and Newtownards.\textsuperscript{39} Hanging Brae, a small hill between Crossgar and Killinchy, is a reminder of the bloody sequel to the 1798 Rebellion.\textsuperscript{40} 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.\textsuperscript{41} Even more terrifying was the sequel to that execution. In Malachy 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.'\textsuperscript{42} 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.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{39} T. G. F. Paterson), edited by E. E. Evans (Dundalk, 1975), p. 49.
\textsuperscript{40} O.S. 6'/1 mile, Co. Cavan, Sheet 20, Tullymogan Upper townland; O.S. 6'/1 mile, Co. Dublin, Sheet 11, Windmill Lands townland.
\textsuperscript{41} O.S. 6'/1 mile, Co. Down, Sheet 6, Greystown townland.
\textsuperscript{42} G. A. Little, \textit{Malachi Horan Remembers} (Dublin, 1943), p. 9.
\textsuperscript{43} Little, \textit{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).
\textsuperscript{44} The author is indebted to Dr Oliver Padel for a number of valuable suggestions which have been incorporated into the text of this paper.
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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 \textit{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 provos 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 \textit{Tempore Jurandi 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 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.

barnames 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 Sconingham, 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 hagiographical 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 O 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), Aibot (p. 73), Haukinus (p. 87), Dike (p. 105) and Raulinus (p. 114). It looks to me as though one example of Dawe is not a hypocorism of David (as is usually supposed)³ but a rhyming pet-form of Ralph (or Rau); Dawe Ballard, admitted in the guild in 1246–65 (p. 109), is likely to be the same man as Radulhus filius Roberti Ballard, given the freedom of the city in 1248–49 (p. 120).⁴ His father was


⁴ For unambiguous evidence of Daw as a pet-form of Ralph, see O. J. Pedal, ‘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, the New English Dictionary, the Dictionary of English Surnames, Fransson’s English Surnames of Occupation, and Thuresson’s Middle English Occupational Terms.

Here are a dozen examples, with their earliest references in these standard sources given in brackets: Belietera 1227–28 (p. 58) ‘bell-founder’, cf. MED s.v. bel(e)e-tetere (1247); le Bulger 1244–45 (p. 81) ‘maker of leather bags’, cf. Fransson p. 127 (1300); le Carbom 1190–1210 (p. 37) ‘charcoal-burner’, cf. Fransson p. 174 (1275); le Gunmer 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 Hotspiz 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 (p. 39) ‘one who puts the toppe of flax or tow on the distaff, a spinner’, cf. DES s.n. Topper (1275); le Taneler 1244–46 (p. 82) ‘cooper’, cf. Fransson p. 169 (1334); le Wastler 1232–33 (p. 64) ‘maker or seller of wastels (bread made of the finest flour)’, cf. Fransson p. 63 (1327); le Wibetere c.1190–1210 (p. 27) ‘fuller’, cf. Fransson p. 121 (1271). A less certain instance of an occupational name is Clater 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 Barbhte 1237–38 (p. 72), which is the first genuine evidence I have met for a ME bar-bunte (later bor-hunte) ‘boar-hunter’. I put it that way because the citations for bor-bunte ‘boar-hunter’ in MED do not belong to the word. They are unquestionably toponymic bynames (de Barbhunte 1296, de Borbunte 1304, de Borhunte 1324, as well as le Borbunte 1325 which the context shows to be an error for de Borbunt) and they all refer to Boarhunte 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) bar ‘boar’, and the o spellings are conventional substitutions for u. The modern place-name, whose spelling probably arose from an antiquarian misconception, goes back to an OE *Burfuntia ‘spring by the fortification or town’, later altered to *Burhunta, ME Burhunte.11

I have given the approximate date c.1210–1215’ to the names entered under the heading Tempore Jardani Clerici.

Other examples are: Bokmongere 1259–60 (p. 101) ‘book-seller’; le Bothwrickhe 1245–46 (p. 84) ‘booth- or stall-maker’; le Cercler c.1190–1210 (p. 20) and le Cercler c.1190–1212, 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, cercler ‘hooper, cooper’;1” the Casturer 1225–26 (p. 53), probably denoting one who made coers, ornamental hangings for walls and beds; le Dooneur 1222–23 (p. 49), perhaps ‘one who provides down or soft feathers for pillows and beds’; le Gardelwrichte 1227–28 (p. 58) ‘girdle-maker’; le Luggage 1245–46 (p. 83), probably a derivative of ME laggen ‘to pull or drag’; le Maile 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 plates’; le Skopener 1264–65 (p. 109), perhaps ‘scop-maker’ from an unrecorded by-form of ME scope ‘scop, ladle, shovel’; le Techrwich 1233–34 (p. 66) and le Techrwich 1244–45 (p. 82), evidently a compound of ME lybech ‘roof-covering, thatch’ and wright, hence ‘roofer, tier (č), thatch-maker’; and finally le Tovurith 1231–32 (p. 63), le Teurute 1255–56 (p. 95) and le Tevere 1260–01 (p. 102), which, like the synonymous Taymaker (1567) noted in Thuresson p. 231, are based on OE teōb and Old French (OF) teie, teie, giving ME teie (also “teie and “toie) ‘chest, coffier, cover’, hence ‘one who makes chests, cases, boxes or coverings’. Wright, wright, wriith and wriute 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 Kerkeby that hern is mantel modilie (‘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 Seracic Sarhalle ‘sour ball[6]’ (p. 7), Robertus the Wilde (p. 13), Walterus descund le Mast (p. 16), Philippus Unmitting ‘no stingy fellow’ (p. 22), Robertus Lecher (p. 41), Robertus Go bi the Wind (p. 66),

1 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 Kockeshrayn (p. 69), Nicholas Falintbewolle ‘fell 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 descend 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 decent 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 Wips c.1190–1210 (pp. 7 and 8), is from OE wips ‘lipping’, for which neither MED nor NED has evidence of survival in Middle English. Nibe c.1190–1210 (p. 11) looks like an unrecorded south-western reflex of OE *brybba or *brylle ‘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 (DN) spard ‘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 Crosse (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 anedating 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 Manske ‘Manx’ does not appear in MED though it clearly goes back to an ON *Mansker. Its first citation in NED is 1572. My eye was also caught by the byname of Rogerus Gambere 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 gampere, commonly a term for the bent stick used by butchers for spreading and hanging a carcass on. The first citation of the word by Godfrey is in
1452, 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 onym 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 gamber in nineteenth-century Normandy. 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 gambel ‘leg’.

My final illustration is Adam Puffin ante 1222–23 (p. 48). According to Lockwood, puffin was ‘originally the name given to the cured carcass of the nesting shearwater, until the end of the 18th cent. an esteemed delicacy, supplies coming from the Scillies and the Calf of Man’. MED cites the forms poisson (1337) and Poffin (1345), and somewhat earlier its use as a byname, Puffin (1279). Latham gives paphinus (1237), puffo (1297), and poissonus (1336) as Anglo-Latin for ‘puffin’. 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 it would 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 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 kilidding where Connolly (p. 22) prints le Kildare, and from the same membrane (col. B) Gilbert (p. 47) prints Reeke where Connolly (p. 22) prints Recke. I don’t know what to make of Kildare or Reeke but kilidding looks like a version of ME kilidding ‘seller of faggots’ [?] or ‘hawker, pedlar [?]’ (Fransson p. 54 and DES s.n. Kidder), while Reeke (of uncertain meaning) is a byname found elsewhere at this period (DES s.n. Keeb cites examples from 1296 and 1299). 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 mustardier de londone. Connolly (p. 20) prints this as Michael le Mustardier 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 hoc Robi's chopphe (the copyist’s error for cuphe—cf. Walserus Choppe de Bristol’, p. 64), which Connolly represents as Alanus bomo 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’ Amot bursar’. This has been incorrectly transcribed (p. 60) as Willems Annot Burtarius. 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 *Nor*ef or possibly de *Horef* and *Thomas Le Harpeur*. These names are printed (p. 41) as *Thomas de Mores* and *Thomas le Harpeur*.

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 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 idiosyncrasies 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 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 Uperi
En Pere Jonen 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 *luben* or *Uperi* 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 velicta Henrici Clerici de Arco* (p. 81) and *Ena (sic but better read as Ena) Pret de Cardigan* (p. 102).

---

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 Nor*ef, it would be plausible to extend it to *de Nor*efolk).

20 *Ece* 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 Tristeldenmod is modern Castledermot or that Chalaner is likely to have been indexed under 'Blanket-maker', Circler under 'Cooper' or Foster under 'Joiner'.

In an Anglo-Norman context, Foster would in any case be better glossed more specifically as 'saddle-tree maker' (see NED s.v. foster), a sense supported in the Dublin roll itself by the entry, Herius le Foster 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 Foster, but for the one listed for p. 42 I can find no Foster 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 *Joiner. If Joiner is indeed the manuscript form, then it is probably not an occupational term but a patronymic from OF Joiner, Continental Germanic (CG) Gustman. The index entry 'Crocker' refers us to p. 25 of the text, where the only name that seems to correspond is Croc (twice); if this is the correct form and not a misprint, it is either a patronymic from ON Krór 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 Fostard. 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 Teewrate (p. 95) and le Tevere (p. 102), which, as I have suggested earlier, probably signify 'cheese-maker'. As for the 'costermonger' on p. 53, the only name that bears any resemblance to it is le Cursterer. The term coster, 'apple', is a post-medieval corruption of ME cosard and cannot be the basis of Cursterer which, as I have already suggested, may denote a maker of cofursters 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-mesures' (cf. DES s.n. Pecker).

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 Askenere, which in reality is a metathetical form of ME askernere '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, gabler). '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 (Glouce). In this context, Hachere could well be a patronymic from an OF baptismal name, representing CG Hachari or CG Agibari. 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. Badur, for example, is probably a derivative of ME boule (OF boule) 'falsehood, trickery', hence 'a cheat, a fraudster', and Disere, which also appears in the roll as le Deier (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 Traunter 'hawker, tractor, 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 Chalauer (p. 43) should have been listed under 'Blanket-maker'. Bracker (p. 33) and Brachar (p. 116) belong under 'Brewer'; Maceer (p. 1) and Maceere (p. 66) under 'Butcher'; Chepman (p. 66) under 'Chapman'; Color, Colere, and Colere (pp. 2, 9, 24 and 58) under 'Charcoal-burner'; Combere (p. 64) under 'Comb-maker'; Anceps (p. 43) under 'Falconer'; Fiello (p. 66) under 'Fuller'; Matben (p. 71), if re-read as Machun, under 'Mason'; Corder (p. 45) under 'Roper'; Seeler (p. 12) under 'Saddler'; Dicier (p. 8, two examples) under 'Sweatman'; Monitor (p. 10) under 'Sunter'; Sarvargianus (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 Boxer (p. 35) 'oxherd'; le Cachebol (p. 65), the standard nickname for a rent-collector; le Henner (p. 65) 'helmet-maker'; le Koger (p. 98) 'a sailor or master of a cog or small ship'; le Meyler (p. 93), an aphetic form of ME maillor 'emalnerer' (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 Rimor (p. 88), le Rymer (p. 102) 'rhymer, poet'; le Rouer (p. 108) 'rooler'; le Rutur (p. 88) 'one who plays the rote (a plucked string instrument)'; le Sanger (p. 87) 'singer, songster'; le Saunier (p. 17), if re-read as le Saunier, 'salter'; le Serenier (p. 101) perhaps 'shearman, shearer'; Stalke (p. 41), perhaps 'one who makes game'; le Tolleer (p. 44) 'toll-gatherer' and Weyder (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 toponymous 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 Asitone, Asitone 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 Kirkton 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 Malton, Mealtun, Maltone and Maltune, which indicate places named Malton, Melton or Molton. Kalveleie points to Calveley (Cheshire) not Calverley (Yorks. West Riding). Hildesstone 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.). Llandinis does not belong to the early forms of London, nor Petra to Peterborough, Dereham to Durham, Cleve to Cleveland, Koundon to Cowden (Kent), Asla Regis to Kingsholm (Gloucs.), nor Britten and Britkstone to Brighton (Sussex). The forms Campedene and Compedane, which have been associated 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. Bordeleis, Bordell, Burdeles and Burdel', all of which signify Bordeaux (in Gironde, Loiret or Seine-Maritime), are mistakenly interpreted as Burdeleston (sic for Burleston?) in Dorset. Bosines (Bouvines, in the department of Nord) is wrongly identified as Boveny (Bucks.); Katovile (Catteville, in La Manche) as Catton (Norfolk); Cauncy (probably Cunchy, in Calvados or Somme) as Kent; Mabrai and Mandbray (Montbray, 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.); Percy (Percy, in Calvados or La Manche) as somewhere apparently called 'Percy' in Northumberland; Runceville and Runcilla (unidentified but probably French) as Runciton (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-names21 (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 Burgu Blandus represents Blundeston (Suffolk), even though the ablative and nominative case endings indicate that the toponymic byname is simply de Burgu (referring most likely to Peterborough, Northants., if not to one of the many places called Brough, Burgh, Burrow and so forth), and that Blandus is the merchant's second byname, a nickname meaning 'fair-haired'. The same error is made when the two bynames of Walerus de Westby' 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 never should be used as substitutes for a general index of all the names in their original spellings. I cannot see the point in producing an

---

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 far 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.
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Attendant eriam sacerdotes, ne lasciva nomina que silicet mox prelata sonant lasciviam, imponi permettant parvulis baptizatis, sexus precipe feminini. Et si contrarium fiat, per confirmantes episcopos corrigatur.'

Let priests take care, that they do not allow frivolous (lascivia) 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

This is a shortened version of a paper read at the regional meeting of the Society for Name Studies at Bristol in November 1995 and I am grateful to the participants for their tolerance and feedback. I am, as usual, indebted to Richard Smith and Judith Bennett for consultation on these matters over several years, without in any way committing them to any of the perceptions made here. It is intended as a speculative attempt to indicate pathways to problems. The paper in particular has been influenced by some recent work on sociolinguistics, especially J. Coates, Women, Men and Language, 2nd edn (London, 1993), especially chapters 4–5 and 8. Finally, this paper could not have been written without the pioneering research of the late Cecily Clark.