

Editorial

Once again we have to apologize for the late appearance of the current volume, in principle due out during 1990. In part this has been due to a need to change production methods. The text is now being typeset under the supervision of Miss Clark. We have been fortunate in recruiting as Editorial Assistant Miss Fiona Duncan, who brings good humour as well as expertise to dealing with difficult texts.

We now hope that future volumes will, provided the present system can be maintained, appear more punctually than has been the case over the last four years. Typesetting of Volume XIV (1990-91) is already well under way, and publication will follow as soon as feasible. All being well, we hope to be able to bring Volume XV (1991-92) out during the relevant year, 1992, and thereafter to return to a punctual pattern of publication.

For XV we shall be welcoming as Editor (English Place-Names), in place of Dr Rumble, Mr John Freeman, who has for some time been engaged in studying the place-names of Herefordshire and was the author of an article published *ante*, X, 61-77; and we hope that he will enjoy working as a member of the team. Sadly, we have lost the services as assistant bibliographer of Dr Mark Bateson, owing to changed professional circumstances; our gratitude and good wishes follow him in his new career. In consequence, however, future bibliographies may lack the copiousness our readers may have come to expect, and we ask them to bear with us.

C.C.
O.J.P.
A.R.R.
V.J.S.

Abbreviations, Symbols, and Maps

Except where otherwise indicated, abbreviations throughout this volume are those listed *ante* X, 210-15, and XI, 212-13. Readers are particularly reminded that the formula 'PN + abbreviated county name' denotes the relevant volume in the English Place-Name Survey.

Pronunciations are shown, when necessary, by means of the International Phonetic Alphabet.

All maps relevant to any article are inserted as a group following that article's text.

On some Controversy surrounding *Gewissae* / *Gewissei*, *Cerdic* and *Ceawlin*

Richard Coates

THERE has been controversy surrounding the Old English tribal name *Gewissæ*. It has to do with whether the form used in titles by the Alfredian dynasty in Wessex was a learned revival of the tribal name found in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (c.730) or a continuation of the older tradition. That is not our concern here, but the uncertainty has led to unnecessary linguistic controversy, which is. Here is what is known. *Gewis* (or, in the archaic spelling, *Giwis*, patronymic *Gewising*, in the A Text) is given in the late-ninth-century recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as the name of the great-grandfather of Cerdic, the supposed founder of the West-Saxon dynasty.¹ This is, however, almost certainly an eponymous invention back-formed from the plural *Gewissæ*, an early alternative name for this dynasty.² The dynastic name is also found in the form (*regio*) *Iewissorum* in a tenth-century record of a synod of Edward the Elder's time.³

The problem is well set out by Geoffrey Ashe.⁴ What seems to be the same name also appears in early medieval Welsh, including Latin texts embodying or based on the Welsh traditions: e.g., as *Giuoys* in the *Welsh Annals* (s.a. 900);⁵ as *Geguis* in Asser's *Latin Life of Alfred*;⁶ in a mention in the twelfth-century Anglo-Latin *Textus Roffensis* which Stevenson takes to derive from Asser;⁷ and in an apparently later form *Iwys*, *Iwis* in *Armes Prydein* (c. 930).⁸ This latter was apparently pronounced *Iw̄ys* (i.e. [iūis], not [iw̄is]), presumably on the analogy of other names with the -w̄ys suffix, to judge from rhymes like *eglwys* in a poem of Gwalchmai.⁹ Similar forms are found 'in one of the older prophetic poems' and in the *awdl* to St David by Gwynfardd Brycheiniog (thus Ashe). Geoffrey of Monmouth, writing in the early 1140s, refers to the *Gewissei* and makes Vortigern *dux Geuuisseorum*.¹⁰ A connection between the Welsh and the English contexts is suggested by the possibility that the Eliseg, king of Powys, referred to on the Valle Crucis pillar as claiming descent from a Vortigern,¹¹ was the same person as the Elea of the *Chronicle* who was Cerdic's father.¹² Even if this were the case, though, Tatlock's derivation of *Gewiss* [*sic*] from *Gwenhwys* 'man of Gwent' (itself from Latin **Ventensis*) is misguided and must be rejected.¹³ It is impossible for the Primitive Welsh **Went̄s* postulated as underlying *Gwenhwys* to appear in Geoffrey's Latin in this form by the usual phonological processes and scribal

channels of transmission.¹⁴ Whatever may have been in his 'sources', Geoffrey used in his romance a form based upon the Old English *Gewissæ*, with a Latin inflection added to, rather than replacing, the Old English one, thus *Gewissei*. He used the name also in the *Vita Merlini*.¹⁵ However, Ifor Williams pointed out Geoffrey's arbitrary treatment of it (he even made Vortigern into (a) *Gewissus* in the *Vita Merlini*, line 986), noting additionally that the name was understood by the creators of the Welsh *Bruts* as denoting the area called *Ewyas* in Gwent and Herefordshire, represented by the village of Ewyas Harold in the latter county.¹⁶ Furthermore, the antecedent of *Gwenhwys* cannot underlie OE *Gewiss-*, because it would regularly have yielded something like ***Wintis(s)-* in English; cf. *Lindissi* 'Lindsey' from **Lindēs-*.

M.G. Jenkins puts forward the alternative idea that the form *Gewissæ* and its relatives were merely ghosts.¹⁷ He argues that Bede's form *Geuissae* was derived from his informant Daniel, bishop of the West Saxons, but *viâ* Aldhelm of Malmesbury. During this roundabout transmission, according to Jenkins, a scribal form *Gewissae* was substituted by an English-speaker for a spelling **Gieuissae* to which it was phonologically equivalent. This **Gieuissae* was supposedly a misreading of **Gleuissae*, which was a reLatinization in a Welsh cultural context of an inflected form of PrW **Glēwēs*, itself presumably from Latin **Gleuensis* 'inhabitant of Gloucester'. Whilst there is nothing technically impossible about all this, it is fair to wonder why some, but not all, of Daniel's information should have passed to Bede *viâ* Aldhelm; why Daniel should have Latinized the (presumably masculine) Welsh **Glēwēs* as a first-declension noun (forming the plural in *-ae*); why, if he did, his form should have corresponded so nicely with an OE *i*-declension nominative-plural form in *-ae*, rendering *-e*; why the name of Gloucester, for much of the Anglo-Saxon period in Hwiccean territory, should have given its name specifically to the West Saxons; and why Geoffrey should have been ignorant of such a Latin tradition, preferring to coin his own new nominative form *Gewissei*. The form given by Asser, noted above, is further evidence against Jenkins's theory, as it shows no letter at all between the initial *g* and *e*.

To me, it is clear that *Gewissæ/-ei* is (rests on) an English name, whatever the resolution of any historical controversy might be. The phonological reasons were set out long ago by Stevenson, who pointed out that the form *Iwys* in the Welsh *Brut y Tywysogion* (s.a. 898)¹⁸ can reflect only a form with an OE *ge-* prefix, not one with a Welsh initial syllable beginning with *g-*.¹⁹ Welsh *g-* no

doubt always represented [g] in relevant contexts; there is no record of initial *g-*, whatever the following vowel, being replaced by the vowel symbol *i*. The *g-* in the earlier Welsh spellings (e.g. *Giuoys*, *Geguuis* mentioned above) might represent either a sound-substitution for the OE palatal fricative *g-* [j],²⁰ or a retention in the Welsh of an Old English spelling in insular *g-* (i.e. *ȝ*). The Welsh *I*-form represents, of course, a later spelling for the syllable consisting of [j], the regular Old English reflex of Germanic **g-* before a front vowel, followed by the vowel-letter representing either [i] or [ə], as found in the revived title of the later, Alfredian, West-Saxon dynasty, presumably having an approximant [j] rather than a fricative [j], as its later history in Middle English would indicate.²¹ Indeed, the person of Alfred himself is the connecting link between these Welsh and English forms; the passages in the *Welsh Annals* and the *Brut y Tywysogion* refer specifically to (the death of) Alfred (*Albri rex giuoy, Alvryt urenhin Iwys*).²² It must be assumed that the *Giuoys* of the *Annals* is an OW spelling for **Giuuys*.²³

What the name *Gewissæ* might originally have meant is a trickier matter. Morris asserts that it derives from an Old English word meaning 'confederates', a view inherited (I believe) from Müllenhoff's edition of *Beowulf*, perhaps *viâ* an article of 1946 by Johnstone; though it was in any case a common-coinage opinion.²⁴ Stenton is properly non-committal, describing it merely as 'a piece of antiquarian decoration in the charter-styles of the later Old English kings'.²⁵

In fact there seems to be no objection to an obvious solution which I have never seen proposed; namely that it is a nominalization of the adjective *gewis*, among the meanings of which were 'sure, reliable'.²⁶ If the first West-Saxon warbands referred to in the *Chronicle* were indeed led by Britons or by men of part-British descent, as has been suggested (not uncontroversially) by numerous scholars over the last fifty years, it would be small wonder if the English had chosen to distinguish 'good' Britons in this way. It is open to reasonable doubt, of course, whether (part-)Britons really were involved here,²⁷ but I shall provisionally suppose that they were in order to examine the two personal names sometimes invoked in support of this hypothesis, *Cerdic* and *Ceawlin*. It has even been considered highly doubtful whether the names are of the time their bearers purport to inhabit, but see below on the question of dating.²⁸ It would still be of interest if these names should turn out to be British or Welsh in origin, as this would say something, however obliquely, about the sources behind the *Chronicle* itself.

The *Cerdic* (var. *Cerdic*, *Cerdice* [dat.]) of the genealogical

preface to the \bar{A} -Text of the *Chronicle* is, as has long been known, ultimately derived from a British name, once given as **Coroticos*, but now accepted as having been **Caraticos*, comparable with the name *Ceretic* (with *i*-affection of two syllables) in the *Welsh Annals* and with Welsh *caedig* 'beloved'.²⁹ The name of Cerdic's grandson *Ceawlin* is problematic and has apparently hardly been discussed before.³⁰ It is not English. It would be fair to assert that it is not Brittonic either, since it has left no anthroponymic traces in the Brittonic languages. Rather than leave it as totally obscure, we can ask what it could be if it were English. I can find no answer. Derivation as a nickname-form from Old English *ceawl* 'basket' seems implausible, and **Ceawl-* certainly never occurs as a theme in dithematic names (it is scarcely semantically appropriate). The implausibility becomes greater when we consider what are apparently related short-forms, *Ceawa*, *Ceawwa*, which do not appear likely hypocoristic forms of a derivative of *ceawl*.³¹ They might suggest Anglicization of a Brittonic **Caw*, an idea which provides the impetus for my own bipartite, Brittonic, solution to *Ceawlin*, to be developed more fully below. There is, however, a *prima facie* reason to follow a British trail. Searle catalogues two other name-forms which he assumes to represent *Ceawlin*: *Caelin* in Bede (*HE* III, 23; and with α in Miller's edition of OE *Bede*), and the Latinized *Celinus*, the name given by Eddius Stephanus as that of the provost of Ripon in c.700 (also a *Celin* in the *Durham Liber Vitae*).³² The first of these is of special interest: *Caelin* was brother to men called *Ceadda* (i.e. St Chad) and *Cedd*, both of which names are taken by Förster and by Jackson as of Brittonic origin.³³ If we ask what *Ceawlin* could be if it also were Brittonic, we may find a partial answer. It could be derived from a British **Cawolinos* or, better, from a hypothetical PrW **Cawlin*. The first element of such a name could be the onomastic counterpart of Welsh *caw* 'skilled', as perhaps also in the continental Celtic tribal name *Cavoseni*.³⁴ The second element, *-lin*, is harder to account for; it appears as such in no Brittonic names whose etymology is secure but may be compared with the initial element in Old Breton *Linuoret*.³⁵ The lexical status of this form is uncertain, but a corresponding simplex name may be implied by the existence of the continental **Liniacum* place-names registered by Holder.³⁶ It therefore appears that *Ceawlin* could be Brittonic, but the suggestion is advanced with the most extreme caution.

Whatever its origin, no instance of the name *Ceawlin* unambiguously shows English *i*-umlaut. This is consistent with the view that that process was completed before the West-Saxon

Ceawlin's supposed lifetime (*fl.* 556–584), provisionally taken to represent the time at which the name was borrowed into English. I have argued elsewhere, for independent and quite different reasons, that *i*-umlaut was completed before c.550.³⁸ The form *Ceawlin*, if the name is Brittonic in origin, would also be consistent with the view that its bearer became a figure in English history before Welsh internal *i*-affection of the seventh century,³⁹ for that would have yielded a form representable in English as **Cewlin*.

Since Welsh internal *i*-affection is a seventh-century phenomenon, we could assume that *Cerdic* in the *Chronicle* would not show it, appearing as it does in an ostensibly English context of the mid-sixth century and presumably remaining immune from further Welsh influence before being written down. On the other hand, the phonologically more straightforward assumption would be that it does indeed show *i*-affection (as well, of course, as syncope of the pretonic [penultimate] vowel) and that its bearer therefore became a figure in English history after the seventh century. This possibility sets up an interesting tension if both *Ceawlin* and *Cerdic* should be of Brittonic origin, for it is possible in the light of what has just been written that *Ceawlin* became English before *i*-affection but *Cerdic*, the supposed grandfather's name, after it.

As a step towards resolving this matter, we must investigate whether *Cerdic* can show the result of OE *i*-umlaut rather than of PrW *i*-affection, whose effects are similar. We must start by assuming, almost uncontroversially, that PrW **ca-* yields OE *cea-* in West-Saxon, *viâ* **cæ-*, just like early borrowings from Latin words in *ca-* such as *ceaster*, *cealc*. The umlaut of *ea* originating from * α of whatever origin, although in West-Saxon usually *ie* (and later *i/y*), could rarely yield *e* also, just as non-umlauted instances of *ea* may also yield *e* in the late dialect.⁴⁰ The rarity of all this, though, should lead us to consider that *Cerdic* shows no *i*-umlaut; in so doing, we arrive at a way of reconciling the phonology of *Cerdic* and that of *Ceawlin* (always assuming them both to be of Brittonic origin). I suggest that neither shows either OE *i*-umlaut or Welsh internal *i*-affection, in which case *Cerdic* must either show later West-Saxon monophthongized *e* for *ea* after *c* (rare before 900)⁴¹ or be taken direct from Bede's reference (c.730) to a British king. If they show neither the Welsh nor the English vowel-affection process, then they must have entered English-language channels of transmission after the operation of the former and before the operation of the latter, i.e. between c.550 and c.650.

West-Saxon outside the *Chronicle* shows one spelling *Cærdic* (BCS 224, Sawyer 263 [A.D. 774 (12th c.)]), as well as a further

instance of the dominant *Chronicle* spelling (BCS 186, Sawyer 1256 [A.D. 759 (15th c.)]). What passes for a mid-eighth-century Kentish document (BCS 181, Sawyer 96 [A.D. 755 x 757 (10th c.)]) shows the crucial form *Ceardic* with the clear diphthong (or, at least, digraph) *ea*, as do other attestations in the Genealogical Preface of the A-Text of the *Chronicle* and BCS 200, Sawyer 262 (A.D. 776 for ?774 [17th c.]), the latter in the Latin genitive form *Ceardicis*. These confirm that the form *Cerdic* could have originated in PrW **Car'dig* and passed through the normal array of West-Saxon sound-changes.

However, we need also to reckon with the possibility that Bede's *Cerdice* (dat.), with *e* instead of *ea*, referring specifically to a British king of Elmet who died c.616, shows either Anglian *i*-umlaut or Welsh internal *i*-affection. Bede's form could either have been taken from a Welsh source postdating internal *i*-affection, i.e. after the mid-seventh century,⁴² which is perfectly plausible; or else show Northumbrian breaking after a palatal consonant and a spelling of the result as *e*, for in names Bedan MSS. largely eschew the characteristically Old English digraphs (cf. *Edwini* for *Eadwine*).⁴³ The name of the West-Saxon king Ceawlin is spelt *Caelin* (avoiding the *-ea-*, but this may be a pseudo-Latinization on the basis of the stem of *caelum*, a frequent Late Latin rendering of *coelum*), before going on to gloss this as *Ceaulin* (*HE* II, 5). The latter solution makes no requirement of contact between Bede and the Welsh to whom he was so hostile, though that is not to deny that such contact was possible.

We have now explained the Bedan form *Cerdice* in two alternative ways, both without recourse to *i*-umlaut or to *i*-affection, just as we argued the *Cerdic* in the *Chronicle* to be free from the effects of these two changes. If we insisted, in defiance of the argument presented above, that it were indeed an English form and that it showed *i*-umlaut, we should have to juggle carefully the conflicting demands of syncope in the donor language (dated after c.550 by Jackson; cf. unsyncopated *Keredic* in *The Gododdin* of c.600)⁴⁴ and of *i*-umlaut in the receiving language, if correctly dated before c.550.⁴⁵ The place-name *Gembling* in the East Riding of Yorkshire, probably settled before or around 500, seemingly shows a 'non-primary' name-form with umlaut⁴⁶, and this suggests that *i*-umlaut may have remained active slightly later in the North of England than previously postulated by me. However, my argument allows the date of *i*-umlaut to be later if archaeological and other evidence requires the date of settlements bearing *-ingas/-inga-* names to be later, since I postulate only that *i*-umlaut ceased to operate

before the formation of such names (*Gembling* now apparently being the sole exception).⁴⁷ If such evidence were forthcoming, we could concede that Bede's *Cerdice* shows both British syncope and English *i*-umlaut. However, I suggest that all this is unnecessary if due account is taken of Bede's northern background and the scribal convention of the extant Bedan MSS.

My sole concern in this essay has been to debate what kind of linguistic objects the crucial names are, not to infer from them either the course of history or whether they are used to refer to real peoples or persons. I regard much of this latter information as irrecoverable.⁴⁸ The most that can be deduced from this discussion is a little about what was known by the early English and Welsh of each other's linguistic forms; when they knew them; and what happened to them once they knew them.

Summary. The tribal name *Gewissæ* could be the nominalization of an English adjective, and no recourse to Welsh is required to explain it. The name of the West-Saxon *Ceardic* is Brittonic, as has been long known, and as a name deployed in the West-Saxon royal house was genuinely borrowed between c.550-650, showing therefore neither pre-Old English *i*-umlaut or Primitive Welsh *i*-affection. The northern form *Cerdice* probably also shows neither effect. *Ceawlin* is also arguably of Welsh origin, though the precise ancestral form of the name, and its import, are less certain in this case. It is unlikely to be English.

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND NOTES

My thanks are due to Oliver Padel for comment on *Ceawlin*; to Patrick Sims-Williams for suggestions for further reading and for general remarks; and to David N. Dumville, Veronica Smart and Peter Kitson for kindly providing material otherwise unavailable to me. They do not necessarily agree with my interpretations.

¹ J.M. Bately, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS A* (Woodbridge, 1986), genealogical preface and *s.aa.* 552, 597, 855 [hereafter cited as *Chronicle*]. There is further relevant discussion of the extant Old English materials in two articles by D.N. Dumville, 'The West-Saxon Genealogical Regnal List and the chronology of early Wessex', *Peritia* IV (1985), and 'The West-Saxon Genealogical Regnal List: manuscripts and texts', *Anglia* CIV (1986), 1-32. A doubtful instance on an eleventh-century coin is mentioned by V. Smart, 'Scandinavians, Celts, and Germans

in Anglo-Saxon England: the evidence of the moneyers' names', in M.A.S. Blackburn, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History* (Leicester, 1986), 171-84, esp. 182.

² Thus also K. Sisam, 'Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies', *Proceedings of the British Academy* XXXIX (1953), 287-348, esp. 303; cf. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, eds and trs, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969 [hereafter *HE*]), e.g. III, vii (*Gevissae*). On the supposed letter of Daniel, bishop of Winchester, to Bede, see G.M. Young, 'The origin of the West-Saxon kingdom', in *idem*, *Last Essays* (London, 1950), 112-29, esp. 119.

³ See *BCS* 614 [not in Sawyer], from a single-sheet document ostensibly of A.D. 905. This form is also in B.L. Add. MS. 15,350, fo.112, a twelfth-century copy. Cotton MS. Cleopatra E.1, fo.43b, has *Geuissorum* and the later reworking of the same material, *BCS* 615, has *Gewisorum*.

⁴ G. Ashe, 'Extending the map', in *idem*, ed., *The Quest for Arthur's Britain* (London, 1968), 149-62, esp. 158-9.

⁵ J. Morris, ed., *Nennius: British History and the Welsh Annals* (Chichester, 1980), s.a. 616, ch.63 [hereafter *Nennius*].

⁶ W.H. Stevenson, ed., *Asser's Life of King Alfred* (Oxford, 1904), 162.

⁷ *Ibid.*, xxx.

⁸ I. Williams, ed. (tr. R. Bromwich), *Armes Prydein* (Welsh version: Cardiff, 1955; English translation: Dublin, 1972), lines 108, 181.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.xv-xvii (English edition).

¹⁰ N. Wright, ed., *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, I—Bern*, *Burgerbibliothek, MS. 568* (Cambridge, 1985), ch.v, 8, and other places; ch.vi, 6; J.S.P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain* (Berkeley, 1950; repr. New York, 1974), 74. Geoffrey also makes the tribe into a daughter of Claudius called *Geuissa*; ch.iv, 14-15).

¹¹ R.A.S. Macalister, *Corpus inscriptionum insularum celticarum* (Dublin, 1945-9), no.1000 [hereafter *CIIC*]; V.E. Nash-Williams, *The Early Christian Monuments of Wales* (Cardiff, 1950), no.182 [hereafter *ECMW*].

¹² *Chronicle*, as n.1. There appears to be good support for an English *Elesa* in the place-name *Elsenham* (cf. *PN Essex*, 527-8). But it is not unknown for a British-derived personal name to be compounded with an English generic in a place-name; cf. *Chertsey* and *Branscombe* (*PN Surrey*, 105-7 and *PN Devon*, 620, respectively; assuming *cumb* to have been naturalized by the relevant date even if of Brittonic origin). Nash-Williams, in *ECMW*, *loc. cit.*, dates the Eliseg commemorated on the Valle Crucis pillar to the mid-ninth century, which would effectively destroy any possibility of the equation *Eliseg* = *Elesa*, unless the relevant portions of the *Chronicle* were ninth-century inventions based on unknown Welsh sources. For more on the name *Eliseg*, see *LHEB*, 709, and compare annals 814 and 943 of the *Welsh Annals* (*Nennius*, s.a.).

¹³ Tatlock, *Legendary History*, 74-5, following J.J. Parry, *Brut y brenhinedd, Cotton Cleopatra Version* (Cambridge [Mass.], 1937).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *LHEB*, §§6.2, 28.3, 49, 108, *et passim*. There would be no

parallels for the loss of the first [n], for instance, nor, so far as I know, for the Latinization of Welsh *gw* as *g*.

¹⁵ B. Clarke, ed., *Life of Merlin* (Cardiff, 1973), line 1500, and cf. p.189; emendation to *Cambri Gewissos...*, following Parry, *Brut*. Clarke, uncritically, takes the form *Gevissae* in *HE* to reflect British usage.

¹⁶ Clarke, *Merlin*, line 986; Williams, *Armes Prydein*, p.xxxiii. Cf. J. Rhys and J.G. Evans, eds, *The Text of the Bruts from the Red Book of Hergest* (Oxford, 1890) [hereafter *Red Book Bruts*].

¹⁷ M.G. Jenkins, 'Gevissae ac Iwis: dwy ddrychiolaeth', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* XX (1962-4), 1-11, esp. 7-8.

¹⁸ *Red Book Bruts*, 260.

¹⁹ W.H. Stevenson, 'The beginnings of Wessex', *EHR* XIV (1899), 32-46, esp. 36, n.15.

²⁰ Or for [g-], if the theory of Karl Luick, *Historische englische Grammatik*, I (Vienna, 1921), 633, were to be accepted. For a form foreshadowing the later ME approximant [j], see the reference by Stevenson in his edition of Asser (as in n.6) to a form *Iewissorum* in an ostensibly tenth-century English charter form (in a twelfth-century copy), also n.3 above. See also Williams, *Armes Prydein*, p.xv.

²¹ See A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959) [hereafter *OEG*], §§426, 430.

²² *Nennius* and *Red Book Bruts*, as in nn.5, 18. Cf. also R. Bromwich, 'The character of the early Welsh tradition', in N.K. Chadwick, ed., *Studies in Early British History* (Cambridge, 1959), 83-136, esp. 109, n.2; Williams, *Armes Prydein*, 49-50.

²³ Cf. Williams, *ibid.*, p.xvi, n.3.

²⁴ K. Müllenhoff, ed., *Beowulf* (Berlin, 1889), 63, comparing an alleged Gothic **gaviss* 'verbindung'; J. Morris, *The Age of Arthur* (London, 1973), 226; P.K. Johnstone, 'Cerdic and his ancestors', *Antiquity* XX (1946), 31-7, esp. 36.

²⁵ F.M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1970), 21 n.

²⁶ As in Wærferth's translation of *Gregory's Dialogues* (H. Hecht, ed., *Bischofs Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialogen Gregors des Grossen*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa V [Hamburg, 1900]), 147, line 24; in 'The Seafarer' (in G.P. Krapp and E. van K. Dobbie, eds, *The Exeter Book*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records III [New York/London, 1936]), line 110; and in O. Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England* (London, 1864; repr. New York, 1965), III, 186, lines 19 and 27. For further citations, see T. Toller, *Supplement* to J. Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford, 1921), s.v. If one were to deny the rôle of Britons in the establishment of Wessex altogether, one could have recourse to the view of Peter Kitson, who suggests in forthcoming work that *gewis* in this name means 'echt', and distinguishes the Saxons who came from the 'old south-eastern dialect area' from the 'upstart' Thames-Valley Saxons. On both Kitson's view and mine, of course, the name is entirely English, which is the main point at issue.

27 It is established, of course, that the names—as opposed to the persons bearing them—are British. see *LHEB*, 614, and especially P.P. Sims-Williams, 'The settlement of England in Bede and the *Chronicle*', *Anglo-Saxon England* XII (1983), 1-41, esp. 26-31 on the back-formation of eponyms from place-names in sources purporting to be early.

28 Cf. Sims-Williams, *ibid.*

29 See E. Ekwall, *English River-Names* (Oxford, 1928), *s.n.* *Char(ford)*; cf. *Nennius*, 90. (The perversion *Cedric* is due to Sir Walter Scott in *Ivanhoe* and was, surprisingly, popularized by being the name of the hero of Frances Hodgson Burnett's *Little Lord Fauntleroy*.)

30 Except by Johnstone, 'Cerdic', where he derives *Ceawlin* from the ancestor of Welsh *coel* 'omen', believing the *Ceawl-* to represent ***Coewl-* in the same way as Middle Welsh *Gloew* and OE *Gleaw-* represent RB *Glev(-um)* 'Gloucester'. None of that stands up. The true relation among OE *glēaw* (as a lexical word or a place-name element), MW *gloew*, *gloyw*, and RB *Glevum* has not yet been fathomed out (but see: N.M. Holmer, 'Postvocalic *s* in Insular Celtic', *Language* XXIII [1947], 125-36, esp. 135; *LHEB*, 324-30, esp. 327-8; *PN Glos.*, II, 123, which misrepresents the phonological arguments of *LHEB*; and *PNRB*, *s.n.* *Glevum*). Johnstone does not explain where the *w* in his ***Coewlin* could have originated.

31 These appear in *BCS* 476, 833, Sawyer 311, 529 (A.D. 854 and 947, dates being throughout as presented in Sawyer). These forms are not in M. Redin, *Studies in Uncompounded Personal Names in Old English* (Uppsala, 1919), though this has *Caua* from the Durham *Liber Vitae* (for which see n.32 below, and esp. Gerchow, *Gedenküberlieferung*, 311, item 296), which on the face of it could be a Northumbrian version of *Ceawa*, or a spelling of OE *Cāfa*, or a rendering of the Welsh name about to be discussed (there are several clearly British/Welsh names in this *Liber Vitae*).

32 J.G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* (Cambridge, 1897), *s.n.*; forms from Bede checked in Colgrave and Mynors, *HE*; from OE *Bede*, in T. Miller, ed., *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, EETS OS 95 and 96 (Oxford, 1890-91); from Eddi, in B. Colgrave, ed., *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge, 1927), ch.61; and from the *Liber Vitae ecclesiae Dunelmensis* in H. Sweet, 'Liber Vitae (Northumbrian)', in *idem*, ed., *The Oldest English Texts*, EETS OS 83 (Oxford, 1885), 153-66, line 222, J. Gerchow, *Die Gedenküberlieferung der Angelsachsen* (Berlin, 1988), 304-20, esp. 311, item 436, and in the facsimile edited by A.H. Thomson, *Surtees Society* 136 (1923). Cf. also the references in n.1 above to works by Dumville and by Smart.

33 M. Förster, 'Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen', in M. Förster and K. Wildhagen, eds, *Texte und Forschungen zur englischen Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Felix Liebermann zum 10. Juli 1921* (Halle an der Saale, 1921), 119-242, esp. 180-5; also *LHEB*, 554.

34 *CIIC*, no.417. Cf. also the Gaulish tribal name *Andecavi*, apparently 'the

highly skilled'.

35 J. Loth, *Chrestomathie bretonne* (Paris, 1890).

36 A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, 3 vols in 2 (Leipzig, 1891-1913), II, 237.

37 An alternative account might invoke a sporadic *l/r* alternation in P-Celtic languages and adduce Gaulish *Cauarinus* (see G. Dottin, *La Langue gauloise* [Paris, 1920; repr. Geneva, 1985], 111, and D. Ellis Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names* [Oxford, 1967], 332), though this is highly doubtful.

38 R. Coates, 'On an early date for Old English *i*-mutation', in A. Crépin, ed., *Linguistic and Stylistic Studies in Medieval English*, Publication de l'Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur 10 (Amiens, 1984), 25-37.

39 *LHEB*, 173.

40 *OEG*, §§185, 200.

41 *OEG*, §312.

42 *LHEB*, §176.

43 On the Old English name-forms in Bede, see especially H. Ström, *Old English Personal Names in Bede's History: an Etymological-Phonological Investigation*, Lund Studies in English VIII (Lund, 1939).

44 K.H. Jackson, ed., *The Gododdin: the Oldest Scottish Poem* (Edinburgh, 1969), 128 (sections A28/29).

45 I.e., by Coates, 'Early date'.

46 On the notion 'non-primary form', see J.McN. Dodgson, 'The significance of the distribution of the English place-names in *-ingas*, *-inga-* in south-east England', *Medieval Archaeology* X (1966), 1-29.

47 Cf. Coates, 'Early date', 34. *Gembling* would no longer be exceptional if the base name were *Gemela*, an alternative which was postulated in *PN Yorks.ER*, 91-2, to the *Gamela* proposed in *DEPN*, and adopted by K. Cameron, *English Place-Names* (London, 1961), 69.

48 Cf. Sims-Williams, 'Settlement', 41.