsh place-names. On the other hand, the processes would have been overseen by notaries public¹⁷ – renowned for their professional accuracy in these matters – and any mistakes missed by them could have been picked up at the public reading in the audience of contradictory letters. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to judge which of these factors weighed heaviest on the final outcome. The obvious means of doing this, by tracing a set of names through the various

procedural stages, cannot be adopted owing to lack of evidence: in theory, it would show up the points at which copying errors were made, but the fact is that for some stages there are almost no surviving records at all.¹⁸ Examples of original petitions for papal letters are very rare;¹⁹ so too are instances of letters surviving both in the original and as copies in the papal registers – only a small proportion of the total of issued letters was actually registered.²⁰ Normally, items from the letter-forming procedure survive in isolation; in these cases, one has to postulate the causes of any garblings from the garbled forms themselves. A 1224 original bull of Pope Honorius III, now in the Devon Record Office, which confirms the possessions of the prior and chapter of Totnes,²¹ has *Tortan'* for Totnes, *Briham* for Brixham, *olistun'* for Broad Clyst, and *Aspingunt* for Ashprington. *Briham* could contain Anglo-Norman <c> ([ts] for [ks]);²² *olistun'* would seem to be a straightforward copying error of *o* for *c*;²² *Tortan'* probably represents an abbreviated version of the normal form of Totnes at this period (*Totten-*, *Tottanes(se)*)²³ but with *r* misread for the first *t* of double *t*.²⁴

The Nicholas IV mandate which was copied at the head of ES Roll 94 did not, unsurprisingly, get into Nicholas IV's register; few letters of justice were registered, and of those that were, most concerned important suits. So one cannot even compare this local copy with any copy that might have been made at Rome, yet alone check it against the original text (which does not survive). But what one can do is to examine its name-spellings in relation to the forms of the same names found in the roll's other documents – those that were actually composed, and copied, near the scene of the dispute. The exercise reveals that the mandate's forms were in no way odd. When quoting the name Cusop, the local documents usually give it a double *s* (*Kyussope*) rather than a single one like the mandate; and the local documents, unlike the mandate, sometimes have a double *p*; the more unusual forms, *kussope* and *kyvsope* (one instance of each), both occur in the local documents. But the spellings of Cusop throughout ES Roll 94 seem to be more self-consistent than the three forms of the name in the printed edition of the 1291 *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* of Pope Nicholas IV.²⁵ Of the *Taxatio*'s forms, one is *kyweshop*, which Ekwall used;²⁶ another is *kynehope*²⁷ which, presumably, has *n* for *u*, and misses out medial *s*; and a third is *kynslope*,²⁸ containing *n* for *u* and *sl* for double 'long' *s*. These forms are in the original manuscripts of the *Taxatio* used by the Record Commission edition (PRO, E164/14, at fos. 228v and 237r; BL, Cott. Tib. C. x, at fo. 85r), and if they do contain errors, they are those of a thirteenth-century copyist rather than of the nineteenth-century editor. It is, of course, possible that the scribe of ES Roll 94 altered the mandate's spellings to

match the local ones; but if that were so, he would surely have effected a closer correspondence between the forms than he has. It seems more likely that he copied the names as he saw them, and that therefore the spelling of Cusop in the copied mandate is the same as that which one would have found in the original, had it survived.

So much for the names in the papal letter. The rest of the documents in the roll are from the hearings begun at Abergavenny on the same letter's authority. From now on, although the court was papal, it was doing much the same sort of thing as the ordinary tribunals of the English Church – dealing with the nitty-gritty of local litigation. And as the procedure became more local, so did the names in the procedural record.

Once the series of secular court rolls preserved in the Public Record Office becomes regular and frequent, around the 1270s, the need to rely on 'occasional' sources such as the papal letters is not as great. The assize rolls, for example, provide the EPNS county surveys with the earliest forms for quite a few major names and are better in this respect than the records of church courts, probably because of the narrower judicial competence of ecclesiastical tribunals. Church courts were restricted by the law of the land to exclude suits of a 'temporal' nature, such as those over property and money, and encompassed only cases of a spiritual character.²⁹ Nevertheless, because tithes were classed as spiritualities,³⁰ cases concerning them were properly heard before ecclesiastical,³¹ not secular, courts, and it should be noted that tithe suit documents sometimes recorded field-names – in descriptions of tithe boundaries.³² Such is true of the Cusop tithe suit record.

As read out at the first hearing at Abergavenny on 20 June 1292, David de Merthyr's libel (his formal case) contained a description of the common boundary between the parishes of Cusop and Clifford – probably because he wanted to show that the disputed tithes were within his parish; and it also included an account of the tithes' boundaries. The document began by saying that the monks had perpetrated their 'alienations' on the Cusop side of *quoddam sychetum seu rivulus qui vocatur Smalebroch, descendens de Rub' Colle, prout idem rivulus descendit et ducit deorsum usque ad descensum eius in Wayham*; this little stream or dried-up watercourse was, it said, the well-known and approved boundary customarily dividing the parish of Cusop from that of Clifford. If *Wayham* refers to the river Wye, being the Latin accusative singular case of *Weia*, a common spelling of the river-name at this time, governed by the preposition *in* 'in, into',³³ then the stream called *Smalebroch* must be either that now called Hardwick

Brook, to the NE. of Hay, or the stream, unnamed on the 6" O.S. map, just to the south of Hardwick Brook. The modern boundary between the civil parishes of Cusop and Clifford intersects the Wye at a point south of these streams, and appears to have moved there since the Middle Ages.

David de Merthyr next proceeded to describe the tithes which Clifford had alienated. He defined a boundary running from *Smalebroch* up to another stream, *qui vocatur Kethyr*, nearer to his church: between the two streams, Clifford had taken a third of the garb tithes; from certain fields between the *furcas de Haya*, (that was to say *a lapide qui vocatur Anneston'* up to *Smalebroch*) and from *campo qui dicitur Agatefeld*, they had taken them all. Finally, David claimed that Clifford had despoiled him of a third of the garbs from *Kethyr* up to the village of Cusop – above that village as far as *locum qui dicitur Perchbengam*, below it as far as *locum qui dicitur ab' Reubadryg'*.

It is tempting to speculate that the stream just to the south of Hardwick Brook, mentioned earlier, is the *Kethyr*, while the *furcas de Haya* may have been a crossroads just east of Hay. It has not been possible to identify the other names. They do, though, seem to be predominantly topographical in nature, so closer study of the terrain, and research on other documentary evidence, may pinpoint some locations.³⁴

To ask the same question of David de Merthyr's libel as was asked earlier of the papal mandate: how reliable are its place-name spellings? The answer seems to be that they do look like authentic forms. The toponymists consulted in the course of the research for this article thought so; and knowledge of the documentary context supports their view. Unlike the mandate, which was the product of several drafts, the copy of the libel in ES Roll 94 was probably taken straight from the original, contemporaneously, and meant to be a working copy, not a fair copy. So both original and copy were written in places close to the locality their texts describe; the copy was made possibly a month or two after the original was drawn up, and maybe only hours after the likely author read it out in court.

The evidence of procedure in ecclesiastical and secular courts at this time can lend credibility to the name-forms preserved in their records. After the libel was given, the defendant could delay subsequent proceedings by proposing exceptions to it. These could focus on any hint of error or vagueness in the plaintiff's case. In theory, objections that place- or personal names were inaccurate would have been quite in order, although no good examples came to light in the handful of ES Rolls studied for this article. However, a comparable source, the assize rolls, have

furnished some. In a roll of the Cornish assize of 1324-5, a witness claimed that *Willelmus vocatur Willelmus de Naynou, et non de Naynho*; and in another case recorded on the same membrane of that roll, it was objected that the village in question was called *menethclusou et non Meneclusou* (the form used in court).³⁵ Both claims were upheld. Although the monks of Clifford did not make this sort of complaint, they did criticise David de Merthyr's libel for its ambiguity about the stream-name. This document was said to be defective and uncertain at the point where it mentioned *quidam rivulus qui vocatur Smalebrok*, since there was another stream of the same name, and it was not clear which of the two David wished to be understood. Had David's place-name forms been garbled or strange-looking, they would surely have been criticised too, just like those in the Cornish assize roll.

ENGLISH PLACE-NAME SOCIETY,
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

APPENDIX

[From the formal libel of the rector of Cusop, setting out his case against the monks of Clifford for the recovery of tithes from them; Canterbury Dean and Chapter Muniments, Ecclesiastical Suit Roll 94, reproduced here by kind permission of the Dean and Chapter.]

Coram vobis domine ... prior de Bergeveny iudex principalis a sede apostolica delegate ... dico et edendo propono ego Davit rector ecclesie de Kyussoppe Herfordensis dyocesis contra religiosos viros priorem et monachos de Clifford eiusdem dyocesis ... quod cum quoddam sychetum seu rivulus qui vocatur Smalebroch descendens de Rub' Colle, prout idem rivulus descendit et ducit deorsum usque ad descensum eius in Wayham, ut limes notarius et approbatus parochiam ecclesie mee de Kyussoppe predictae et parochiam de Clifford dividit et dividere consueverit ab antiquo, iidem cum religiosi, sue salutis immemores, tertiam partem decime garbarum a dicto rivulo Smalebrock' usque ad alium rivulum ecclesie mee predictae magis propinquum qui vocatur Kethyr infra limites parochie mee predictae provenientium ut totam decimam garbarum de quibusdam campis infra limites eiusdem parochie existentibus qui sunt iuxta furcas de Haya, videlicet a lapide qui vocatur Anneston' usque ad predictum rivulum Smalebrok, et de quodam campo qui dicitur Agatefeld', percipiunt minus iuste ... iidem cum religiosi ecclesiam meam sepredictam et me tertia parte garbarum a dicto rivulo Kethyr usque ad villam de Kyussoppe, et supra villam usque ad locum qui dicitur Perchbengam, et sub villa usque ad locum qui dicitur ab' Reubadryg' provenientium, spoliarunt ... ['Before you, lord, prior of Abergavenny, principal judge delegated by the Apostolic See, I, David, rector of the church of Cusop in the diocese of Hereford, say and propose against the religious men the prior and

monks of Clifford, of the same diocese, that although a certain dried-up stream or rivulet called *Smalebroch*, from its source on *Rub' Colle* down to the place where it flows into the Wye, divides and was accustomed to divide since antiquity, as the well-known and approved boundary, the parish of my church of Cusop aforesaid from the parish of Clifford, the same religious men, paying no thought to their own salvation, are unjustly collecting a third part of the garb tithes between the said *Smalebrock*' and another stream, closer to my aforesaid church, called *Kethyr*, which are thus inside my parish, and represent the entire tithe of garbs from certain fields within the boundaries of the same parish next to the *furcas de Haya*, that is to say, from the stone which is called *Anneston*' up to the said *Smalebrok*, and from a field called *Agatefeld*' ... The same religious men are despoiling my said church and me of a third part of the garb tithes from the said *Kethyr* up to the village of Cusop, and as far above the village as the place called *Perchbengam*, and as far below it as the place called *ab' Reubadryg*' ...].

NOTES

This is a revised version of the paper given on 26 March 1988 at the XXth Annual Study Conference organized by the Council for Name Studies held at the University College of Wales, Swansea.

¹ I. J. Churchill, *Canterbury Administration* (2 vols, London, 1933), I, Chapter X, 'The Archbishop and his Court of Canterbury'.

² By the latter half of the thirteenth century, the court met in the church of the Blessed Mary of the Arches in London: B. L. Woodcock, *Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese of Canterbury* (Oxford, 1952), 7.

³ N. Adams and C. Donahue Jr., eds., *Select Cases from the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Province of Canterbury c. 1200-1301*, Selden Society XCV (London, 1978-9), Introduction, 63,71.

⁴ *Ibid.* Introduction, 35-7.

⁵ In Adams and Donahue, *Select Cases*.

⁶ There is a typescript handlist, made in 1927, now kept in the Muniment Room in the Dean and Chapter Library at Canterbury. This frequently fails to identify the modern forms of the parties' names, preferring for the most part to leave them in the original form; see, e.g., the following note.

⁷ In the Muniment Room handlist, *Kynesope*; in an 1808 endorsement by Bunce (the then Canterbury Cathedral archivist), *Kynesope*.

⁸ C. R. Cheney, *The Study of the Medieval Papal Chancery*, The Edwards Lectures, II (Glasgow, 1966), 29.

⁹ For the text, see E. Friedberg, ed., *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879-81), II, cols. 5-928.

¹⁰ 'William of Drogheda and the Universal Ordinary', repr. from *EHR* in *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England: Six Essays* (London, 1898), 122-3.

¹¹ *The Letters of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) Concerning England and Wales: A Calendar ...* (Oxford, 1967), xiii; see also *ibid.* x, xxii.

¹² R. L. Poole, *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery* (Cambridge, 1915), 115-19.

¹³ See the examples printed and discussed in J. E. Sayers, 'Canterbury proctors at the court of the "audientia litterarum contradictarum"', *Traditio* XXII (1966), 312-13.

¹⁴ Cheney, *The Medieval Papal Chancery*, 22; on the way this was done, see J. E. Sayers, *Papal Government and England During the Pontificate of Honorius III (1216-1227)* (Cambridge, 1984), 32.

¹⁵ This brief account is based entirely on Sayers, *Honorius III*, 32-49.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 43: 'Where the scribes [of original letters of Honorius III with an English interest, listed *ibid.* Appendix IA] can be identified with places, they are Italian ...'

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 32-3.

¹⁸ E. g. there are no minutes known to survive from before the fourteenth century: *ibid.* 32 n.

¹⁹ Cheney, *The Medieval Papal Chancery*, 18-19.

²⁰ Cheney (*ibid.* 15), commenting on the medieval papal chancery generally, puts it at 'perhaps no more than a tenth'; more recently, Sayers, comparing Honorius III's register with surviving English originals of that pope, found that 28-29 per cent of those originals were registered: *Honorius III*, 67.

²¹ Printed by Sayers, *Honorius III*, Appendix 2, No. 36.

²² I am grateful to Professor J. McN. Dodgson for this suggestion.

²³ *PNDevon*, I, 334.

²⁴ I am grateful to Dr J. Insley for this point.

²⁵ T. Astle, S. Ayscough and J. Caley, eds., *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae Auctoritate P. Nicholai c. 1291*, Record Commission (London, 1802), 159.

²⁶ *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 159 (given in note as a variant form of *Kynslope*); *DEPN*, 137.

²⁷ *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 175.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 159.

²⁹ For a detailed account of how the State 'whittled down' the church's jurisdiction, see G. B. Flahiff, 'The writ of prohibition to court christian in the thirteenth century', *Medieval Studies* VI (1944), 261-313; and VII (1945), 229-90. For a lighter introduction to the boundary between secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Middle Ages, see R. E. Rodes, Jr., *Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation* (Notre Dame, London, 1977), 56-9.

³⁰ J. H. Denton, *Robert Winchelsey and the Crown 1294-1313: a Study in the Defence of Ecclesiastical Liberty* (Cambridge, 1980), 56-7.

³¹ Though this generalisation must be qualified in several ways: W. R. Jones, 'The relations of the two jurisdictions: conflict and cooperation in England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* VII, (1970-1), 79-210; esp. Chapter IV, 'Tithes and Pensions'.

³² Another Canterbury ES Roll (66), from a case between John Aubrey, rector of *ecclesia de sancto Maughan*', and Henry Trochard, chaplain, rector of the church of *ecclesia de Llandeccan* (probably modern Llanddettty, parish eight miles SE. of Brecon - *ex inff.* Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones) contested c.1291-2, contains the following depositions of John ap Bledguret: ... *Dicit quod quidam rivulus nomine Cleudagh a capite usque ad decensum suum in Caruanelth est limes inter parochiam de Sancto Maughan' et forestam de Clynolthwen, cuius foreste decima spectat ad capellam de Penkethlyn. Requisitus qualiter hoc scit dicit quod per hoc quod parochiani de sancto Maughan' inhabitant usque ad predictum rivulum. Requisitus si ecclesia de Sancto Maughan' sit in possessione percipiendi decimas personales et prediales usque ad dictum rivulum dicit quod non set est quedam particula terre que dicitur Trefbletheros ratione cuius orta est contentio inter dictos infra dictum rivulum ex qua dicta ecclesia de Sancto Maughan' non precipit premissa ...* ['... he says that a certain stream by the name of *Cleudagh*, from its head to its descent into *Caruanelth*, is the boundary between the parish of *St Maughan*' and the forest of *Clynolthwen*, the tithe of which forest belongs to the chapel of *Penkethlyn*. Asked how he knows this, he replies: "from the fact that the parishioners of *St Maughan*' live right up to the said stream". Asked if the church of *St Maughan*' is receiving the personal and predial tithes up to the said stream, he replies "no - but there is a certain piece of land called *Trefbletheros*,

over which a dispute has begun between the same parties, below the said stream, from which the said church of St *Maugan'* does not take the things mentioned before" ...']. ES Roll 83 is another record of this case.

³³ I am grateful to Mr J. Freeman for this suggestion.

³⁴ In a personal communication, Dr J. Insley kindly suggested the following etymologies for the English names: *Anneston* from OE **Annanstān* 'Anna's boundary stone'; *Smalebrock*, from OE *smæl* 'narrow' and OE *brōc* 'brook' = 'the narrow brook'; *Agatefeld*, from OFr *agace* 'magpie', with *-t-* for *-c-* due to scribal error, and OE *feld*. In another personal communication, Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones kindly did the same for the Welsh names: *Kethyr*, from Welsh *cethr* 'spike, lance'; *Perchbengam*, from Welsh *perth* 'bush, brake, hedge', and *pengam*, a compound of *pen* 'top, head' + *cam* 'crooked, bent', giving a meaning of 'a top-bent bush/hedge'; *Reubadrig*, a rendition of Welsh *Rhiw Badrig*, containing *rhiw* 'slope, hill' + *Padrig*, the Welsh form of Patrick.

³⁵ PRO, JUST 1/1391 m. 11v. Note also, in PRO, JUST 1/1357 m. 2r (1313): *Iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Stephanus vocatur Stephanus de Trewynt et non Stephanus de Trewent [Stephanus de Trewent de Bodmina named as a defendant earlier].*

A BEDAN GLOSS ON BEDFONT, BEDWELL, ETC.

Alexander R. Rumble

The three English place-names Bedfont, Bedford Well, and Bedmond have frequently been treated as a group with a common etymology.¹ It is generally agreed that the shared second element is OE **funta* 'a spring', which is ultimately derived from Latin *fontāna* and may reflect some Roman structure built over the water-source.² The nature of the first element apparently common to the three names has however been the subject of debate since at least 1942. In that year the editors of the English Place-Name Society volume on Middlesex, in their discussion of the name Bedfont, disputed Eilert Ekwall's identification of the first element as an OE personal name *Bēda*, a derivation first proposed by him in *Englische Studien* in 1920 and repeated in the successive editions of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* from 1936 onwards.³ The editors of *PNMiddx* proposed that the first element of Bedfont was an OE word *byd(e)* with the topographical sense of 'a hollow', and quoted Bedford Well (Sussex) and Bedmond (Herts.) as parallel compounds of this word with **funta*, meaning 'spring in the hollow' (although the Sussex name had in 1929 been thought by the editors of *PNSussex* to contain the OE personal name *Bæda*).⁴ A. H. Smith in *English Place-Name Elements* (1956) took the first element of these names to be not a hypothesized OE word *byd(e)* but rather the recorded OE substantive *byden* [having a Kentish form *beden*] which had lost its final *n* in the formation of the compound appellative **byden-funta* [Kt **beden-funta*].⁵ The OE word *buden* [cognate with OHG *butin*, OLG *budin*, from Latin *butina*]⁶ is shown by its occurrences in Anglo-Saxon written texts to have had three meanings. Firstly, it had the meaning 'a bushel' and glossed Latin *modius*, a dry measure;⁷ secondly, it had the meaning 'a barrel, butt, water-vessel' and glossed Latin *dolium*, *cupa* and *hydria*, all liquid measures;⁸ and thirdly it seems also to have had the topographical sense of 'a hollow'.⁹ Smith suggested that the second meaning is found in English place-names in compounds with OE *wella* 'a well, a spring, a stream' signifying 'well provided with a vessel' [the Bucks. and Beds. examples of which had previously been thought to contain the OE personal name *Byda*].¹⁰ In other compounds containing *byden* [including Bedfont, Bedford Well, and Bedmond] Smith proposed that the significance of the use of *byden* was either a reference to a vessel at the spring or stream concerned, or was a topographical usage 'depression, hollow, valley'. Recently Dr Gelling has used the term 'vessel spring' to translate both the compounds (*byden* + **funta*) and (*byden* + *wella*).¹¹