論　文

Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names:

London (2)

TAMOTO Kenichi

要　旨

本稿は，Tamoto (2019) の続きであり，‘Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: London’ の後半部を成す。

国際的に有名な大都市でさえ，地名として取り扱われる場合，それらについての知識はとかく共時的になりがちであって，世界地図やそれらの都市の地図の現代版から得られるものは，最新の情報である。しかしながら，二次元的な地図の下には見えないけれども，多大な三次元的な興味深い情報があるということは明白なことである。そのことは Tamoto (2017), Tamoto (2018), Tamoto (2019) にて実証されている。それらの都市の共時的知識の背後にある情報は，学生ないしは生徒がそれらの都市名をより深く理解するのに役立つ重要な役割を果たすものと思われる。

本論では，“London” を語彙習得の観点から地名研究の対象とする。Tamoto (2017), Tamoto (2018) 及び Tamoto (2019) において既に例証したように，London の語源学的分析が地名研究方法論の第一段階となる。そして，地名 London に関する教授についての考察と，教材としての地名 London の提案を試みる。橋（特に London Bridge）や通りの名称は補助的ではあるが London のイメージに資するのに必要な要素でありうる。教材として提案されるものは，リーディング用のサンプル・テクストであり，本稿の最後に点線の枠で囲んで提示する。

キーワード：vocabulary acquisition（語彙習得）, suggestion of materials in teaching place-name（地名教材の提案）, London（ロンドン）, street names of London (ロンドンの通り名), the London Bridge (ロンドン橋), the Tower of London (ロンドン塔), Famine (飢饉), the great fires of London (ロンドン大火), Pestilence (ペスト), the Hundred Year's War (百年戦争)

Introduction: Methodologies employed for the present research

This account is the latter half of the research on 'Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: London'. Tamoto (2019) is the first half of this work, and is entitled 'Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: London (1)', in which are discussed etymology of the place-name London, the forms of London and the other names for London in Latin, Greek and Anglo-Saxon documents, stories of the city in those documents, and what numismatic findings tell.

In this part the situation of London after Anglo-Saxon and Viking age will be discussed. Names of bridges over the Thames, the Tower of London, street names on the map of old London , and fires of London will also be discussed as the supplemental but necessary elements to build up an image of this city. Those elements are worthwhile to discuss in reference to the name of the city on this occasion.

Finally, a passage suggested as the teaching material for reading will be illustrated within a frame of dotted line at the end of this article.

2.2. Numismatic Evidence

With regard to coinage of the Anglo-Saxon period, Weinreb (1983, 727) comments as follows:

> The right of coinage has always been a royal prerogative, exercised with varying degrees of honesty and efficiency by successive monarchs; from the Anglo-Saxon period kings were in the habit of creating their own mints and of issuing coins bearing their own effigy and place of origin. The addition of the name of the moneyer gave proof of the coin's integrity.

Offences against coinage deserved severe punishment, including cutting off the right

hand and emasculation, which is proved by the following passage of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.[1]

> 1125. On þis gær sende se king Henri toforen Cristes messe of Normandi to Engla lande 7 be bead þet man scolde beniman ealle þa minitere þe wæron on Engle lande heora liman. ꝥ wæs here elces riht hand 7 heora stanen beneðan. ꝥ wæs for se man ðe hafde an pund he ne mihte cysten ænne peni at anne market. 7 se biscop Roger of Særes byrig sende ofer eall Engla lande 7 bebead hi ealle ꝥ hi scolden cumen to Winceastre to Cristes messe. Þa hi ðider coman ða nam man an 7 an 7 benam ælc ðone riht hand 7 þa stanes beneðan. Eall þis wæs gedon wið innon þa twelf niht. 7 ꝥ wæs eall mid micel rihte forði ꝥ hi hafden fordon eall ꝥ land mid here micele fals. ꝥ hi ealle abohton.
> (A. 1125. Before Christmas, this year, king Henry sent from Normandy to England, and commanded that all the mint-men of England should be deprived of their limbs, namely of their right hands and of certain other members. And this because a man might have a pound, and yet not be able to spend one penny at a market. And Roger bishop of Salisbury sent over all England, and desired all of them to come to Winchester at Christmas; and when they came thither his men took them one by one, and cut off their right hands. All this was done within the twelve days, and with much justice, because they had ruined this land with the great quantity of bad metal which they all bought.)

Hereafter three coins of the Anglo-Saxon period will be discussed; two of them were struck by Mercian kings in London and one by a Wessex king also in London. The following is a recently discovered gold coin, or *mancus*, of King Coenwulf of Mercia struck in Londonwic in *c.* 805-10. Diameter is 2.1 cm.[2] 'Mancus' is an Old English word signifying money of account of the value of thirty pence, and it is equivalent to Old Saxon *mancus*, glossing *bazanticum*, *aureus*, and Old High German **manchus*, accusative plural form of *manchussa*, glossing *solidos*, *aureos*, *phillippos*.[3] The coin refers to Londonwic, or Lundenwic, as *DE VICO LUNDONIAE*, meaning 'from London City'. As mentioned previously at the end of Section 2, Lundonwic is a new village or town of the Anglo-Saxons, who did not inhabit within the wall of the site of Roman Londinium. Excavations in 1985 and 1988 revealed the location of Lundenwic, which 'stretched from Shorts Gardens to the Thames, and from Trafalgar Square to the Royal Opera House' (Milne 2003, 30; Mount 2015, 19–20).

The following coin at the left is a silver penny of King Egbert of Mercia struck in London in 828–29. Its diameter is 2 cm.[4] The coin mentions London as *LVNDONIA CIVIT*, meaning the city of London. It follows something that looks like a cross. Barber (2012, 5) comments about the Lvndonia Civitas that 'some administrative activity continued in a small area in the north-west of the walled city, to this day still called Aldermanbury, and this is probably what is referred to in the silver penny of King Egbert of Mercia of 828–29 referring to the town of London ('LUNDONIA CIVIT')'. Ekwall (1954, 195) gives the following commentary on 'Aldermanbury':

> It has been suggested that Aldermanbury was the king's residence in London till the time of Edward the Confessor (Page, *London*, p. 140) and later became that of an alderman, possibly the alderman of the Frith Guild. The evidence for this is not satisfactory. If the name Alderman is old, it is possible that the alderman was Æthelred, son-in-law of Alfred and alderman of Mercia, who for some time was Governor of London. Professor Stenton takes the name to represent OE *ealdormanna burh* 'fortified enclosure of the aldermen' (*Norman London*, p. 12).

The above coin at the right is a silver penny that King Alfred struck in London *c.*

890. Its diameter is 1.9 cm.[5] The reverse of this coin is beautifully designed with the incorporated monogram of 'LUNDO(N)I(A)' with a cross at the top. Its obverse has a portrait of King Alfred with his name 'ÆLFRED REX' impressed (Clark 1989, 15). Because of repeated Viking raids on Lundenwic in the first half of the ninth century, 'London mint went out of production from 851 for over a decade' (Milne 2003, 40). Lundenwic, or Aldwych (old 'wic') was defenceless, and it had to be abandoned and moved to defensible location. Alfred had a long and difficult fight against the Vikings, and succeeded to regain Lundenwic from the Danes. King Alfred 'the Great' celebrated the triumph by issuing coins with the London monogram, which were struck within the walls of Alfred's new fortified town, called 'Lundenburg', located at the old walled site of Roman Londinium (Milne 2003, 41). This repair of London by Alfred is mentioned in an account dated 886 of *the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which will be illustrated in Section 2.4.

2.3. Anglo-Saxon and Danish London

In spite of Bede's description of seventh-century London as an emporium of many nations (Book 2, Chapter 3), this period was one of very serious and unpleasant struggles with the Viking invaders. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* contains accounts of repeated Danish assaults on British cities and towns in 10th–12th centuries, and London was occupied or stormed several times after the year 839. Furthermore, in the year 962 there was a great fever and a destructive fire in London, and St Paul's was burned down. In 982 London was burned again. *The Encyclopedia Americana* (*s. v.* 'London': Anglo-Saxon and Danish London) comments about perplexity and later prosperity of London since the mid-tenth century as follows:

> London was a stronghold in the troubled times that followed Athelstan's reign. This was a factor in the claim of its leading citizens to elect the kings of England. London was now a prosperous trading center and the largest town in the land. Little archaeological evidence of Anglo-Saxon London has been uncovered, however. The remains of a modest 11th-century wooden hut were excavated in 1956 close to St. Paul's Cathedral and form a striking contrast to a great hall of the 8th or 9th century discovered in 1962 under 10 Downing Street and below the remains of the Tudor palace of Whitehall.

2.4. Viking raids on London referred to in documents

As mentioned in the above section, the first Viking attack on London was launched in 839, which the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* documents as follows.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (A), 839:
> Her wæs micel wælsliht on **Lundenne**, 7 on Cwantawic, 7 on Hrofes ceastre.
> (This year there was great slaughter at **London**, and at Canterbury, and at Rochester)

The OE word for 'London' is *Lundenne* in the above account.

Only twelve years later, that is to say, in 851, London was stormed by the Danish crew of three hundred and fifty ships.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (A), 851:
> . . . 7 þy ilcan geare cuom feorðe healfhund scipa on Temese muþan, 7 bræcon Contwara burg, 7 **Lundenburg**, 7 gefliemdon Beorhtwulf Miercna cyning mid his fierde, 7 foron þa suþ ofer Temese on Suþrige . . .
> (. . . And the same year came three hundred and fifty ships to the mouth of the Thames, and the crews landed and took Canterbury and London by storm, and put to flight Berthwulf, king of the Mercians, with his army, and then went south over the Thames into Surrey . . .)

Lundenburg is used for London here.

It was in 878 that Alfred's army defeated the Danes led by Guthrum at the battle of Edington. He concluded a truce with Guthrum on conditions that King Guthrum should be converted to Christianity, and that the territory of the Danes should be located in the north of the Roman Watling Street, the district known as 'the Danelaw'. After this, as mentioned in section 2.2., Alfred, the King of the Wessex (871–899), repaired London, which became his new fortified town, called 'Lundenburg'. The account of the year 886 of *the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* reads as follows.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (E), 886:
> Her for se here eft west þe ær east gelende. 7 þa up on Sigene. 7 þær winter sætu namon æt Paris þære byrig. Ðy ilcan geare gesette Ælfred cyning **Lundenburh**. 7 him eall Angelcyn to gecyrde. ꝥ butan Deniscra manna hæfnede wes. 7 he þa

> befeste þa burh Æþerede ealdormen to healdenne.
> (This year the army which before had drawn eastward, went westward again, and thence up the Seine, and there took up their winter quarters near the town of Paris. That same year king Alfred repaired **London**; and all the English submitted to him, except those who were under the bondage of the Danish-men; and then he committed the town to the keeping of Ethered the ealdorman)

Lundenburh, a variant of *Lundenburg*, is used here for London, and it is referred to as *þa burh* (the town), which is in the feminine accusative singular. The above passage describes also that King Alfred entrusted the government of the city to Mercian Ealdorman Ethelred. By marriage with Alfred's daughter, Ethelred became Alfred's son-in-law (Clark 1989, 18; Milne 2003, 44).

Descriptions of a great plague and fires in London are found in the following accounts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (A), 962:
> Her forðferde Ælfgar cinges mæg on Defenum, 7 his lic rest on Wiltune. 7 Sigferð cyning hine offeoll, 7 his lic ligð æt Wimburnan. 7 þa on geare wæs swiðe micel man cwealm, 7 se micela man-bryne wæs on **Lundene**, 7 Paules mynster forbarn . . .
> (This year died Elfgar, the king's kinsman, in Devonshire, and his body rests at Wilton. And king Sifferth killed himself, and his body lies at Wimborne. And then, within the year, there was a great **plague**, and the **fatal fire** was in London; and Paul's minster was burnt . . .)[6]

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (C), 982:
> Her on þys geare comon upp on Dorsætum iii. scypu wicinga, 7 hergodon on Portlande. Þy ilcan geare forbarn **Lunden byrig** . . .
> (In this year landed among the men of Dorset three ships of pirates; and they ravaged in Portland. That same year London was burnt . . .)

In the account of the year 962, the variant *Lundene*, with the suffix –*e* probably for a dative form, occurs, and in that of the year 982 occurs the variant *Lundenbyrig*.

3. London Bridge; the first medieval timber bridge over the Thames

From the cause of defence, a bridge over the Thames was inevitable in order to keep the Danish invaders from advancing to Lundenbyrig. Milne (2003, 59), on archaeological evidence, remarks that ‘the first medieval bridge was built in *c.* AD 1000’, which ‘lies squarely in the long reign of Ethelred II (978–1016)’.[7] The northern abutment of the mediaeval timber bridge was constructed in the Billingsgate area and the southern one at the south bank site of Fennings Wharf (Milne 2003, 56–57; Watson *et al.* 2001, 54). The bridge was about 4.5 meters wide, and it was described as ‘so broad that two wagons could pass each other upon it’ (Milne 2003, 56; Watson *et al.* 2001, 75).[8] The following account in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* mentions how the bridge effectively halted the progress of the Danish fleet and the Danes had to dig a bypass on the south bank to drag their boats to the west side of the bridge.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (E), 1016:
> . . . Þa comon þa scipo to Grenawic to þam gandagum. ⁊ binnon lytlum fæce wendon to Lundene. ⁊ dulfon þa ane mycele dic on ða suðhealfe ⁊ drogon heora scipa on west healfe þære brycge. ⁊ be dicodon syððon þa burh uton ꝥ nan mann ne mihte ne inn ne ut. ⁊ oft rædlice on ða burh fuhton. ac hi heom heardlice wið stodon . . .
> (… Then came the ships to Greenwich at Rogation days. And within a little space they went to London, and they dug a great ditch on the south side, and dragged their ships to the west side of the bridge; and then afterwards they ditched the city around, so that no one could go either in or out: and they repeatedly fought against the city; but the citizens strenuously withstood them . . .)

The account of the year 1013 of *the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* contains a passage which describes how Sweyn failed in attacking London, many of his soldiers were drowned in the Thames, and the citizens of London with King Æthelred held out against the Danes.

> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (E), 1013:
> . . . wende þa to Oxna forda. ⁊ seo burhwaru sona abeah ⁊ gislode. ⁊ þanon to Winceastre. ⁊ ꝥ ilce dydon. wendon þa þanon eastward to **Lundene**. ⁊ mycel his folces adranc on Temese. forðam hi nanre brycge ne cepton. Ða he to þære

> byrig com. þa nolde seo burhwaru abugan ac heoldan mid fullan wige ongean. forðan þær wæs inne se cyning Æþelred. ⁊ Þurkil mid him . . .
> (. . . Then went he[9] to Oxford, and the townsmen soon submitted, and delivered hostages; and thence to Winchester, and they did the like. Then went he thence eastward to **London**, and much of his people was drowned in the Thames, because they kept not to any bridge. When he came to the city, then would not the townsmen submit, but held out against him with all their might, because king Æthelred was therein, and Thurkill with him . . .)

This concerns one of the most dramatic events in the history of London, which some people call the Battle of London Bridge. This account mentions four noteworthy points. Firstly, people drowned in the Thames were Sweyn's men, that is to say, the Danes. Secondly, they were drowned because they did not keep to any bridge (Whitelock 1955, 223: 'because they did not trouble to find a bridge'). Thirdly, the townsmen of London, or militia corps of London were strongly tied up to hold out against Sweyn. Fourthly, the townsmen of London accepted King Æthelred, and incomprehensibly Thurkill (fl. 1009) the Danish Earl also.

Discussing those four points may require, for the sake of supplementation and comparison, a rough survey of the account of the year 1014 in 'Saga of Olaf Haraldson' in the *Heimskringla*. Laing's translation of Chapter 12 of the *Heimskringla*, which does not occur in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, reads as follows:

> . . . King Olaf, and the Northmen's fleet with him, rowed quite up under the bridge, laid their cables around the piles which supported it, and then rowed off with all the ships as hard as they could down the stream. The piles were thus shaken in the bottom, and were loosened under the bridge. Now as the armed troops stood thick of men upon the bridge, and there were likewise many heaps of stones and other weapons upon it, and the piles under it being loosened and broken, the bridge gave way; and a great part of the men upon it fell into the river, and all the others fled, some into the castle, some into Southwark. Thereafter Southwark was stormed and taken. Now when the people in the castle saw that the river Thames was mastered, and that they could not hinder the passage of ships up into the country, they became afraid, surrendered the tower, and took Ethelred to be their king. (Laing 1907, 260–61).

Now we will discuss the first point mentioned above. Who were drowned in the Thames? In the account of the year 1013 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the drowned people were Sweyn's men, that is to say, the Danes. However, the situation is different in the account of the year 1014 in Olaf's saga. According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, King Sweyn, after failing to assault London in 1013, succeeded in conquering all the English people except those of London; and then the townsmen of London had to submit to authority of Sweyn. In Olaf's saga, in 1014, when King Æthelred, hearing about the death of Sweyn, returned from Flanders directly to England, many people flocked to him, and among them was King Olaf with his great troop of Northmen. King Æthelred and King Olaf sailed the Thames, but the Danes had a castle within London. It is probable that when the bridge was attacked the Danish troops stood on it, trying to defend themselves, and they were drowned.[10] Alternatively, they may be a mixture of the Danes and the English militia corps of London. The third possibility would be that they were 'Londoners', on which Mount (2015, 59) comments as follows:

> Olaf destroyed London Bridge. His men rowed upriver and wound cables around the bridge supports. While Londoners crowded the bridge, raining arrows, spears and stones down upon the enemy, Olaf ordered his men to row hard on the ebb tide. The bridge collapsed, throwing the defenders into the Thames. Many were drowned.

The second point concerns the word *brycge*, in feminine plural accusative, signifying 'bridges'. Ingram (1823, 190) gives the following note: 'this expression, though unnoticed by the Latin translators, implies that there were at that time many bridges over the Thames'. The equivalent of the word *brycge* in Old Norse is *bryggyur*, which is in the plural, but its use to refer to a single bridge is 'quite common in the sagas and related literature' (Hagland & Watson 2005, 333, note 38). Davies (1987, 91) states that St. Olaf helped 'the English defeat the Danes at the Battle of London Bridge in 1014'. Incidentally it would be worthwhile to note that Zoëga (2004) defines the Old Icelandic word *bryggia* as '(1) *gangboard*, *gangway*; (2) *landing-stage*, *pier*, *quay*; (3) rarely, *bridge*, = brú'. Townend (2012, 750), therefore, translates the phrase *brauzt bryggjur Lundúna* in stanza 8 of Hǫfuðlausn as 'you broke the wharves of London', whereas Hagland & Watson (2005, 331) translates the phrase as 'you broke [destroyed] the bridge[s] of London'. Clark (1989, 24) comments that 'a later historian recorded an attack in which Olaf Haroldson,

afterwards King Olaf (the royal saint) of Norway, destroyed the bridge—though the obscure poem that inspired this account may describe an attack on the "wharf" rather than the "bridge" of London'.

The third point is related to strong tie-up of the townsmen of London against the invaders. In the year 1013, as is narrated in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the townsmen of Oxford, Winchester and other cities were obedient to Sweyn, King of the Danes, and soon submitted to him. When he came to London, the townsmen of the city would not submit to him, holding out, with King Æthelred, obstinately against the Danish king. However, at last, even the close tie-up of the townsmen of London was to submit to Sweyn. The Londoners' tie-up was soon recovered in the following year, that is to say, in 1014, when they accepted King Æthelred again, both the king and the townsmen establishing full friendship, 'by word and by pledge, on either half, and declared every Danish king an outlaw from England forever'.[11] As is illustrated in the following account of the year 1016 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the levies could do nothing without the support of the Londoners:[12]

> Then began the etheling Edmund to gather his forces. When the forces were assembled, then would it not content them except it so were that the king (=Æthelred) were there with them, and they might have the help of the citizens of London: then gave they up the expedition, and each man went him away home. . . . And the etheling Edmund went to London to his father. And then, after Easter, went king Canute with all his ships towards London. Then befell it that king Æthelred died, before the ships arrived. He ended his days on St. George's mass day, and he held his kingdom with great toil and under great difficulties the while that his life lasted. And then, after his end, all the peers who were in London, and the citizens, chose Edmund to be king: and he strenuously defended his kingdom the while that his time lasted.

The Londoners' strong tie-up must have been reenforced by solid wall of the city and the bridge over the Thames.

Finally, our discussion should be centered on the person named Thurkil. Þurkil or Þorkell, is known as Thorkell the Tall, or as Thorkell the High[13] (ON *Þorke(ti)ll inn hávi*, Norw. *Torkjell Høge*, Swed. *Torkel Höge*, Dan. *Torkild den Høje*) was a prominent member of a Viking order based at Jomsborg, which was a semi-legendary Viking

stronghold located at the southern coast of the Baltic Sea (mediaeval Wendland, modern Pomerania).[14] The settlement was established *c.* 970 and destroyed by the Danes in 1098. Thurkil was a notable lord and the chief commander of the Jomvikings.[15] Before further discussing on about Thurkil, it would be helpful to add a brief digression on the movement of the Scandinavian forces in the 990s and the first decade of the eleventh century. In the year 991, as is mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Anglo-Saxon forces were defeated by the Scandinavian or Viking forces at the Battle of Maldon, and King Æthelred payed ₤10,000 in Danegeld to the Vikings, which, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, was the tribute paid by the English King for the first time. The tribute was effective in making the Scandinavians change sides. Óláfr Tryggvasson, a Norwegian adventurer, now became one of the commanders of Æthelred's mercenary army, and he became King of Norway (995–1000). In 1000 he was defeated by Eirik Hakonarson. Eirik Hakonarson ruled Norway, whereas he was a Danish vassal. More Scandinavian raids followed after the year 991: Æthelred paid further tribute in 994 (₤10,000), 1002 (₤24,000) and 1006 (tribute and food). In 1009 Æthelred at last determined to gather a fleet at Sandwich to repel the Viking invasion, but it turned out a failure because of unexpected storms. From this point on Thurkil's name appears in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. After losing a large part of his fleet, the English forces withdrew their remaining ships to the Thames to block London from being invaded by Thorkil's fleet. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* continuously in the account of the same year records the attack of the vast hostile army of Thurkil on Canterbury. All the people of East-Kent gave Thorkil a tribute of ₤3,000 to make peace with him. Thorkil's army then continued their assault on the Iles of Wight, Sussex, Hampshire, and Birkshire, and Essex. Their final destination was London, and they often fought against the city of London, but the townsmen of London did not surrender. In the year 1012 Thurkil received a tribute of ₤48,000 to make peace with the English. Afterwards Thurkil remained in England with his 45 ships, and covenanted with Æthelred that Thurkil and his army would defend England against his fellow Vikings as part of his agreement with Æthelred. Thus Thurkil had switched his allegiance from Sweyn, King of Denmark, to Æthelred, the English king. That is why in 1013, when Sweyn attacked London, Thurkil was in London with Æthelred.

3.1. Is the account of Olaf's breaking London Bridge the origin of a nursery rhyme?

In the previous section the account of the Battle of London Bridge of the year 1014 was mentioned. It is found in 'Saga of Olaf Haraldson' in the *Heimskringla*, and we read it in translation by Samuel Laing (1780–1868). The account is followed by a skaldic poem of Ottar svarte, which Laing translates as follows:

London Bridge is broken down, —
Gold is won, and bright renown.
Shields resounding,
War-horns sounding,
Hild is shouting in the din!
Arrows singing,
Mail-coats ringing—
Odin make our Olaf win!

Weinreb and Hibbert (1983, 496) states that in 1014 'King Ethelred and King Olaf of Norway burnt down the bridge to divide the Danish forces', but where is any source for 'burning down the bridge'? Neither chapter 12 of the *Heimskringla* nor the skaldic poem of Ottar svarte has the phrase of 'burnt down'. Is it caused by an anachronic application of the later London fire which did a considerable damage to the London Bridge?

Arguments have been adduced for and against the relation between this skaldic poem and the famous children's song 'London Bridge', which goes as follows:

London Bridge is falling down,
Falling down, falling down.
London Bridge is falling down,
My fair lady.

There is a variant version of this song, which goes, 'London Bridge is broken down, Broken down, broken down. London Bridge is broken down, My fair lady.' Weinreb and Hibbert (1983, 496) comments that these familiar versions of the nursery rhyme did not appear until the mid-17th century. Some argue that the song became immensely popular in the mid-18th century. Others hold that its origin might goes back to the middle ages.

It seems here necessary to make substantial researches into the relation between the 11th-century skaldic poem of Ottar svarte and the nursery rhyme 'London Bridge' of the mid-17th or the mid-18th century. Modern scholars agree that the original text of the skaldic poem by Ottar svarte (Stanza no 8 of *Hǫfuðlausn*) is as follows:[16]

Enn brauzt, éla kennir
Yggs gunnþorinn, bryggjur
(linns hefr lǫnd at vinna)
Lundúna (þér snúnat).

Hǫfðu hart of krafðir
— hildr óx við þat — skildir
gang, en gamlir sprungu
gunnþinga járnhringar.

The syntax of this stanza is complex, and it may be too difficult to understand without rearranging the stanza in prose order. Townend (2012, 750–52) gives the following rewrite in Norse prose and its modern English translation, which is followed by explanatory notes:[17]

> Gunnþorinn kennir éla Yggs, brautzt enn bryggjur Lundúna; hefr snúnat þér at vinna lǫnd linns. Skildir, hart of krafðir, hǫfðu gang, en gamlir járhringar gunnþinga sprungu; hildr óx við þat.
>
> [Battle-daring master of the storms of Yggr <= Óðinn> [BATTLES > WARRIOR], you further broke the wharves of London; it has turned out for you to win the lands of the serpent [GOLD]. Shields, hard pressed, had movement, and old iron-rings of battle-meetings [MAIL-SHIRTS] sprang apart; battle increased at that.]

Even though this narrative of King Olaf's contribution toward dividing the Danish forces by breaking the bridge is not recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, it is found in the *Heimskringla* and the skaldic poem composed by Ottar svarte. The credibility of account will further be enhanced by the street name 'Tooley Street' in Southwark/Bermondsey, and Norwegian churches in London. Concerning 'Tooley Street', Bebbington (1972, 323) states as follows:

> Tooley Street (Bermondsey 5) is a corruption of St Olave's Street, from the church which stood here by the twelfth century but has now been combined with St John's in Fair Street. 'St Olave's Street', as it was recorded in 1598, had become 'St Tooley's Street' by 1606 and 'Towles Street' by 1608.

St Olave's Church had stood on the site (27 Tooley Street, London, SE1 2PR) since the time of the Norman Conquest. It was rebuilt or repaired in 1736 (because of antiquation), in 1873 (damaged by fire), and it declared redundant in 1918 after having served the community for ten centuries. The estate of the church was bought by the Hay's Wharf

Company and in 1928 they built St Olaf House there. There are two other Norwegian churches: one of them is St Olave's Church, Hart Street (on the corner of Hart Street and Seething Lane, built in 1450), the other is Norwegian Church (St. Olav's) located at 1 St Olav's Square, Albion Street, Rotherhithe, dating from the late 17th century, consecrated in 1927.

It has been pointed out that the first line of Ottar svarte is equivalent to 'the London Bridge was broken down' in the English version of Samuel Laing (1844). Actually, Chapter 12 of the *Heimskringla*, which is a prosaic Saga of Olaf Haraldson, contains a reference to Olaf's destroying London Bridge. However, as discussed above, the equivalence is limited to 'demolishing bridge(s)/wharves of London' in the skaldic poem composed by Ottar svarte. It appears that what we can speculate from this fact is that Laing's translation was a free translation or rewriting which was composed by mixing the song of 'London Bridge' already known into the original version of the skaldic poem of Ottar svarte . Therefore, it is not certain that the Old Norse version was the origin of the song of "London Bridge". On the other hand, the prose part obviously describes Olaf's giving orders for breaking the bridge. Incidentally, even occurrence of this event cannot be accepted by some historians.[18]

4. The Normans (1066–1154)

On 14th October, 1066, Harold, the last Anglo-Saxon king of England (*c.* 1020–1066), was defeated by William, Duke of Normandy, at the Battle of Hastings. The battle was fought in the Senlac Hill, began at about 9 am, lasting all day. William, who won the battle, became King of England: his coronation was held at Westminster Abbey on 25th December, 1066. The victory at the Battle of Hastings did not mean that William governed England without resistance. During two months before his coronation he had to suppress some of the English clergy and magnates in the southern areas, though their opposition was rather unenthusiastic. William then marched to northern areas in order to break down resistances or rebellions of English magnates. This is called 'Harrying of North', which was over by April 1070. William is now William the Conqueror. William was the Conqueror not only from the political viewpoint, but also from the linguistic viewpoint. The society of England was now a bilingual one: the Normans, who were the ruling class, spoke French, while the subjugated Anglo-Saxons spoke English, their

own language. This situation continued about 300 years, and during these years a great number of French words were borrowed into English vocabulary, as a result of which a lot of original English words or their original meanings became obsolete in the course of the Middle English period or the early Modern English period. It was in 1362 that English officially regained its power. In that year opening of the Parliament was proclaimed in English.

4.1. The Tower of London

William's last job of the Conquest was to control the intrepid townsmen of London. He built castles in order to rule the city. One of them is Baynard's Castle, which was built before 1017 and rebuilt after the Norman invasion by William the Conqueror. The castle was located 'on the west side of the town, south of Ludgate' (Clark 1989, 28). It was demolished in 1666. William also built Tower of Montfichet: (also known as Montfichet's Castle) on Ludgate Hill between present-day City Thameslink railway station and St Paul's Cathedral. It was demolished in 1213 by King John. William's biggest work was building of the White Tower in the south-east corner of London. He repaired the Roman city wall on the east side and on the riverside. Clark (1989, 28) further remarks as follows:

> The fortification was completed on the north and west, facing the rest of the town, by a new palisade and a ditch. Soon, before 1080, work began on a more substantial structure within this enclosure, a fortified palace of stone, the White Tower. Gradually over the next 200 years the walled area around it was extended, creating the great concentric fortress, the Tower of London, that still stands.

The White Tower was high and stately enough to overwhelm the subjugated Anglo-Saxons. The Tower symbolizes the beginning of the Norman Dynasty. It was in 1988 that the Tower of London was placed on the World Heritage List.

However, the Norman kings' attitude to London was not wholly oppressive. Geoffrey de Mandeville, who was appointed to the portreeve of London by William, received a charter from William, and Henry I awarded many privileges to London. The following passage is modern English translation of the charter issued by William in 1066–75 (trans. by Clark 1989, 29):[19]

> William the king greets William the bishop and Geoffrey the portreeve and all the citizens in London, French and English, in friendship. I inform you that I intend you to have all the rights in law you had in the days of King Edward, and each child to be his father's heir after his father's day; and I will not allow any man to do you any wrong. God keep you.

Henry I issued the following charter in favour of the citizens of London in Michaelmas 1130–August 1133 (trans. Douglas & Greenway 1981, 1012–13):[20]

> . . . Know that I have granted to my citizens of London that they shall hold Middlesex at "farm" for 300 pounds "by tale" for themselves and their heirs from me and my heirs, so that the citizens shall appoint as sheriff from themselves whomsoever they may choose, and shall appoint from among themselves as justice whomsoever they choose to look after the pleas of my crown and the pleadings which arise in connection with them. No other shall be justice over the men of London. And the citizens shall not plead outside the walls of city in respect of any plea; and they shall be quit of scot and of Danegeld and the murder-fine. Nor shall any of them be compelled to offer trial by battle. And if any one of the citizens shall be impleaded in respect of the pleas of the crown, let him prove himself to be a man of London by an oath which shall be judged in the city. Let no one be billeted within the walls of the city, either of my household, or by the force of anyone else. And let all the men of London and their property be quit and free from toll and passage and lestage and from other customs throughout all England and at seaports. . . .

William accomplished another achievement, the Domesday Book, which is the survey of William's kingdom ordered by the King from Gloucester in 1085 (Williams 2004, 1–2). The Domesday Book is comprised of two volumes, and it conveys 'the economic geography of 11th-century England: an essentially rural country with a population of around 1½ million, few towns having more than 2000 inhabitants' (Clark 1989, 30). London and Winchester, the old West Saxon royal city, were omitted from the list, because the surveyors were defeated by the complex organization of the towns (Clark 1989, 30). London's population then reached 10,000 or even 15,000 (Clark 1989, 30).

5. From the 12th century on

Mount (2015, 125) states that 'in the year 1300, London reached its peak population for the Middle Ages at 80,000–100,000', and by the 14th century London's commerce had greatly developed. The cause of the population growth was the warm climate and good harvests of the previous century. It seems that the prosperity of London had been achieved steadily by the end of the 13th century, but before and after the period it had been accompanied with sufferings, such as fire, famine, pestilence and prolonged war, including the insurrection of Wat Tyler in 1381.

In the third quarter of the 12th century, Londoners achieved a remarkable rise in autonomy, which appeared as the mayorship and guilds. The first Mayor of London was a draper, named Henry Fitz-Ailwin (*c.* 1135–1212), who held the office from 1189 until 1212. By 1215, significance of the Mayor of London had grown to such an extent as Mayor William Hardel signed the *Magna Carta* as the only commoner alongside the barons and most important clergymen (Mount 2015, 113). Mount states that 'one of the earliest known London guilds was that of the Pepperers, first mentioned in the Pipe Roll of 1180', and he also mentions that 'guilds must have existed even earlier' (Mount 2015, 117–18). In the year 1212, when Londoners suffered the Great Fire, people really understood necessity of more and more power of the guilds. In the following three centuries merchants, tradesmen and craftsmen began to form one guild after another.

London Bridge had been the only one bridge over the Thames since the mediaeval period until opening of the Westminster Bridge in 1750. The last wooden bridge over the Thames was built in 1163 under the direction of Peter Colechurch, which was followed by the construction of the first stone bridge beginning as early as 1176 (Mount 2015, 114). It required 33 years to build the new stone bridge, that is to say, it finally finished in 1209, but only three years later it became out of use because of the devastating damage of the Great Fire in 1212, which burned down much of the city and devoured as many as at least 3,000 townsmen (Mount 2015, 115–16). The more famous devastating conflagration is the Great Fire of London of 1666, in which there were few casualties and even fatalities (Mount 2015, 116). It seems that the London Bridge had been rebuilt before 1600, because London Bridge appears in the map drawn *c.* 1600.[21] Almost two centuries later, in 1831, new modern London Bridge was completed. The Tower Bridge, which was constructed in 1894, is a suspension bridge with tall twin towers and drawbridges. It is a world

heritage site, and attracts visitors from all over the world.

In the fourteenth century London, as well as all the other part of England, suffered great tribulations one after another. After healthy lifestyle and prosperity Londoners suddenly came to experience cold and wet summer, which caused poor harvest and then led to the Great Famine. The famine broke out in 1314 and it continued off and on throughout the 1320s (Mount 2015, 127). Stow (1908, Vol. II, 1908, 163) gives the following report for the year 1314: 'Famine and mortality of people, so that the quicke might vnneath bury the dead: Horse flesh, and dogs flesh was good meat'. London then had dense population and a large number of corpses to be buried, and it was confronted with removing the filth and keeping the roads clean. With Londoners living in such condition, they were to be confronted with another disaster. Pestilence broke out on 1 November 1348. Stow (1908, Vol. II, 1908, 166) gives the following record for the year 1348: 'A great pest. Sir *Walter Mannie*, knight, founded the Charterhouse by Smithfield, to be a buriall for the dead', more than 50,000 people were reportedly buried in Smithfield (Stow 1908, Vol. II, 1908, 81). Its worst period was from 2 February 1349 until 12 April, when the above-mentioned sir Walter Manny bought another churchyard and 'aboue 100,000 bodies of Christin people' had been buried there (Stow 1908, Vol. II, 1908, 82). The third event that had disturbed peace of mind of the exhausted Londoners, as well as all the other English people, was the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War, which was a series of conflict carried on from 1337 to 1453 between the English House of Plantagenet and the French House of Valois. It is divided into three periods: the first period 1337–60, the second period 1369–80, third period 1413–28, when Jeanne d'Arc (1412–31) joined the army of Charles VII, and freed Orléans with the French King from the English force (the *Britannica* 15th). Over the centuries English teritories in France had decreasd drastically.

Conclusion

Methods adopted in the present article are those of etymology, philology, numismatics, paleography, archaeology, history, and topography, and what was drawn by use of those methods was three-dimensional sketch of London, the great city. Because of the features of methods and materials examined, discussions tend to concentrate on London of the ancient times and the mediaeval period. It is unfortunate that for want of space the argument in present article must be finished without exploring and discussing modern

London amply.

‹A sample of teaching material for reading›

There are several theories about the original meaning of London. According to one opinion, London meant ‘the town of bold people’. It seems that this place-name takes origin from Celtic. However, there are other people who are against the opinion, and say that the ancient form of the place-name originated in Latin. In the year 600 B.C. the Celtic movement from the Continent started and finished in about 100 B.C. This means that the Celtic people had already inhabited in London area when the Romans started invasion of *Londinium* in 43 A.D. Geoffrey of Monmouth, a twelfth-century historian, wrote a history about British kings, which includes an account about a great British city of Troynovant, an old name of London, meaning ‘New Troy’. The historian says that Troynovant was founded by Brut, a descendant of Æneas and the legendary ancestor of the Britons. As a matter of course, the Britons revolted against the Roman army. The most famous revolt against the Romans was that of Boudica in 60 or 61 A.D. The Romans gained mastery over the Britons, and Roman *Londinium* was founded probably in the reigns of Claudius (41–54) or Nero (54–68). In Latin documents, London is sometimes called *Augusta*, the title granted to *Londonium*. Coins of the ancient times have been excavated, which also prove residence of the Roman force in *Londonium*.

After the withdrawal of the Romans in 410, the Anglo-Saxons began to inhabit London (449–1066). Bede, an English historian, describes London as a center of commerce for many nations who come to it by land and sea. It seems that under the reign of Anglo-Saxon kings monetary economy was growing, which is proved by excavation of coins struck in London in the reign of Anglo-Saxon kings. King Alfred was one of them. In order to defend the city from the Vikings, he constructed a new fortified town located at the old walled site of Roman Londonium in 886, and he called the town *Lundenburg*. The latter part of the town name, *-burg*, is an Anglo-Saxon noun meaning ‘town’ or ‘city’. During the following two centuries, London suffered repeated attacks of the Vikings. London was a stronghold in such troubled time, and tie-up of the townsmen of London was strong. Furthermore, probably the most important factor was the London Bridge. The impregnable bridge confronted

the invaders. However, there is a description of breaking the bridge in the Norse saga of King Olaf in the year 1014. It is not mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

William the Duke of Normandy had insisted on his succession to the English throne, and in the year 1066 the Normans defeated the English force at the Battle of Hastings. William became King of England on 25th December 1066. He further suppressed the Anglo-Saxon resistances or rebellions. His conquest was over by April 1070, and he became William the Conqueror. William built the White Tower, a fortified palace of stone, in the south-east corner of the Roman wall of London, enclosing it with a new palisade and ditch before 1080. Gradually the walled area was extended, creating the Tower of London, which was placed on the World Heritage List in 1988.

In the year 1300, the population of London reached its peak for the Middle Ages at 80,000–100,000, and by the 14th century London's commerce had greatly developed. The cause of the population growth was the warm climate and good harvests of the previous century. It seems that the prosperity of London had been achieved steadily by the end of the 13th century with autonomic growth of the mayorship and guilds, but before and after the period it had been accompanied with sufferings, such as fire (1212, and 1666), famine (1314–1320s), pestilence (1348–49) and prolonged war, which is called the Hundred Years' War (1337–1453).

The London Bridge had been the only bridge over the Thames since the mediaeval period until the opening of the Westminster Bridge in 1750. The mediaeval stone bridge, after 33 years of construction, finished in 1209, but it was destroyed by the great fire in 1212. The London Bridge had been rebuilt before 1600. Almost two centuries later, in 1831, new modern London Bridge was completed. The Tower Bridge, which was constructed in 1894, is a suspension bridge with tall twin towers and drawbridges.

Bibliograghy

Barber, Peter, *London; A History in Maps* (London: The London Topographical Society *in association with* The British Library, 2012)

Bebbington, Gillian, *Street Names of London* (London: B T Batsford Ltd, 1972)

The Century Dictionary Cyclopedia and Atlas, Vol. IX Proper Names (London: The Times; New York: The Century Co., 1894)

Clark, John, *Saxon and Norman London* (London: the Museum of London, 1989)

Coates, Richard, 'A New Explanation of the Name of London', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, Volume 96: 2, 203–229 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1988)

Davies, Andrew, *The Map of London; from 1746 to the Present Day* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1987)

Douglas, David C., and George W. Greenaway, *English Historical Documents 1042–1189*, 2nd ed. (London: Eyre Methuen; New York: Oxford University Press, 1981, first edition 1953)

Earle, John, and Charles Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892)

Ekwall, Eilert, *Studies on English Place-Names* (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 1936)

Ekwall, Eilert, *Street-Names of the City of London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954)

Ekwall, Eilert, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960)

The Encyclopedia Americana, International Edition (Danbury: Grolier Incorporate, 1998)

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, ninth ed. (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1875–1889)

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th ed. (Chicago; Tokyo: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1989)

Giles, J. A., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London: G. Bell and Sons, LTD., 1914)

Hagland, Jan Ragnar, and Bruce Watson, 'Fact or Folklore: the Viking attack on London Bridge', *The London Archaeologist*, Spring 2005 (London: London Archaeologist, Spring 2005)

Hall, John Richard Clark, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960, originally published 1894)

Ingram, J, *The Saxon Chronicle*: with an English translation, and notes, critical and explanatory. To which are added chronological, topographical, and glossarial indices; a short grammar of the Anglo-Saxon language; a new map of England during the Heptarchy; plates of coins, &c (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1823)

Liebermann, Felix, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1898)

Milne, Gustav, *The Port of Medieval London* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Mount, Toni, *Everyday Life in Medieval London from the Anglo-Saxons to the Tudors* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2014)

The New Encyclopædia Britannica, 15th ed. (Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 1989)

The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, in association with the British Academy, from the earliest times to the year 2000, eds. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989)

Partridge, Eric, *Origins: An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, 4th ed. (London: Routledge, 1966, impression of 1990; first published 1958)

Rössler, Hellmuth, und Günther Franz, unter Mitarbeit von Willy Hope und anderen Fachgelehrten (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970; originally published by R. Oldenbourg Verlag in München, 1958)

Snorre Sturlason, *The Heimskringla: a History of the Norse Kings*, done into English out of the Icelandic by Samuel Laing, revised with notes by Rasmus B. Anderson, Vol, I (London, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Berlin, New York: Norrœna Society, 1907)

Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla: The Chronicle of the Kings of Norway* (Create Space, 2010)

Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla, Vol. III, Magnús Óláfsson to Magnús Erlingsson*, trans. by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for northern research, University College London, 2015, first ed. 2011)

Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla, Vol. II, Óláfr Haraldsson (The Saint)*, trans. by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for northern research, University College London, 2014)

Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla, Vol. I, The Beginnings to Óláfr Tryggvason*, second ed., trans. by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for northern research, University College London, 2017)

Stow, John, *A Survey of London*, reprinted from the text of 1603, Vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908)

Tamoto, Kenichi, 'Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: Britain, England and UK (1)' in *Language and Culture: Bulletin of Institute for Language Education*, Aichi University (Nagoya: Arm, 2017)

Tamoto, Kenichi, 'Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: Britain, England and UK (2)' in *Language and Culture: Bulletin of Institute for Language Education*, Aichi University (Nagoya: Arm, 2018)

Tamoto, Kenichi, 'Vocabulary Acquisition—English Place-Names: London (1)' in *Language and Culture: Bulletin of Institute for Language Education*, Aichi University (Nagoya: Arm, 2019)

Townend, Matthew (ed.) 2012, 'Óttarr svarti, *Hǫfuðlausn* 8' in Diana Whaley (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 1: From Mythical Times to c. 1035*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 1. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012)

Watson, Bruce, Trevor Brigham, and Tony Dyson, *London Bridge: 2000 years of a river crossing*, Museum of London Archaeology Service, monograph 8 (London: Museum of London, 2001)

Weinreb, Ben, and Christopher Hibbert (eds.), *The London Encyclopædia* (London: Macmillan, 1983)

Whitelock, Dorothy, *English Historical Documents, c. 500–1042* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955)

Williams, Brenda, *The Secrets of the Domesday Book* (Norwich: Jarrold Publishing, 2004)

Zoëga, Geír T., *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2004)

Notes

1 The Old English text is quoted from Earle and Plummer (1892, E text, 255); Modern English translation from Giles (1914, 192).

2 Barber (2012), p. 5. British Museum: registration number 2006, 0204.1.

3 The *OED*, s.v. 'mancus'.

4 Barber (2012), p. 5. British Museum: registration number 1893, 1204.208.

5 Barber (2012), p. 5. British Museum: registration number 1935, 1117.412.

6 Translation by Giles (1914); alteration in bold face by me.
7 Weinreb and Hibbert (1983, p. 496) states that ‘the first London Bridge was probably built of wood between AD 100 and 400 during the Roman occupation’.
8 ‘There were arched bridges there over the river between the city and Southwark so wide that wagons could be driven over them in both directions at once’ (*Heimskringla* vol. II, trans. by Finley and Faulkes 2014, 10)
9 Sweyn, King of the Danes (987–1014), King of England (1013–14), father of Canute.
10 Hagland and Watson (2005, 329) states that ‘presumably Swein had realized that London was the key to controlling the kingdom, so he would have garrisoned it with trustworthy troops to ensure the loyalty of the city. According to the skalds Ottar the Black and Sigvat, London Bridge and the Southwark bridgehead were strongly defended by such troops. So Æthelred first sought to recapture London from Anglo-Scandinavian forces loyal to Cnut. The recapture of London apparently involved the ships of Óláfr Haraldsson another Norwegian adventurer’. See also Watson *et al* (2001, 232–3).
11 Giles (1914, 103).
12 Giles (1914, 105), addition in parentheses mine. MS E (Plummer 1892, 147–49) reads as follows:

> Ða ongan se æðeling Eadmund to gadrienne fyrde. Þa seo fyrd gesomnod wæs. Þa ne onhagode him buton se cyng þære wære. 7 hi hæfdon þære burh ware fultum of Lundene. geswicon þa þære fyrding. 7 færde ælc mann him ham. . . . 7 se æþeling Ædmund wende to Lundene to his fæder. 7 þa æfter Eastron wende se cyng Cnut mid eallum his scipum to Lundene weard.
>
> Ða gelamp hit þet se cyng Æðelred forðferde ær ða scipu comon. he geendode his dagas on sc̃s Georius mæsse dæge æfter mycclum geswince. 7 earfoðnissum his lifes. 7 þa æfter his ende. ealle þa witan þe on Lundene wæron 7 se burhwaru gecuron Eadmund to cynge. 7 his rice he heardlice werode þa hwile þe his tima wæs.

13 Britannica 15th, s.v. ‘Canute the Great’. See also the *Century Dictionary Cyclopedia and Atlas*, Vol. IX Proper Names (1894), p. 995.
14 Rössler and Franz (1970), p. 466.
15 *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), Vol. 54, pp. 586–87.
16 Hagland and Watson (2005), p. 331. Townend (2012), p. 750, ‘Óttarr svarti, *Hǫfuðlausn* 8’.
17 Hagland and Watson (2005, 331) also gives a similar rearrangement, explanatory notes, and modern English transaction.
18 Hagland and Watson (2005), ‘Fact or Folklore: the Vicking attack on London Bridge’, London Archaeologist 12, pp. 328–33.
19 The charter is written in Anglo-Saxon, and it is recoded in Liebermann (1898, 486: *Wl Lond*): Willelm kyng gret Willelm bisceop 7 Gosfregð portirefan 7 ealle þa burhwaru binnan Londone, Frencisce 7 Englisce, freondlice. 7 ic kyðe eow, þæt ic wylle, þæt get beon eallra þæra laga weorðe, þe gyt wæran on Eadwerdes dæge kynges. 7 ic wylle, þæt ælc cyld beo his fæder yrfnume æfter his fæder dæge. 7 ic nelle geþolian, þæt ænig man eow ænig wrang beode. God

eow gehealde!

20 The original text is written in Latin, which reads as follows (Liebermann 1898, 524–25: *Hn Lond Prot.*):

> . . . Sciatis me concessisse ciuibus meis Lundoñ. tenendum Middlesexe ad firmam pro CCC libris ad compotum, ipsis et heredibus suis de me et heredibus meis, ita quod ipsi ciues ponent uicecomitem qualem uoluerint de se ipsis et iusticiam quemcunque uel qualem uoluerint de se ipsis ad custodiendum placita corone mee et eadem placitanda; et nullus alius erit iusticia super ipsos homines Londoñ. Et ciues non placitabunt extra muros ciuitates pro ullo placito. Et sint quieti de scot et danegildo et de murdre. Et nullus eorum faciat bellum. Et si quis ciuium de placitis corone implacitatus fuerit, per sacramentum, quod iudicatum fuerit in ciuitate, se disrationet homo Londoñ. Et infra muros ciuitatis nullus hospitetur, neque de mea familia neque de alia ui alicui hospitium liberetur. Et omnes homines Londoñ. sint quieti et liberi et omnes eorum res et per totam Angliam et per portus maris de theolonio et passagio et lestagio et omnibus aliis consuetudinibus.

21 Ekwall (1954) includes a map entitled 'The city of London showing the Wards and Liberties as described by Stow, c. 1600'.