and Newtownards.[59] Hanging Brae, a small hill between Crossgar and Killinchy, is a reminder of the bloody sequel to the 1798 Rebellion.[60] With the coming of more civilised times, the public gallows and gibbets fell into disuse, and the people tried to forget the horrors of the past. Nevertheless, impressions of such gory sights were very enduring. Malachi Horan in 1943 remembered his father telling of the hanging of a poor unfortunate, one Patrick Lawlor, in 1798 or so, for stealing a half ounce of tobacco and three halfpence.[61] Even more terrifying was the sequel to that execution. In Malachi Horan's own words, 'There was an old man named Boylan who lived in Killenarden. He could not keep his mouth shut. He went about saying that they were hanging men for nothing. One of the magistrates heard this, and said that the dignity of the bench would have to be upheld; so they took Neddy Boylan, son of the old man, and hanged him, although they knew him innocent. They said as he was not content to live by English law that he had better die by it.'[62] Gradually, the place-names and street-names were altered, and with the passage of time, the connections of certain places with executions passed into oblivion, but deep down in folk memory, some of the more gory associations survive, while a wealth of material relating to this theme lies scattered through eight centuries of documents awaiting exhumation by some dedicated scholar.[63]

T. G. F. Paterson), edited by E. E. Evans (Dundalk, 1975), p. 49.

[59] O.S. 6"/1 mile, Co. Cavan, Sheet 20, Tullymongan Upper townland; O.S. 6"/1 mile, Co. Dublin, Sheet 11, Windmill Lands townland.

[60] O.S. 6"/1 mile, Co. Down, Sheet 6, Gregstown townland.

[61] G. A. Little, *Malachi Horan Remembers* (Dublin, 1943), p. 9.

[62] Little, *Malachi Horan Remembers*, p. 9; Killenarden, where Boylan lived, was the place where Lawlor was executed, now swallowed up in the suburbs of greater Dublin (Tallaght area).

[63] The author is indebted to Dr Oliver Padel for a number of valuable suggestions which have been incorporated into the text of this paper.

The Names of Merchants in Medieval Dublin

Peter McClure
University of Hull

A review of *The Dublin Guild Merchant Roll, c. 1190-1265*, edited by PHILOMENA CONNOLLY and GEOFFREY MARTIN, First Supplement to *The Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin*. Dublin Corporation: Dublin, 1992, xxiv + 159 pp., 5 plates, £ (Irish or sterling) 19.95p. + £2 postage (from: Archives Division, City Hall, Dame Street, Dublin 2, Ireland).

For over a century this remarkable document has been generally known only through John T. Gilbert's edition of extracts, amounting to nine of the 43 surviving membranes, published in *Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland 1172–1320* (Rolls Series, London, 1870). The complete roll is now available in a transcription by Philomena Connolly, accompanied by a fine introduction by Geoffrey Martin and by a number of appendices and indexes: a list of provosts 1221–1264; a transcription of the Roll of Free Citizens of the City of Dublin (ante 1234 to 1249); a table of the admissions to the guild 1222–1265 and to the freedom of the city 1234–1249; a physical analysis of the guild roll by John Gillis; an index to place-names by Emma Williams; and an index to occupations by Philomena Connolly.

A few of the merchants who are entered in the guild roll (noticeably among the early admissions) are identified by a single personal name only, but the great majority are given at least one distinguishing byname, which in some cases appears to be a family name. The antiquity of the earliest names is a matter of some importance but also of uncertainty. The roll has probably lost one or more of its initial membranes but whatever entries may be missing they are unlikely to have pre-dated 1171 when Henry II granted his newly acquired city to the men of Bristol. The question remains as to how much later than this the first extant entries are. The first time reference does not occur until m. 11 with the heading *Tempore Jurdani Clerici*. From other documentary evidence it appears that this clerk, together with other merchants named in the first twelve membranes,

was active in Dublin during the middle and later years of King John (see this edition p. xiii and Gilbert's edition pp. viii–ix). The first explicit dating of annual entries (1222–23) occurs on m. 14 and the mean number of annual admissions to the guild thereafter is 112. Professor Martin argues from this that the undated entries of the first ten membranes, listing some 2800 names, 'can be taken to begin c.1190 at the latest, and not improbably some years, or even a decade or more, earlier' (p. xiv). Such a view coincides with my own impression that the pattern of personal names in the earliest membranes is more archaic than that in the annual entries dating from 1222–23 onwards.[1]

Extensive town records for the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries are rare indeed, and the names in this roll provide exceptionally valuable evidence for a variety of historical enquiries. The toponymic bynames, for example, show that Dublin attracted traders not only from Bristol and its hinterland but also from other Irish towns, from Wales, from all over England (most of the major towns seem to be represented), from Scotland, the Isle of Man, northern France, the Low Countries and Italy. The wealth of information here about the origins of medieval Dubliners and about the mobility of the mercantile classes offers an outstanding opportunity for demographic research. Mobility is a key concept here. Guild members were not necessarily resident in Dublin and the roll provides information about individuals who were citizens of other towns at a time when urban records are usually scanty or non-existent. The value of this roll for students of medieval Bristol must be considerable. I can speak from personal knowledge only about Nottingham, from where at least seventeen of the guild members came, two of them also being free citizens of Dublin. Several bear the

---

[1] These patterns are distinguishable among the English merchants chiefly by a decline in the use of most insular Old English and Old Scandinavian baptismal names in favour of names imported from France. There is no space in this review for a careful analysis of the Dublin material, but for some representative discussions of this complex phenomenon in other Anglo-Norman sources, see P. H. Reaney, *The Origin of English Surnames* (London, 1967), pp. 102–07 and 129–32; and C. Clark, 'The early personal names of King's Lynn: an essay in socio-cultural history, part I—baptismal names', *Nomina*, 6 (1982), 51–71, republished in *Words, Names and History: Selected Writings of Cecily Clark*, edited by P. Jackson (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 241–57, especially pp. 242–44.

bynames of known Nottingham families, and in some instances antedate the first appearance of the family in the Nottinghamshire records. The names can have linguistic as well as genealogical value: the byname of *Rogerus de Scnotingham*, admitted in 1262–63 (p. 107), implies a pronunciation of the place-name for which there has previously been no evidence after the 1150s.[2]

The baptismal names in use among the merchants exhibit a rich variety, dominated by biblical and hagiological names and the Continental Germanic names chiefly introduced by the Normans, but also including Gaelic, Welsh and obsolescent Old English and Old Scandinavian names. There are not a few merchants whose first name and patronym come from linguistically and ethnically distinct name-stocks, and the occasional appearance of Irish Ó and *mac*, Welsh *map* and English *-son*, instead of the otherwise ubiquitous Latin *filius*, further contributes to the impression of a mixed-race polyglot population. The usual scribal practice is to latinise baptismal names but there are many instances where they are recorded in a vernacular form, including hypocorisms such as *Willekin* (p. 6), *Bette* (p. 16), *Hobbe* and *Robin* (p. 17), *Hiche* (p. 34), *Hulle* (p. 39), *Watte* (p. 41), *Hugin* (p. 51), *Hobekin* (p. 52), *Dawe* (p. 53), *Dicun* (p. 56), *Magot* (p. 64), *Colinus* (p. 69), *Ablot* (p. 73), *Haukinus* (p. 87), *Dike* (p. 105) and *Raulinus* (p. 114). It looks to me as though one example of *Dauwe* is not a hypocorism of *David* (as is usually supposed)[3] but a rhyming pet-form of *Ralph* (or *Raw*): *Dauwe Ballard*, admitted to the guild in 1264–65 (p. 109), is likely to be the same man as *Radulphus filius Roberti Ballard*, given the freedom of the city in 1248–49 (p. 120).[4] His father was

---

[2] Cf. *Snotingeham* 1086 Domesday Book, *Snotn*, *Snoti*, temp. Henry I Coins, *Snot*, temp. Stephen Coins, in J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire*, English Place-Name Society (EPNS) 17 (Cambridge, 1940), p. 13.

[3] See e.g. P. H. Reaney and R. M. Wilson, *A Dictionary of English Surnames*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1995) [hereafter *DES*], s.n. *Daw*.

[4] For unambiguous evidence of *Daw* as a pet-form of *Ralph*, see O. J. Padel, 'Names in *-kin* in medieval Wales', to appear in *Names, Time and Place*, edited by D. Postles and D. Hooke (London, forthcoming). Further evidence will be presented in my own paper, 'The interpretation of hypocoristic forms of baptismal names in Middle English (and Middle Scots)', to be given at the Glasgow conference of the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland, April 1997.

perhaps *Robin Ballard*, admitted to the guild before the time of Jordan the Clerk (p. 17). This well illustrates how heavily the identification and derivation of hypocoristics depend on prosopographical research, which in turn depends on the availability of comparative documentation. This is another reason among many why the publication of documents like the Dublin Guild Merchant Roll and the Dublin Roll of Free Citizens is greatly to be welcomed and encouraged. It also highlights the need for a general index of names, which surprisingly this edition does not provide.

Since occupational bynames and nickname bynames are major sources of evidence for early vocabulary, onomastic documents of the size and date of the Dublin guild roll are of special value in lexicological research. I have only sampled the text of the roll but there seem to be a good many occupational names that antedate the earliest record in standard reference works such as the *Middle English Dictionary*,[5] the *New English Dictionary*,[6] the *Dictionary of English Surnames*[7], Fransson's *English Surnames of Occupation*,[8] and Thuresson's *Middle English Occupational Terms*.[9]

Here are a dozen examples, with their earliest references in these standard sources given in brackets: *Belietere* 1227–28 (p. 58) 'bell-founder', cf. *MED* s.v. *bel(le-yetere* (1247); *le Bulger* 1244–45 (p. 81) 'maker of leather bags', cf. Fransson p. 127 (1300); *le Carboner* c.1190–1210[10] (p. 37) 'charcoal-burner', cf. Fransson p. 174 (1275); *le Gunnur* 1238–39 (pp. 75, 116) 'gunner, operator of a siege engine', cf. *DES* s.n. Gunner (1285); *le Henepere* 1223–24 (p. 49) 'maker or seller of *hanaps* or goblets', cf. Fransson p. 140 (1319); *le Hotsmiz* 1263–64 (p. 109) 'hood-smith', i.e. a maker of chainmail hoods or coifs, cf. Fransson p. 117 s.n. *Hodere* (*Hudsmyth* 1582; but *DES* s.n. *Hudsmith* treats this sixteenth-century instance as a corruption of 'Hudd's *maugh*

---

[5] Edited by Hans Kurath and others (Ann Arbor, 1954–); hereafter *MED*.

[6] Edited by J. Murray and others (Oxford, 1888–1933); second edition, as *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1989); hereafter *NED*.

[7] Reaney and Wilson, *Dictionary of English Surnames*.

[8] Gustav Fransson, *English Surnames of Occupation 1100–1350* (Lund, 1935); hereafter Fransson.

[9] Bertil Thuresson, *Middle English Occupational Terms* (Lund, 1950); hereafter Thuresson.

[10] I have given the approximate date 'c.1190–1210' to the names enrolled on the first ten membranes.

or kinsman-in-law'; if that is right, the Dublin roll citation is unique evidence for the term 'hood-smith'); *the Ledere* 1225–26 (p. 52) 'porter, carter', cf. Thuresson p. 94 (1296); *le Lodman* 1238–39 (p. 74) 'load-man, carter' or perhaps 'pilot', cf. Thuresson p. 97 (1301); *Toppere* c. 1210–15[11] (p. 39) 'one who puts the *toppe* of flax or tow on the distaff, a spinner?', cf. *DES* s.n. *Topper* (1275); *le Tuneler* 1245–46 (p. 82) 'cooper', cf. Fransson p. 169 (1334); *le Wasteler* 1232–33 (p. 64) 'maker or seller of *wastels* (bread made of the finest flour)', cf. Fransson p. 63 (1327); *le Wlbetere* c.1190–1210 (p. 27) 'fuller', cf. Fransson p. 101 (1271). A less certain instance of an occupational name is *Clatere* which appears in c.1190–1210 (p. 6) and in 1227–28 (p. 58), antedating the only citation (1327) in *DES* s.n. *Clater* by a hundred years and more. Reaney argues that it is a nickname from Middle English (ME) *clater* 'noisy chatter' and is metonymic for 'chatterer', but it occurs to me that the byname might alternatively be an unrecorded derivative of ME *claten* 'to beat' (cf. flaxbeater, leadbeater, goldbeater, woolbeater).

There are at least another dozen that as far as I am aware have not been recorded at all. One example is *le Barhunt* 1237–38 (p. 72), which is the first genuine evidence I have met for a ME *bar-hunte* (later *bor-hunte*) 'boar-hunter'. I put it that way because the citations for *bor-hunte* 'boar-hunter' in *MED* do not belong to the word. They are unquestionably toponymic bynames (*de Burhunte* 1286, *de Borhunte* 1296, *de Bourhunte* 1304, *de Borehunte* 1324, as well as *le Borhunt* 1325 which the context shows to be an error for *de Borhunt*) and they all refer to Boarhunt in Hampshire. Even if we discounted the overwhelming evidence of the preposition *de*, the spellings with *u* and *ou* would rule out a derivation from Old English (OE) *bār* 'boar', and the *o* spellings are conventional substitutions for *u*. The modern place-name, whose spelling probably arose from an antiquarian misconstruction, goes back to an OE **Burhfunta* 'spring by the fortification or town', later altered to **Burhunta*, ME *Burhunte*.[12]

---

[11] I have given the approximate date 'c.1210–1215' to the names entered under the heading *Tempore Jurdani Clerici*.

[12] See E. Ekwall, *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th edn (Oxford, 1960), s.n. *Boarhunt*; R. Coates, *Hampshire Place-Names* (London, 1989), s.n. *Boarhunt*; and A. H. Smith, *English Place-Name Elements*, 2 vols, EPNS 25–26 (Cambridge, 1956), s.vv. *burh* and *funta*.

Other examples are: *Bokmongere* 1259–60 (p. 101) 'book-seller'; *le Bothwrichte* 1245–46 (p. 84) 'booth- or stall-maker'; *le Cerclur* c.1190–1210 (p. 20) and *le Cercler* c.1190–1210, 1225–26 and 1227–28 (pp. 27, 54 and 59), a term not recorded in *MED* but to be identified with *Circulator* 1259–60 (p. 101), i.e. Medieval Latin (ML) *circulator*, *cerclator* 'hooper, cooper';[13] *le Custurer* 1225–26 (p. 53), probably denoting one who made *costers*, ornamental hangings for walls and beds; *le Douneour* 1222–23 (p. 49), perhaps 'one who provides down or soft feathers for pillows and beds'; *le Gurdelwrichte* 1227–28 (p. 58) 'girdle-maker'; *le Luggere* 1245–46 (p. 83), probably a derivative of ME *luggen* 'to pull or drag'; *le Maliere* 1257–58 (p. 99), very likely a synonym of ME *malemakere* 'bag-maker'; *le Saucerur* c.1210–15 (p. 46), presumably 'a maker of saucers or dishes'; *le Skopener* 1264–65 (p. 109), perhaps 'scoop-maker' from an unrecorded by-form of ME *scope* 'scoop, ladel, shovel'; *le Techwricht* 1233–34 (p. 66) and *le Techwrichte* 1244–45 (p. 82), evidently a compound of ME *t(h)ech* 'roof-covering, thatch' and *wright*, hence 'roofer, tiler (?), thatch-maker'; and finally *le Toiwrith* 1231–32 (p. 63), *le Teewrute* 1255–56 (p. 95) and *le Teyere* 1260–01 (p. 102), which, like the synonymous *Taymaker* (1367) noted in Thuresson p. 231, are based on OE *tēah* and Old French (OF) *teie*, *toie*, giving ME *teie* (also **tee* and **toi*) 'chest, coffer, cover', hence 'one who makes chests, boxes, cases or coverings'. *Wricht*, *wright*, *writh* and *wrute* are all ME forms of OE *wryhta* 'worker, craftsman', often more specifically 'carpenter, joiner'.

Now and again the names of guild members are accompanied by additional descriptive identifications, one of the more charming being that of *Ben de Kirkeby that berth is mantel modily* ('who bears his mantle haughtily', p. 86). Such personal characterisations are more usually encapsulated in a nickname, of which there are very large numbers in the roll, most of them in English, French or Latin, but some, too, in Irish and in Welsh. A handful of examples can do little justice to this abundantly varied corpus of names, and I only mention the likes of *Searaic Surballoc* 'sour ball(s)' (p. 7), *Robertus the Wilde* (p. 13), *Walterus devand le Mast* (p. 16), *Philippus Unnithing* 'no stingy fellow' (p. 22), *Robertus Lechur* (p. 41), *Robertus Go bi the Wind* (p. 66),

---

[13] This byname has also been noted in Gloucester c.1210: A. D. Mills, 'Some Middle English occupational terms', *Notes and Queries*, 208 (1963), 249–57 (p. 251), s.n. *cercler*, where a full explanation is given.

Robertus de Arundel Kockesbrayn (p. 69), *Nicholaus Falinthewolle* 'fall in the well' (p. 90) and *Johannes Wellisoten* 'well boiled' (p. 98) in order to whet the appetite. I am not sure if I am right to categorise *devand le Mast* as a nickname but it seems to anticipate by more than four hundred years the first recorded use of the equivalent English phrase, *before the mast* (implying a berth in the forecastle), familiar to us as a metonym for service as an ordinary seaman (see *NED* s.v. *before*, 2d, earliest citation 1627). The name occurs again with *Rogerus devant le Mast* (p. 25).

Given that so few literary documents survive from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, you would expect the nicknames in this roll to provide some rare lexical items. The family name *Wlips* c.1190–1210 (pp. 7 and 8), is from OE *wlips* 'lisping', for which neither *MED* nor *NED* has evidence of survival in Middle English. *Nubbe* c.1190–1210 (p. 11) looks like an unrecorded south-western reflex of OE **hnybba* or **hnybbe* 'nib, tip, point', otherwise only found in ME in the form *neb* meaning 'the human face, the nose' and 'beak, snout'. The byname of *Willelmus Sparthax* c.1210–15 (p. 41) indicates the existence in Middle English of a hitherto unrecorded compound of Old Norse (ON) *sparða* 'battle-axe' (itself recorded in *MED* no earlier than 1261) and OE *æx*. If the byname of *Ricardus cum Seturi* c.1190–1210 (p. 35) is read as *cum Securi* 'with the battle-axe', it is perhaps a Latin rendering of *Sparthax*. The sobriquet of *Willelmus Crucesignatus* c.1210–1215 (p. 43), meaning 'signed with the cross', is duplicated in the vernacular by that of *Robert le Crossede* 1247–48 (p. 86) and probably denotes someone who had intended to go on a crusade (though there are other possibilities). *Crossed* is not recorded in *MED* and is not noted before the sixteenth century in *NED*.

Another example of significant antedating occurs in the toponymical nickname of *Gilebertus le Manske*, admitted in 1253–54 (p. 94), and *Johannes le Manske de Russyn*, admitted in 1262–63 (p. 107). The adjective *Mansk* 'Manx' does not appear in *MED* though it clearly goes back to an ON **Manskr*. Its first citation in *NED* is 1572. My eye was also caught by the byname of *Rogerus Gamberel* c.1190–1210 (p. 15). It precedes by over two and three hundred years respectively the first recorded use in French and English of the word *gamb(e)rel*, commonly a term for the bent stick used by butchers for spreading and hanging a carcass on. The first citation of the word by Godefroy is in

1452,[14] and in *NED* 1547; as a surname it has not been noted before 1535 in France and 1618 in England (*ex inf.* J. Wyatt Gambrell). Although the byname might have originated as an occupational metonym for 'butcher', I suspect that it was actually a nickname for someone with small or bad legs. The meanings 'butcher's bent stick' and 'someone who has bad legs' are both found for the parallel term *gambier* in nineteenth-century Normandy.[15] *NED*, s.v. *gambrel*, suggests that these words are derived from Celtic **cambo-* 'crooked', but my own feeling is that they are simply diminutive forms (with perhaps a pejorative connotation) of Old Northern French *gambe* 'leg'.

My final illustration is *Adam Pufin* ante 1222–23[16] (p. 48). According to Lockwood, *puffin* was 'originally the name given to the cured carcass of the nestling shearwater, until the end of the 18th cent. an esteemed delicacy, supplies coming from the Scillies and the Calf of Man'.[17] *MED* cites the forms *poffoun* (1337) and *Poffin* (1345), and somewhat earlier its use as a byname, *Puffin* (1279). Latham gives *paphinus* (1237), *puffo* (1297), and *poffonus* (1336) as Anglo-Latin for 'puffin'.[18] Etymologically it appears to be a derivative of the English verb *puff* 'to swell up, be swollen', the suffix being *-in* or *-on*, not *-ing* as Lockwood supposes. As a human nickname would it have denoted personal plumpness (with or without metaphorical reference to the bird), or was it an allusion to an occupation in the Anglo-Norman trade in salted sea-birds?

A more thorough examination of the Dublin Guild Merchant Roll than I have made will undoubtedly bring to light large quantities of important additional material. The text of the roll consists almost entirely of the names of individual merchants, well over 8000 of them, and it seems to me that in editing it the interests of etymologists and onomasticians should have been a major consideration. Although this

---

[14] F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, 10 vols (Paris, 1881–1902), s.v. *gamberel*.

[15] See E. and A. Duméril, *Dictionnaire du patois normand* (Caen, 1849).

[16] The section of the roll headed CIROGRAPH occurs between that headed *Tempore Jurdani Clerici* and the first of the dated, annual entries (1222–23). I have given names in this section the date 'ante 1222–23'.

[17] W. B. Lockwood, *The Oxford Book of British Bird Names* (Oxford, 1984), p. 121.

[18] R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List* (London, 1965).

new edition goes some way towards meeting these interests, I do have some reservations about it.

In two most important respects Connolly's transcription of the roll is much superior to Gilbert's: it is complete and by and large it offers readings that are more intelligible. Just occasionally a better opportunity to make onomastic sense is provided by Gilbert. From membrane 6d (col. A), for example, Gilbert (p. 46) prints *le kiddire* where Connolly (p. 22) prints *le Riddire*, and from the same membrane (col. B) Gilbert (p. 47) prints *Keche* where Connolly (p. 22) prints *Reche*. I don't know what to make of *Riddire* or *Reche* but *kiddire* looks like a version of ME *kiddiere* 'seller of faggots [?]' or 'hawker, pedlar [?]' (Fransson p. 54 and *DES* s.n. *Kidder*), while *Keche* (of uncertain meaning) is a byname found elsewhere at this period (*DES* s.n. *Keech* cites examples from 1206 and 1209). I am not suggesting that Connolly's readings are therefore mistaken. It seems, however, that the scribe who copied up m. 6d wrote *k*, *K*, and *R*, in a sufficiently similar way as to produce disagreement between two experienced editors of Irish medieval manuscripts.

Without consulting the original document it is impossible to arbitrate, but the new edition does provide five photographic enlargements of parts of several membranes (though not of m. 6d), and these give one a limited opportunity to compare the manuscript with Connolly's printed transcriptions. On the plate facing p. 56 the reproduction of m. 5d (col. A) shows six entries including (as I read it) *Michel le mustarder de london*'. Connolly (p. 20) prints this as *Michael le Mustarder de London*', where she has capitalised the principal initial letters (her usual practice) and has replaced the medieval vernacular form of the first name with the normal modern form. Three entries later is *Alanus hō Rob'ti thoppe* (the copyist's error for *choppe*?—cf. *Walterus Choppe de Bristoll*', p. 64), which Connolly represents as *Alanus homo Roberti Thorpe*. I think that *Thorpe* is a doubtful reading (and perhaps an unlikely one since asyndetic forms of toponymic bynames were not usual at that time), but the issue can only be settled definitively by finding other, more certain examples of long *r* and *pp* written in the same hand. On the plate facing p. 72 the reproduction of part of m. 21 (col. A) shows six entries including *Will' Amiot bursar*'. This has been incorrectly transcribed (p. 60) as *Willelmus Annot Burlarius*. The reference to 'Burel-maker' in the Index to Occupations

should therefore be deleted and an additional reference under 'Purse-maker' inserted. Finally, in the frontispiece reproduction of part of m. 11d (col. A), there are eight entries, including what look to me like *Thom' de Noref* (or possibly *de Horef*)[19] and *Thomass Le Harp[ur]*. These names are printed (p. 41) as *Thomas de Mores* and *Thomas le Harpur*.

It would be unfair to judge the entire transcript on the basis of these photographs, representing as they do such a small sample of the edition. However, the occurrence here of normalisation of names and of transcriptional errors and doubtful readings does raise some general issues about the editing of texts which are primarily onomastic in content. The common practice, whereby abbreviations are silently expanded, whereby *u* (if it is *u* and not *n*) is rendered, as in this edition, as *v*, and whereby words and commonplace names are printed in their most familiar form, is designed to produce a clear, simple and intelligible text, where the reader is not distracted by the idiosyncracies of the scribes or by a clutter of editorial symbols. For those whose business it is to interpret the names, such 'clean' texts can be a mixed blessing in so far as they pre-empt the etymological and onomastic processes. Information regarding scribal idiosyncracies and calligraphical uncertainties can be invaluable in helping to assess etymological and onomastic choices. An edition that requires the reader to consult the original manuscript in order to find out what the scribe actually wrote is to some degree defeating its own purpose. With respect to a document like the Dublin Guild Merchant Roll, where the text is little more than a list of names, I think a strong case can be made for printing the names as close as possible to their manuscript forms. Of course, the question of how best to transliterate medieval calligraphy is not a simple one and there are sometimes no absolutely right answers. Ambiguous letter-forms are endemic to English court hand and they vary in nature and frequency from scribe to scribe. In the end the editor has to put something down even when unsure what the correct letter is. But all doubtful readings should be discussed in footnotes; changes in scribal hand should be recorded whenever

---

[19] There is no visible suspension mark, perhaps because the scribe chose instead to lengthen the cross stroke of the *f* so as to form the line linking the merchant's name to the admission fee. If the intended form of the name was *de Noref*, it would be plausible to extend it to *de Noref[olk]*.

practicable; and the relevant features of the main hands, especially those letter-forms and abbreviation signs that are similar and difficult to distinguish, should be briefly characterised in an introduction or appendix. Although Connolly implies (pp. xii–xiii) that there are numerous changes in scribal hand from m. 7 onwards (mm. 1–6 being shared between two scribes copying from an earlier source) she does not tell us either where or in what manner the scribal changes occur, nor does she inform us about the doubts and difficulties in transcription that she surely experienced. In an edition where eight pages are devoted to a physical analysis of each of its 43 membranes, one may ask why an equivalent space was not given to a matter of such fundamental relevance to the interpretation of the text.

Indeed, the text of the roll is presented to us with the minimum of editorial commentary. The footnotes are confined to indicating scribal insertions, erasures, alterations and marginalia such as the drawings— though oddly the trefoil shown on the plate facing p. 56 has not been noted in the text, p. 20. The following sequence of entries on p. 56 also surely deserves some annotation, for it departs from the usual pattern:

> Enlubet de Uberi
> En Pere Jonec de Unuseline
> En Peris de Pre

I don't understand the function of *En* in this context. It looks like the OF preposition *en* 'in, into', but with what sense here? What follows *En* in each instance is doubtless the name of a merchant, though I don't recognise *lubet* or *Uberi* or *Unuseline*. Not that all the entries in this roll are, in fact, names of people. In 1252–53 (p. 93) the entire *Consilium de London'* was admitted, and I think the editors might have drawn this to our attention. Nor do all the merchants prove to be men. The Introduction (p. xx) tells us that there were three women admitted, but only the name of 'Felicia Hinkley' is given, without date or page reference. You can find her (more correctly *Felicia de Hinkele*) by looking up 'Hinkley' in the Index to Place-Names. It was by good luck that I spotted what I presume are the other two: *Susanna relicta Henrici Clerici de Arclo* (p. 81) and *Ena* (*sic* but better read as *Eua*) *Pret de Kardigan* (p. 102).[20]

---

[20] *Eve* was the third commonest woman's name in Wales between 1215 and 1350; see Gerald Morgan, 'Naming Welsh women', *Nomina*, 18 (1995),

Alas, there is no general index of names, and yet methodical studies of the names in this roll are not possible without the aid of an alphabetically organised index of the names as they appear in the text. What we get instead are two partial indexes, one of place-names (almost complete) and one of occupations (far from complete). The assumption seems to be that names of other types, or whose toponymic or occupational origins were not apparent, would be of lesser research value, a view that is quite unwarranted. It also ignores the needs of prosopographical, genealogical and family name research. The two indexes that are provided, though helpful up to a point, are most frustrating to use. Following a common practice in indexing, the majority of the head-forms are based, not on the name forms that appear in the text, but on the meanings which the indexers have assigned to them. This makes it difficult to work from the text to the index unless you already know, for example, that *Tristeldermod* is modern Castledermot or that *Chaluner* is likely to have been indexed under 'Blanket-maker', *Circler* under 'Cooper' or *Fuster* under 'Joiner'.

In an Anglo-Norman context, *Fuster* would in any case be better glossed more specifically as 'saddle-tree maker' (see *NED* s.v. *fuster*), a sense supported in the Dublin roll itself by the entry, *Hervius le Fuster Sellarius*, i.e. 'saddler' (p. 95). Such differences of opinion about how best to define occupational terms would cause less concern if the actual names had been incorporated within the index, but with some exceptions all we get is an alphabetical list of inferred meanings accompanied by page references. Consequently, whether you are working forwards or backwards between text and index, you can find yourself involved in an arduous guessing game, and any editorial misinterpretation of the names is bound to cause further confusion. All but one of the eleven references for 'Joiner' prove to be examples of *Fuster*, but for the one listed for p. 42 I can find no *Fuster* nor any other appropriate term. The only possible candidate is the byname of *Nicholaus Joimer*, but only if we assume that it is a misprint for *Joiner* or that the editor has silently reinterpreted the minims to produce **Joinier*. If *Joimer* is indeed the manuscript form, then it is probably not an occupational term but a patronymic from OF *Joimer*, Continental Germanic (CG) *Gautmar*. The index entry 'Crocker' refers us to p. 25 of the text, where the only name that seems to correspond is

119–39, especially p. 128.

Croc (twice); if this is the correct form and not a misprint, it is either a patronymic from ON *Krókr* or a nickname from ME *crok* 'crooked object', perhaps for someone with a bent back. 'Ditcher' refers us to p. 7; I cannot find any name there with this sense, so I guess that this is a misunderstanding of the byname of *Johannes Fossardus*, which is not derived from Latin *fossa* but is a patronymic from CG *Foscard*. There is apparently a 'cordwainer' (i.e. a shoemaker) on p. 45 but I can only find a *Giles le Corder*, whose byname means 'rope-maker'. Two of the references for 'Thatcher' appear to involve mistaken interpretations of *le Teewrute* (p. 95) and *le Teyere* (p. 102), which, as I have suggested earlier, probably signify 'chest-maker'. As for the 'costermonger' on p. 53, the only name that bears any resemblance to it is *le Custurer*. The term *coster*, 'apple', is a post-medieval corruption of ME *costard* and cannot be the basis of *custurer* which, as I have already suggested, may denote a maker of *co(u)sters* or hangings for walls and beds. Finally, the allusion to a 'pitcher' (i.e. one who works with pitch) on p. 51 seems to represent a misunderstanding of *le Pekere*, which possibly means 'maker of peck-measures' (cf. *DES* s.n. *Peckar*).

The translations of names that usually form the head-words in the occupational index are sometimes mere transliterations that explain little or nothing, such as 'Doubler' for *le Dobler* (perhaps 'one who doubles or lines garments', cf. *MED* s.v. *doublen*) and 'Stocker' for *le Stocker* (which probably means 'stockfishmonger', cf. *MED* s.v. *stokker*). The trouble is that they can also seriously mislead. 'Axe-burner' (four references) is an unhelpful, not to say mystifying, rendering of *Axbernere*, which in reality is a metathetical form of ME *askbernere* 'ash-burner', in other words a maker of potash. 'Gabler' transliterates the byname of *Marcus le Gabler* (of Rouen) who appears three times in the roll (pp. 80, 98, 106). His name does not signify, as the index seems to imply, a maker of gables, but a tax-gatherer or a money-lender (OF *gablier*, *gableor*). 'Hatcher' transliterates *Hachere* (p. 82) but this may not be an occupational name at all. It is usually taken to mean 'one who lives by a hatch or gate' (*DES* s.n. *Hatcher*). The full name is *Nicholaus Hachere de Kame*, which indicates that he was most likely from Caen in Calvados, though *Kame* might conceivably be a spelling for Cam (Gloucs). In this context, *Hachere* could well be a patronymic from an OF baptismal name, representing CG *Hachari* or CG *Agihari*. I should also mention here the

unintelligible 'Luterer', which presumably refers to *le Lutere* on p. 116; this must be a mistake for 'luter', i.e. a lute-player or lute-maker.

In some eighteen instances Connolly has decided that a byname must be occupational though she has, it seems, been unable to identify a meaning, for she departs from her general principle by indexing them in their textual spellings inside square brackets. The only exception is *Bulger* (p. 81), which inexplicably appears as [Bulgur] in the index. The inclusion of such names is not an altogether safe procedure as not all of them are actually occupational. *Bulur*, for example, is probably a derivative of ME *boule* (OF *boul*) 'falsehood, trickery', hence 'a cheat, a fraudster', and *Dicere*, which also appears in the roll as *le Decer* (p. 116), is a nickname meaning 'dicer, gambler'. Of the other bracketed names, most can be found explained in the standard reference works (*MED*, *NED*, *DES*, Fransson and Thuresson), including *Tiffere*, if it is re-read as *Tissere* 'weaver', and *Tranenter*, if re-read as *Trauenter* 'hawker, tranter, pedlar'. The remainder consist of hitherto unrecorded names, for which I have already suggested possible meanings.

The Index to Occupations is far from complete. Some page references are missing. One more example of *Chaluner* (p. 43) should have been listed under 'Blanket-maker'. *Bracur* (p. 33) and *Brachur* (p. 116) belong under 'Brewer'; *Macecrer* (p. 1) and *Macecre* (p. 66) under 'Butcher'; *Chepman* (p. 66) under 'Chapman'; *Coler, Colere*, and *Coliere* (pp. 2, 9, 24 and 58) under 'Charcoal-burner'; *Combere* (p. 64) under 'Comb-maker'; *Anceps* (p. 43) under 'Falconer'; *Fullo* (p. 66) under 'Fuller'; *Mathun* (p. 71), if re-read as *Machun*, under 'Mason'; *Corder* (p. 45) under 'Roper'; *Seeler* (p. 12) under 'Saddler'; *Diciuer* (p. 8, two examples) under 'Steward'; *Monitor* (p. 10) under 'Summoner'; *Sururgianus* (p. 85) under 'Surgeon'; and *Semer* (p. 92) under 'Tailor'. There are 170 or so occupations listed, some of which are spurious, but many are also missing. I shall just mention those names that are well attested in the standard reference works and which have not already received a mention elsewhere in this paper: *le Bover* (p. 35) 'oxherd'; *le Cachepol* (p. 65), the standard nickname for a rent-collector; *le Heumer* (p. 65) 'helmet-maker'; *le Koger* (p. 98) 'a sailor or master of a *cog* or small ship'; *le Meylur* (p. 93), an aphetic form of ME *ameillur* 'enameller' (according to *DES* s.n. *Mailer*, but a derivative of ME *maillen* 'to make chain-mail' is also possible); *le Poet* (p. 19) 'poet'; *le Rimur* (p. 88), *le Rymor* (p. 102) 'rhymer, poet';

le Rouer (p. 108) 'roofer'; *le Ruter* (p. 88) 'one who plays the *rote* (a plucked string instrument)'; *le Sanger* (p. 87) 'singer, songster'; *le Saumer* (p. 17), if re-read as *le Saunier*, 'salter'; *le Sereman* (p. 101) perhaps 'shearman, shearer'; *Stalkere* (p. 41), perhaps 'one who stalks game'; *le Tollere* (p. 44) 'toll-gatherer'; and *Weydar*' (p. 74) 'woad-dealer'.

An index of occupations divorced from a thorough etymological study of the bynames is almost certain to be unsatisfactory. The Index to Place-Names, compiled by Emma Williams, is more justifiable in its own terms, given that the majority of toponymic bynames are formally recognisable from an accompanying preposition. Unlike the other index, there are therefore only a few omissions and, thankfully, the textual spellings of the place-names are given in brackets after the modern head-form. The identification of the place-names is a different matter, however, and in this the index is seriously defective. The only sources that Williams claims to have consulted are Ekwall's *Dictionary of English Place-Names* (see n. 11, above), *The Domesday Gazetteer* edited by H. C. Darby and G. R. Versey (Cambridge, 1975), and Michael Benskin's 'Origin of the Population of Mediaeval Dublin' (typescript, 1971), which 'was of great assistance' (p. 131). Perhaps her reliance on this (unpublished?) typescript explains why she made no use of the county volumes of the English Place-Name Society or the public archives and published literature relating to the place-names of Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Isle of Man and the continent of Europe. I wonder if it also accounts for the inconsistencies between her stated aims and their execution. We are assured that 'where a place-name may be located in one of several different [English] counties all the possibilities are listed' (p. 131), but this proves to be so far from the truth of the matter that it seems unlikely that any systematic use of English place-name scholarship was made at any stage in the compilation of the index. Typical entries are 'Acton, Suff., Salop (Actun)' and 'Ashton, Corn./Northants. (Astone, Astun, -e, Estone)', where just two possible locations are given in each case. Williams can hardly be imagined to have consulted even Ekwall, who lists twelve places called Acton (originally *Actun*), seven of which are outside Shropshire and none of which is in Suffolk, for the Suffolk Acton has a different etymology and would perhaps still appear in the early thirteenth century as *Acketun, Acheton*, etc. rather than *Actun, Acton*.

Ashton, too, is a very common place-name, Ekwall listing thirteen examples in seven counties. Moreover, the spellings *Astone, Astun(e)* and *Estone* are just as likely to represent one or more of the dozens of places called Aston or Easton. Inadequacies of this kind are abundant throughout the index and do not seem to be limited to names in England. When *la Lee* is assigned only to 'The Lee, Bucks.' (a minor place in the parish of Denton) and *Kirkatun* only to Kirkton in Dumfriesshire, one begins to wonder which scholarly publications were actually consulted and on what grounds they were chosen.

I am not a Celtic philologist and cannot judge how accurately the Irish, Scottish and Welsh place-names have been identified, but the English place-name attributions frequently show ignorance of the medieval forms of modern place-names and of the published scholarship of place-name history. Maldon in Essex is not a correct identification of the forms *Maltun, Mealtun, Meltone* and *Moltune*, which indicate places named Malton, Melton or Molton. *Kalveleie* points to Calveley (Cheshire) not Calverley (Yorks. West Riding). *Hildisdone* is not an early spelling for Ilston (*sic* for Illston, Leics.); it would be formally appropriate to Hillesden (Bucks.). *Wilford* should have been associated with Wilford (Notts. or Suffolk) not Wilsford (Lincs.). *Landinis* does not belong to the early forms of London, nor *Petra* to Peterborough, *Dereham* to Durham, *Cleve* to Cleveland, *Koudon* to Cowden (Kent), *Aula Regis* to Kingsholm (Gloucs.), nor *Brictun* and *Briktone* to Brighton (Sussex). The forms *Campedenne* and *Compedene*, which should have been assigned to Campden (Gloucs.) or Compton (Derbs.), are bafflingly identified as 'Almondbury, Greetland' (presumably in Yorks. West Riding).

French place-names are also subjected to amateurish guesswork. *Bordeles, Bordell, Burdeles* and *Burdell'*, all of which signify Bordeaux (in Gironde, Loiret or Seine-Maritime), are mistakenly interpreted as Burdeleston (*sic* for Burleston?) in Dorset. *Bovines* (Bouvines, in the department of Nord) is wrongly identified as Boveney (Bucks.); *Katevile* (Catteville, in La Manche) as Catton (Norfolk); *Cauncy* (probably Canchy, in Calvados or Somme) as Kent; *Mubrai* and *Munbray* (Montbrai, in La Manche) as somewhere I cannot find called 'Mowbray' in Yorks. North Riding; *Normanville* (in Eure or Seine-Maritime) as Normanby (Lincs.); *Nugent* (Nogent, common in northern France) as Newent (Gloucs.); *Perci* (Percy, in Calvados or La

Manche) as somewhere apparently called 'Percy' in Northumberland; *Runcevilla* and *Runcuilla* (unidentified but probably French) as Runcton (Sussex); and *Toca* and *Toke* (probably Touques, in Calvados) as Tewkesbury (Gloucs.).

There are many other similar errors in this index and the bulk of them were avoidable if Ekwall's dictionary of English place-names and Dauzat's of French place-names[21] (let alone the more detailed works of other scholars) had been carefully consulted. A degree of linguistic competence is also essential, in Latin as well as the medieval vernaculars. We are given the strange misinformation that *Burgo Blundus* represents Blundeston (Suffolk), even though the ablative and nominative case endings indicate that the toponymic byname is simply *de Burgo* (referring most likely to Peterborough, Northants., if not to one of the many places called Brough, Burgh, Burrow and so forth), and that *Blundus* is the merchant's second byname, a nickname meaning 'fair-haired'. The same error is made when the two bynames of *Walterus de Westbir' Rotarius* (p. 47) are treated in the index as though *Rotarius* ('wheelwright') were part of the place-name instead of indicating Walter's occupation. It is most unfortunate that an interpretative index such as this should have been allowed to go to print in such an unsatisfactory state.

Putting to one side the exceptional inadequacies of the Index to Place-Names, I recognise that some of the editorial principles I am unhappy with, regarding the transcription as well as the indexing of the names, are in line with what some scholars have regarded as best practice. The problems I have encountered in using this edition indicate that these principles need re-thinking when it comes to the editing of documents whose contents are predominantly onomastic. Interpretative editing of medieval names requires an etymological competence well beyond most historians and archivists, and performs a particular disservice if it also pre-supposes that the ambiguities and obscurities of manuscript forms should be arbitrarily resolved (or ignored) for the sake of a clear text. In any case, partial, interpretative indexes should never be used as substitutes for a general index of all the names in their original spellings. I cannot see the point in producing an

---

[21] A. Dauzat and Ch. Rostaing, *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms de lieux en France* (Paris, 1963).

edition that might hinder, deter or mislead the very research that its publication should promote.

However, I don't wish to end this review on a negative note. While there is something to criticise, there is also much to be grateful for. This unusually important and fascinating manuscript is for the first time printed in full and in a handsome format, and for all its imperfections, the edition undoubtedly opens up substantial opportunities for significant research, as I have shown in the first half of this review. Although as a limited edition it may not be widely available, I hope that its publication will help to stimulate the research the document deserves, and that Dublin Corporation will continue its admirable policy of publishing modern, scholarly editions of its archival records.

The Distinction of Gender?
Women's Names in the Thirteenth Century

David Postles
Department of English Local History,
University of Leicester

Attendant etiam sacerdotes, ne lasciva nomina que scilicet mox prelata sonant lasciviam, imponi permittant parvulis baptizatis, sexus precipue feminini. Et si contrarium fiat, per confirmantes episcopos corrigatur.[1]

Let priests take care, that they do not allow frivolous (*lascivus*) names, which, when spoken, readily give an impression of wantonness (*lascivia*), to be bestowed upon young people being baptized, particularly of the female sex. If the wrong thing happens, it is to be corrected by bishops at confirmation.

Archbishop Pecham's injunction to the clergy of the southern province at the Council held at Lambeth in 1281 provides a contemporary perception of a cultural change in personal naming by the late thirteenth century. Although Pecham conceded that there was a general problem, he intimated that the naming of female children was of particular concern. The meaning of his testimony, however, may be ambiguous. Pecham, after all, might have preferred the conferment of Christian names—that is Saints', particularly, or Biblical

[1] *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*,II, ii, *1265–1313*, edited by F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964), p. 897 [cap. 3], *De baptismo*. I am grateful to Oliver Padel for suggestions in the translation of the passage.