
For a recent survey of such artefacts, see R. Bruce-Mitford, 'Ireland and the hanging-bowls - a review', in M. Ryan, ed., *Ireland and Insular Art A.D. 500-1200* (Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, 1987), 30-9.

Sixth Annual Report, as in n.28, above.

The Development of OE ȝ and ð in South-Eastern Middle English, Lund Studies in English XLII (Lund, 1972), 60-4, 122, and map on p. 123. I am grateful to Professor M. L. Samuels for referring me to this work. The sole example of OE byden given by Ek (p. 44) is Benet's Green, *PNEssex*, 267. For Bedlar's Green and Bedwell, Ek follows *PNEssex* (p. 35) and *PNHerts.* (p. 138) and adudes OE *byde* thereby, thus ignoring *EPN*, I, 72, s.v. byden.

As above, n.12.

For ME bede-hous, see MED, s.v. *bëdë*-n., 2b. Cf. OE bed-hus, *EPN*, I, 24 and the derived Welsh *bethwys*, ibid. 32.

Both the spellings in question are from local documents rather than from those written at Westminster. For analogical ME spellings in ð in the Sw. of England as a reflex of OE ȝ, see A. McIntosh, M. L. Samuels, M. Benskin, eds, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, 4 vols (Aberdeen, 1987), I, maps 399 (DID), 414 (FIRST), 972 (BURY, BURIED), and 1040 (KIND, MIND); II, map 125 (4 and 5 FIRST: *fered*). I am grateful to Mr Victor Watts for referring me to these maps.


**COMPUTING IN NAME-STUDIES: THE CHARTER BOUNDS**

Joy Jenkyns

This paper describes the setting up of a computer-searchable database of Old English boundary clauses, based on the Toronto Dictionary of Old English Corpus. It goes on to outline some preliminary investigations into the application of computing techniques to this material. Emphasis will be on methodology rather than on specific results.

The boundary descriptions contained within Anglo-Saxon charters are of interest within a number of different disciplines, engaging the attention not only of the linguist and onomast but also of the archaeologist, historical geographer, agrarian historian, historical botanist, local historian and so on. Many of the questions addressed to the material from these differing viewpoints require the bounds to be seen in relation to each other, whether it be to examine the general distribution of one or more place-name elements geographically over the whole country, or to focus on their diachronic relationships. However, each separate set of bounds (essentially text) has its own unique set of references (essentially data), and they are no more directly comparable as regards provenance and date than they are with respect to reliability. The computer, with its ability to manipulate data combined with its capacity for text analysis, seems, therefore, to be particularly applicable here.

The aim of this project, at first merely exploratory, gradually crystallized into the following: the establishment of a database of bounds which could not only be readily augmented and corrected, but could also be sorted, searched and analysed by a variety of programs. The essential point is that it was not set up in order to answer predefined questions, but rather to provide the material for studies within as wide a range of potential applications as possible.

The first step was the identification and extraction from the Toronto Corpus of all the citations containing Old English boundaries. These were assembled into a separate 'file' and extraneous matter was deleted. Each individual perambulation was then referenced with respect to Sawyer number, purposed date of grant, date of manuscript, name of grantor, estate name and county, and printed source. The assembled data was then converted into a format for processing by the information retrieval program 'Famulus77' and sorted into order of Sawyer number. In cases where several sets of bounds exist within one charter each set was individually itemized and referenced. The perambulations themselves were defined within their contexts by placing 'tagging characters' at beginning and end,
allowing subsequent programs to focus either on these alone or to include surrounding text.

The material could at this point be checked against Sawyer\textsuperscript{3} to determine whether or not all items cited in this work as containing English bounds were included. Those which were missing were inserted, and erroneous references were corrected (see below, Appendix I). The sources used by Toronto for the charter material are almost exclusively printed editions, and variant manuscript versions are omitted. A description of the Toronto texts has been published by Hesley and Venezky.\textsuperscript{4}

The referenced Bounds Corpus, numbering 880 perambulations, was finally re-sorted by Famulus into alphabetical order by county and estate. In this form it starts with 'Bedfordshire: Aspley Guise' and runs through to 'Yorkshire: Sherburn-in-Elmet', with 27 unidentified sets of bounds at the end. When the material is arranged in this way, similar versions of the same estate boundary, occurring in different charters, are thrown together and can be compared. Any relational work must clearly take account of such repetition, although only close topographical studies, county by county, can assess the degree of duplication of place-name elements in interrelated sets.

It was also possible at this stage to assess the degree of accuracy of the charter section of the Toronto Corpus by checking the material for the county of Hampshire against the manuscripts. In the 112 sets of bounds (12,362 words of boundary) for this county, there were found to be only seventeen instances of words miscopied by Toronto. Most of the emendations to the texts consisted of the correction of faults already existing within the printed versions (see below, Appendix II).

The material, once assembled and referenced, was edited into various formats for text and data analysis. This was finished by late Autumn 1987, and the writer then had until the end of March 1988 to experiment with its application. It is this somewhat cursory exploration which formed the basis of the Swansea paper\textsuperscript{1} and constitutes the rest of this article.

An attempt was made to assess the relative usefulness of various computing techniques. The elements chosen for this purpose were the watercourse generics broc and burna, in the light of Margaret Gelling's analyses and of Ann Cole's preliminary regional investigations, both primarily concerned with the elements as they occur in major place-names.\textsuperscript{5}

The Corpus had by this time been formatted for an adaptation of an interactive Search Program which ran on the ICL 2988 at Oxford and was
subsequently rendered inoperable by the demise of that machine at the end of December 1987. Applying this, printouts were obtained of all the examples of the character-strings `broc%' and `brok%', and of `burnk%', `burni%', `burnt%' and `burnk%", where % signifies any or no characters. In the present form of the Corpus the computer can only search for strings, not headwords, and unless specifically alerted will of course miss such aberrant forms as 'broc' and 'burn'. Individual instances located by this method have to be checked; in the case of broc, for example, of which there were 1058 contenders, some broken items had to be discarded, together with one or two suspected badgers (brocn, brocc). Using this material, and counting examples county by county, a pilot study was undertaken, which I outline at this stage more as an indication of potential than as an examination of the two elements per se.\(^7\)

SEARCHTEXT located all the examples of broc and burna as defined above and printed them out, within their immediate textual context, in county/estate order. Two different methods were then applied to make comparisons with respect to the relative proportion of each county's material containing the two words. Firstly, the total number of mentions of broc/burna for each county was compared with the total number of words of boundary for that county, and secondly, the total number of discrete sets of bounds which contained at least one broc/burna was compared with the total number of bounds, county by county.

Figure 1 shows the results of the first method. Overall counts were 1033 brocs and 455 burnas. No distinction was made between their occurrence as unqualified nouns and as qualified place-name or quasi-place-name elements, nor was any attempt made at this stage to eliminate repetition within the boundaries. Only counties with a minimum of 400 words of boundary were included.

The percentage figures themselves in Figure 1 are fairly meaningless; the number of 'elements' has been compared with the number of 'words' and clearly many words themselves consist of several elements. The same method has been applied equally to broc and to burna, however, and it is the general order of the counties which is significant. The lines in Figure 1 correlate counties and show the essentially complementary distribution of the two terms. Figure 2, although 'busy', shows the same data in a way designed to give a clearer idea of relative distributions, and to throw into relief idiosyncrasies in the patterns. Here the counties are set not simply in descending order, as in Figure 1, but are also placed in their percentage positions on the scale.

The complementary nature of the broc/burna relationships is better displayed in such a graph as in Figure 2; the group of high-frequency broc counties correlates with the low-frequency burna counties, there is a levelling across the...
Neither of these are counties with a very small amount of material, such as Suffolk and Middlesex which lead the burna table. Nevertheless, it could be seen that the second approach did not disturb the overall picture established by the first, even though absolute positions on the scale varied.

In the study described above, place-names within Latin bounds were not included, nor was any account taken of dates (either of grants or of manuscripts) or of the authenticity of individual texts. It is in these respects that further work can use the facilities of the computer to refine analysis, and the programs be re-run in ways which take account of these factors. Instances of brōc and burna in such phrases as on bone brōc need to be distinguished from cases where these elements are qualified in some way. In this subsequent exercise, interpretation of the maps and tables with regard to Cornwall is modified. Here it can be observed that, although the word brōc occurs relatively frequently in this county, there is only one possible candidate for place-name status – on wone brōc in Landrake. Adding an ascender to a form using the character 'wynn' for 'w' (to render to bone) strongly suggests that there are in fact no examples of brōc used as a qualified place-name element in the Old English boundary material for this county.

This is a rough and ready, but rapidly generated, way of looking at relationships between semantically related pairs of words. It was encouraging to see that the first method of analysis suggested distributions for burna as a lexical item very similar to that outlined from major place-names by Margaret Gelling in 1984,5 and interesting to observe that the brōc data would seem to give a complement to this pattern. The method will be applied to other elements whose general toponymic distribution is already known and, if the results continue to be promising, to those where this is as yet largely unexplored.
The most immediately obvious point to emerge was the difference in the rates...
of occurrence of bórc and burna as unqualified nouns – simply 'the brook' and 'the bourn'. This is illustrated by an examination of the words as they appear after the preposition 'along'. For this the output defined above and illustrated in Figure 5 was used, supplemented by that generated by a listing of the word and correctly with all its variant spellings grouped together. This latter listing was produced in alphabetical order of the word to the right of the preposition (see Figure 6).11

The following observations could then be made:

a) There were 103 examples of burna preceded by the preposition and correctly, compared with 245 of bórc in this position. 39 (approx. 38%) of these burna examples were and correctly plus inflected burna with no intervening word (and correctly burnan etc); 3 (3%) were and correctly plus definite article plus burna (and correctly here burnan etc); 56 (54%) were and correctly plus burna within a 'place-name', commonly in compound form but also qualified by an inflected adjective or a personal name (and correctly great burnan, & lang limburnan, andland [sic] bradan burnan and so on). The remaining five instances were and correctly plus burna as the first element of a compound (in each case burnatow).

b) In marked contrast to this, of the 245 bórcs 178 (approx. 73%) were of the and correctly broces type; 19 (8%) were and correctly plus definite article plus bórc; only 43 (18%) were and correctly plus bórc with a qualifier. There were two examples of and correctly plus bórc as the first element of a compound and three of the preposition plus definite article plus qualified bórc-name.

This information modifies our reading of the tables and the map distributions and would seem to have clear implications with regard to the relative dating of these terms. Analysis, however, needs to be further broken down by location, date and textual background. In this way a series of maps and overlays could be produced to reflect these more subtle analyses. If this proved successful, the technique could be applied to other elements where, unlike the case for bórc and burna, such marked differences in use might not have been predicted.

When attention turned to the qualifying terms themselves questions 1 and 2 above could be addressed. After a broken-down barrow and an unascertained hawk had been rejected and re-alphabetized respectively,12 both lists could be seen to start with the element alor 'alder', with several mentions each over several counties. Other elements qualify both words: mynl 'mill', a significant word for dating purposes, occurs in three counties (Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire) with burna, and in three (Dorset, Hampshire and Berkshire) with bórc. The table gives the distribution of those qualifying elements which appear to show a distinct bias towards one or other of the watercourse generics bórc and burna. This table gives the number of separately named estate
boundaries which contain the particular qualifier. For instance, a combination of the adjective *holl* 'hollow' + *brōc*, although mentioned altogether 39 times, in fact occurs in 28 discrete permutations in fourteen counties. This removes all duplication except where two different boundaries name the same physical feature. The figure for *mearec* is the only one which is significantly altered when this duplication is removed, as the seven instances appear to refer to only five features. The other boundaries are scattered throughout their counties, and a study of the topographical work published for them confirms that there would appear to be relatively little overlap here.

**FIGURE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brōc</th>
<th>burns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>mearec</strong></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ge)meare 7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>brōd</em> 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>holl</em> 14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>föl</em> 10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smūl</em> 5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wōh</em> 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>winter</em> 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There can be some confusion of elements here, and a few ambiguous contenders were rejected from the *brōc* table. Those included all appear to be OE *(ge)meare* 'a boundary'.

We can see from the table that the words for boundary *(mearec* and *(ge)meare* together qualify *brōc* in a total of 32 different permutations, whereas they qualify *burna* in only two. The adjectives *holl* and *föl* together occur with *brōc* a total of 45 times but is only one occurrence *(holl)* with *burna*. Adjectives do occur proportionately less frequently with *burna* than with *brōc*; the adjective *brād*, however, describes *burna* in four separate estates in four counties, but does not appear to qualify *brōc* in this material; *wōh* would appear to share this predilection.

OCP was then programmed to order alphabetically the words immediately to the right of the headwords *brōc* and *burna*. The resulting output, when supplemented by a strictly alphabetical listing of words commencing with the key elements, enables their occurrence as first elements of compounds to be studied. Are they frequent or rare in this position? What is the particular range of words occurring as the second element in compounds with *burna* as opposed to those with *brōc*? Choosing more commonly occurring first elements, such as *mearec* or *wūdu* 'wood', or selecting an adjective, would give a better indication of the potential of such right-sorted OCP runs. Both *brōc* and *burna* are rare in this position. *Burna* only appears in the compound *burnstow*, although this occurs in eight separately named estates in three different counties (?seven distinct features). One of the particular advantages of a concordancing facility such as OCP is the rapidity with which a line of enquiry can be pursued. A list containing all the other words compounded with *stow*, with contexts and references, can readily be generated and printed out. Figure 8 shows just the headword list, with frequency count, for the various forms containing the element. The full list, too long to reproduce here, shows further that the many *hegestowers* are all in Worcestershire and include much duplication, whereas there are three separately occurring *cwælmstowes* (in Hampshire, Huntingdonshire and Wiltshire). Confusion between 'p' and 'wynn' in many manuscripts, illustrated by the *spel/weel* forms, has to be taken into account and explains the inclusion of 'stop' in the search criteria.

**FIGURE 8**

| Bolstowe | 1 | hegestowe | 10 |
| Bolstowe | 1 | hegestowe | 4 |
| būrestowe | 1 | holding stowe | 1 |
| burnestowe | 2 | meare stowe | 2 |
| burn stowe | 5 | plegingstowe | 1 |
| burnstowe | 10 | spelstowe | 1 |
| burstowe | 1 | swelstowe | 1 |
| cot stowe | 1 | meare stowe | 1 |
| cotstowe | 2 | meare stowe | 2 |
| cotstowe | 1 | halige stowe | 1 |
| cwæalmstowe | 4 | meare stowe | 1 |
| Frestowe | 1 | wodestou | 1 |
| halgan stowe | 1 | hwe stope | 3 |
| halige stowe | 1 | hwe stope | 1 |

Frequency list for the words containing the strings 'stow', 'stou' and 'stop', excluding the stream-name 'stour'.

The results of the *brōc/burna* study suggest that the material and the programs are well able to provide the basic information to approach a wide variety of questions, of which the following provide a sample:

a) What other elements commonly occur in conjunction with the words for boundary, *(ge)meare* and *mearec*? Is there a noticeable distinction between these...
terms? What is their distribution? (If, for example, a compound such as mearchroë only occurred in late charters or in early charters with dubious credentials, or if it had instead a particular regional bias or indeed a connection with a particular scriptorium, such patterns should be discernible.)

b) Which elements are frequently qualified by a personal name, and which, though perhaps just as common, are rarely or never so qualified?

c) What prepositions are most commonly used with the particular elements under investigation?

d) Do some elements more than others tend to be preceded by the definite article when following, say, the preposition andlang? How would the addition of information with regard to date and provenance supplement this picture?

e) With respect to an element such as dif 'ditch, dyke', roughly what proportion of the total count is described by the adjective (eald 'old', and what other features are commonly qualified by this adjective?

f) What distinctions can be seen between the occurrence of dif as a masculine as opposed to a feminine noun, and between the use of inflected and uninflected forms?

g) What sorts of features do the boundaries most commonly go along? How often does the boundary cross, as opposed to follow, linear features of various types? What distinctions are there in this respect between the 'way-names' stræt, wæg, peep, herepe, and others?

A further feature of OCP is its ability to generate word lists, word frequency lists, and indexes. At present, for the Bourns Corpus, this is simply an alphabetical listing, with frequency count, of every separately occurring discrete string of characters - i.e. any sequence of characters preceded and followed by a space or a line end. It is only when the Bourns Corpus has been glossed with headwords that something approaching an Index of place-name elements, personal names and so on can be generated. The string-lists do, however, show the range of spellings and inflections for each element and will provide the basis for glossing programs. Figure 9 shows such a list, and Figure 10 gives the forms for the place-name element byrgels, selecting Sawyer number as the reference; other references such as County or Date could be substituted here.

Word list (refers to andlang) with frequency count.

[D, p, ð and þ are declared as equal in the command file for this run, as are æ and Æ. It is an idiosyncrasy of OCP that the form which appears in the list is simply the first encountered in the file. So, for example, the four instances of ælfþryce could well include spellings ælfryce, ælfryce, ælfryce, etc. % = a reconstructed form.]
After this exploratory OCP work had been carried out, the whole of the Old English boundary material was converted for storage as a Relational Database, using the program INGRES. This is a powerful analytical tool which can not only re-generate the material in a form upon which OCP can be run, but is also able to further process the data itself. The texts and references can now be continually updated and corrected as spellings, checked against manuscript forms, are revised, and as references are modified. Superior versions can be substituted: Toronto's text for the estates of Cowley, Cutslow, and Whitehill in Tackley, Oxon. Sawyer 909], following Kemble, would appear to be a less satisfactory version than that found in the St Frideswide's Cartulary and will in due course be replaced. This is one of several such examples. New material can be added; the Latin boundaries represent an obvious lacuna in the Corpus, but some post-Conquest charters might merit inclusion. Much information can also be inserted from the extensive work being carried out on charters at a detailed regional level elsewhere. As the material becomes more reliable, so the range of applications will grow.

It is important to stress that certain investigations (phonological, dialectal, orthographical, etc.) can only legitimately be carried out on the manuscript-checked material. Studies of the breoc/burna type, however, can justifiably be based on the whole Corpus. These will necessarily be preliminary statements to be followed up by more detailed work. The pilot OCP executions outlined above were carried out at the most basic level of analysis, making no distinction between each boundary text with respect to date, manuscript provenance, reliability, etc. These references, which were described at the beginning of this paper as essential to any full investigation, are now carried in the Ingres database, and OCP work will henceforth take account of them. Only when this is done will we be able to address the last of those questions listed with respect to breoc and burna (point 6 above, page 138).

The work described here has grown from exploratory beginnings into a large project. It can be seen that both the manipulation and analysis of a mass of texts are made difficult when each one not only possesses a unique combination of attributes covering a broad geographical and chronological spread, but also contains a kaleidoscopic juxtaposition of place-name elements, adjectives, personal names and so forth. The computer can rapidly search and organize this material and, although rarely providing instant answers, can generate the data for a wide range of investigations. These observations apply equally to the analysis of major place-names.

The availability of the Dictionary of Old English Corpus has stimulated many fields of Anglo-Saxon scholarship over the last few years and it is appropriate to

---

**FIGURE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Sawyer no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boorgeles</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boorgele</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boirige</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birgelsan</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birgelsan</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birgelsum</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burgels</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burgilsan</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrcelse</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgels</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgels</td>
<td>496, 673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelse</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgels</td>
<td>367, 413, 495, 586, 590, 605, 690, 756, 820, 820, 1566, 1568, 1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsan</td>
<td>43, 43, 379, 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsan</td>
<td>449, 487, 558, 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgels</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelse</td>
<td>366, 438, 495, 496, 585, 585, 586, 647, 647, 685, 685, 690, 1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelson</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsum</td>
<td>414, 414, 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgils</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgils</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgils</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgylsa</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgylse</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byriel</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrieles</td>
<td>651, 1248, 1588, 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byriel</td>
<td>651, 1248, 1599, 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrlj</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgils</td>
<td>104, 317, 361, 503, 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsan</td>
<td>605, 695, 699, 699, 1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsses</td>
<td>414, 523, 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelss</td>
<td>317, 427, 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelse</td>
<td>179, 377, 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelsum</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrgelse</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heggenberles</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCP Index extracted from a printout which isolated forms *[y][r][l][s]*, where * represents any or no characters. Most of these forms represent OE byrgels 'a burial place', and show the range of spellings in the Corpus for this element.
end this paper by acknowledging my indebtedness to the Toronto Project. Their work not only provided the raw material upon which the study was based, but also acted as a stimulus for the examination of research facilities only relatively recently available. Such computing resources must surely have a role to play in the future of name-studies.

ST EDMUND HALL, OXFORD

APPENDIX I

The following are emendations to Sawyer\(^4\) noted during the course of the work described above. Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the section between the Sawyer no. and the details of MS(S). No attempt has been made to add material dating from after 1968.

p. 8

p. 56
Under B.M., Lansdowne 269 for 452 read 980
Under B.M., Lansdowne 447 for 452 read 980

p. 80 no. 35
After 7 Redham in Cliffe ingeni, Kent

p. 85 no. 59
After Latin add with bounds

p. 91 no. 80
For Latin with English bounds read Latin with bounds

p. 92 no. 84
After Latin with English add Latin

p. 97 no. 101
After Latin with English bounds read Latin with bounds

p. 108 no. 146
After Latin add with English

p. 114 no. 168
After in English, all in Kent
Under Comments: For Ward 1934 read Ward 1934/1

no. 169
After Swarling add, Kent
Under Comments: For Ward 1934 read Ward 1934/1

no. 170
Ditto

p. 116 no. 177
Ditto

p. 135 no. 254
For Cearn, Somerset read Charmouth, Dorset

p. 138 no. 268
Under MS.: For Claud, B xi read Claud, B vi
Under Comments: Add: Crawford 1922, pp. 68-9, with mapping p. 81.

p. 148 no. 311
After Latin with bounds add with Latin and English

p. 154 no. 338
After Latin add with bounds

p. 155 no. 342
For Cheselbourne read Cheselbourne

p. 157 no. 353
For Latin with bounds read Latin with bounds

p. 159 no. 359
Under MS.: For s xi read s xii

no. 360
Under MSS.: After 3. B.M., Harley 1761, fo. 48 (s.xvi)
add: no bounds [For s xvi read s xiv (A.R.R.)]

p. 163 no. 374
Under MSS.: After 1. B.M., Harley 1761, fo. 47v (s.xvi)
add: no bounds [For s xvi read s xiv (A.R.R.)]

no. 377
Under MSS.: After 2. B.M., Add. 15350, fo. 57r (s.xii)
add: no bounds

p. 165 no. 383
Under Comments: Add Grundy, Hants., 1926, pp. 133-5; Crawford 1922, p. 76

Computing in Name-Studies

p. 166 no. 387
Under Comments: For Finberg 1954 read Finberg 1953

no. 388
Ditto

p. 170 no. 407
After Latin add with bounds

p. 174 no. 477
For of Enford, Hants., read of Enford, Wilts.

p. 176 no. 433
Under Comments: For Finberg 1954 read Finberg 1953

p. 178 no. 442
For Lyme Regis, Dorset read Upham, Devon

p. 180 no. 452
Delete bounds
Under MSS: Delete versions 1 and 2 (those belong with no. 980)

p. 187 no. 485
For Cheselbourne read Cheselbourne

p. 195 no. 526
For Latin with English bounds read Latin with bounds in Old English, Middle English and Latin

p. 197 no. 536
Delete bounds

p. 221 no. 653
Under Comments: For PN Devon, i read PN Devon, ii

p. 228 no. 689
Under MSS: After 2. B.M., Cotton Claud. C ix, fo. 119 (s.xii)
add: no bounds

no. 690
Under MSS: After 3. B.M., Cotton Claud. C ix, fo. 119r-20 (s.xii)
add: no bounds

p. 245 no. 771
For and read land

p. 256 no. 804
For Latin with English bounds read Latin with bounds in Latin and English

Under MSS: After 4. Winchester, DC, 'St Swithun's Cartulary', B 3, fo. 136r, no. 546 (s.xiv)
add: no bounds
Under Printed: For ex MS. 4 read ex MS. 5

p. 259 no. 818
For Tichborne read Tichborne

p. 263 no. 840
Under MSS: After 2. B.M., Add. 15350, fo. 68v-69 (s.xii)
add: no bounds

p. 264 no. 845
Under MSS: After 1. B.M., Harley 1761, fo. 33r (s.xvi)
add: no bounds

p. 267 no. 862
For Latin with English bounds read Latin with bounds

p. 268 no. 870
After Wilton add, Wilts

p. 269 no. 874
Under MSS: Delete entry 2 [This is a different text in Middle English]

p. 270 no. 879
After Latin add with English bounds

p. 275 no. 901
Under Comments: For Glouches read Glocous.

p. 277 no. 907
Under MSS: After 3. B.M., Add. 5811, fo. 2 (s.xviii)
add: no bounds
Under Comments: For PNEsex, p.532 read PNEsex, p.530

p. 281 no. 922
After Latin add with English bounds

p. 287 no. 955
For Cheselbourne read Cheselbourne

p. 293 no. 980
Under MSS: Add B.M., Lansdowne 269, fo. 98r (s.xvii)

B.M., Lansdowne 447, fo. 25v (s.xvii)

p. 297 no. 993
Under MSS: After 2. B.M., Cotton Claud. C ix, fo. 130 (s.xii)
add: no bounds

p. 302 no. 1015
After Latin add with English bounds

p. 347 no. 1180
After Latin add with English

p. 371 no. 1280
After Latin with English add bounds

p. 376 no. 1301
Under Printed: After 144-45 add ex MS. 1 and p. 352 ex MS. 2
no. 1303
Under MSS: Delete entry 3 [This is a different text in Middle English]

p. 380 no. 1305
After English add with bounds

p. 377 no. 1311
Delete bounds

p. 378 no. 1311
Under Comments: After p. 299, insert cf. B 636 where

p. 391 no. 1380
After Upper Arley insert Worscas.

p. 405 no. 1443
After English add with bounds

p. 433 no. 1552
For English read Latin
APPENDIX II

It might be useful to comment here on the reliability of the charter section of the Toronto Old English Corpus, in so far as it can be assessed from the texts relating to Hampshire; the relevant material for this county forms a total of 12,562 words.

One short boundary (Sawyer 1558) was rejected as being altogether too inaccurate a representation of its original. This is a case where the application of ultra-violet light to the manuscript revealed many mistakes in the printed edition cited in Sawyer. A more accurate version was substituted.

This apart, there were 214 cases where the Toronto form did not reflect that found in the manuscript in a way which was deemed to be significant. Only seventeen of these were due to misattribution by Toronto; the rest perpetuated differences already existing within their sources. The 214 cases fell into two main groups, the great majority belonging to the first. These are errors which would not affect the sort of work illustrated in this paper. Many are instances of editing by Birch and Kemble etc., often representing their 'correction' of the text, whether deliberate or otherwise.

Typical examples are angil for MS angil, ealdean for MS ealdean, geat nostalgic for MS geat, bonon ut for bonut; iset for iset; fold for fald; weard seile for weard seile; littan for littan; ofeng for ofeng and geat for geat. Such unpalpability would be entirely inappropriate, however, with respect to detailed linguistic investigations, whether phonological or orthographical. For such studies, working from manuscript-checked versions of the Corpus would be essential.

The second category of misrepresentation comprises instances where running a program on the uncorrected Corpus would be likely to lead to faulty identification of the word or its grammatical form, or to failure to locate it altogether. Representative examples are for MS andlang: be ageae for bee ageae, bomeres for bomerese: mere for mere; morses for meres; brengena for brengena; wone for bone; be for be; be for be; herde for hende; at of on; up for up; heore for heart and heredles for heredales. These are much more serious faults of omission. There were 44 examples in the Hampshire perambulations. Curiously, although the level of accuracy of Toronto's transcription was seen to be low, six of these more significant errors came from among the seventeen Toronto mistakes: tweo for MS trwo; wyrtles for wyrtles; hol for po; sce for sce by; inawra for inawra and a transposition of two phrases within a clause.

A minor category of emendation to the Toronto Corpus consisted of differing preferences in cases where the letters 'ynyn' and 'p' are indistinguishable in the manuscript – for example, pilleage preferred to Birch's and Toronto's witelaige.

Punctuation, capitalization and word division are as idiosyncratic in the Corpus as they are in the printed editions and, indeed, in the manuscripts themselves.
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FAMILYTREE proved an unwieldy tool for sorting and updating INGRES (see above), which was not initially available at OUCS, would have been better for these purposes.

Commands which compare two texts and list all the differences between them (the DIF command on VAX systems running VMS for example), were very useful for the rigorous checking which had to be carried out regularly, although after major reformatting there were usually no short cuts to careful proof-reading at all stages.

The editing programs used for the repeated manipulation of text were ECCE (Edinburgh Compatible Context Editor) and, more rarely, the editor EDT. ECCE is a versatile repetitive editor which was able to effect all the format changes needed, with the exception of the sequential numbering necessary for the conversion to INGRES. I am grateful to Catherine Griffin at OUCS who kindly wrote a SPITBOL program to do this. I am also indebted to Lou Burnard who modified his interactive program SEARCHTEXT and thus enabled me to apply it to my material, and to David Miles who wrote the SIMPLEPLOT program which produced Fig 2 (see below, n. 8).

NOTES

1 This is a revised version of a paper given on 27th March 1988 at the XXth Annual Study Conference organized by the Council for Name Studies, held at the University College of Wales, Swansea. The county abbreviations used are those of the English Place-Name Society. Underlined elements or name-forms that appear in the present article are quoted from the Bounds Corpus.

2 This material is described in the Introduction to the 'Toronto Corpus – Version 2, January 1988' as 'a complete record of all surviving Old English texts, excluding variant manuscripts ... prepared at the University of Toronto's Centre for Medieval Studies as a part of the Dictionary of Old English project'. It is generously made available by the Editors, via the Oxford Text Archive.


6 SEARCHTEXT – software developed at Oxford University for rapid searching of specific texts in the Oxford Text Archive when these were held on the ICL mainframe. See further L. Burnard, 'CATS: A new solution to an old problem', Literary and Linguistic Computing II (1987), pp. 7-12.
I should like to acknowledge the help and encouragement of an Oxford External Studies class during this early stage of the investigation. I am particularly grateful to Michael Pont who wrote the program to produce tables such as that illustrated in Figure 1. This operates on the output from the search programs, making the necessary calculations to set absolute figures against the amount of available data, thus providing the percentages and county rankings.

* SIMPLEPLOT – a graphics package developed by Bradford University Software Services.

* Future applications of this technique will make use of a Graphics facility to shade the counties in slowly decreasing intensity of stippling according to their order and percentage figures in the tables. This will eliminate the need to classify counties into what are somewhat arbitrary groupings, and will give a better visual representation of geographical and/or topographical patterns.


* OCP has a facility which enables specific sequences of characters to be declared as equal for the purposes of ordering output. However, it will not include within this definition strings containing a space. In order to get round this problem, forms such as and lang. & long etc. need to be temporarily joined prior to running the OCP program. The output from which Figure 6 was extracted was produced by applying the following two ECCE commands to the text-file in order to produce a temporary file/f/ lan/s/lan/* and /f/ fon/s/lon/*, where [f] means 'find', [s] substitute, [/] is the string-delimiter and [*] means 'repeat throughout the file'. The dummy character [/] (occurring nowhere else in the file), joins all the words starting with the strings [lan] and [lon] to the previous word. [/] was then declared as 'padding' in the OCP command file, which means that it was effectively ignored. The search criteria were defined as 'headword = @*1@* &1@*', where [0] represents one character and [*] represents any or no characters. This causes the program to treat the strings [@*1&@*] and [1&@*] as equal for sorting, but not for printing. The original space could subsequently be returned to the output file by the ECCE command /f/f/s/ &*], and the temporary file be deleted. Other forms picked up by these criteria, but not illustrated in the extract, include 'endelang', 'alang', 'and lang', and 'endelangweis'. The full printout contains 2912 citations, approximately 65 of which did not represent phrases containing andlang and had to be removed. When the material has been glossed such long-winded routines can be dispensed with, as OCP will be able to operate directly on forms tagged by the headword.

* abercromb thinking and afoc broc.

* The string-lists also serve to check whether any forms will have slipped the net of searches such as that outlined in note 11, above. In this latter case the list showed that there are no words beginning with the letters 'ien' in the Corpus, so that, although 'endelang' forms occur, there was no necessity to include 'ien' in the joining edit carried out by ECCE.


Over the past quarter-century, German research into the so-called 'commemorative documents' surviving from the early Middle Ages has been concentrated in a research-team, directed by Karl Schmid and by Joachim Wollasch at the universities, respectively, of Freiburg and of Münster. The works of both scholars and their teams are of great moment to anthroponymists, especially those concerned with the one-name period extending to c.1100, because commemorative documents such as confraternity books and obituaries (or necrologies) primarily contain personal names, often lacking even such qualifying additions as titles, or indications of relationship to other persons mentioned, or of origin, or of date. The sheer bulk of the material and the often daunting chaos of its arrangement in the unique manuscripts have hindered generations of historians and anthroponymists from fruitful exploitation of it. To give some figures: the largest known confraternity book, that from Reichenau Abbey on Lake Constance, begun by c.824 with material partly dating back to 762, contains nearly 40,000 personal-name items; many of its 164 folios are filled with entries made, over three or even more centuries, by up to 300 different scribes. Another example: the obituaries from the Cluniac ecclesia survive only in nine manuscripts mostly dating from the late tenth to the thirteenth centuries (in one case, the fifteenth) and containing in all about 96,000 name-items, mainly referring to Cluniac monks of the eleventh and twelfth centuries; until 1982, only excerpts from these manuscripts had been published, and their inter-relationships were unknown.

The way that continental historians and anthroponymists have learnt to handle these huge name-corpora concerns their English colleagues also, not least because Anglo-Saxon names form part of the Germanic tradition. The new approach is, besides, of methodological import to scholars in England, because England too has an important tradition of commemorative documents and other material rich in early medieval personal names.

I. The Prosopographical Background
Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch both became interested in commemorative records while members of the 'Freiburger Arbeitskreis' directed by the historian