

15. Stenton (1911), 25; DEPN 96; EPN I. 89, II. 2.
16. Runciman (1984), 18.
17. Hellberg (1975), 103 ff.
18. EHN I. 91 f. According to Arngart, there was a place called Kalletuna in LDB in this hundred, which is referred to as Carletuna 1086 in the Inquisitio Eliensis.
19. Finberg (1964), 158. Ekwall (DEPN 96) noted that the Charltons are often found near important centres.
20. Hellberg (1975), 105. See also Hellberg's article 'Aktuell forskning om tuna-nammen' in the Uppsala Nya Tidning 20.11.1984.
21. Hellberg (1984), 85 ff.
22. Lindow (1976), 119 f.
23. Insley (1982), 84.
24. Lind Supplement, 553.
25. Bede IV. 22.
26. Ine's Laws 51 (Liebermann I. 112).
27. Norðleoda Laga 9-10 (Liebermann I. 460).
28. ASC, s.a. 892 (Earle and Plummer I.84; This is the date of the original scribe of the Parker MS (A). It was wrongly corrected to 893 by a later scribe, and this date was kept by Earle and Plummer. Later editors have usually printed this entry as referring to 892 (see for instance Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader. Third ed. New York etc.: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1971, 153; Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, rev. by Dorothy Whitelock. Fifteenth ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, 34).

ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF DOMESDAY TENANTS IN LINCOLNSHIRE*

A correct interpretation of a personal name ideally requires establishment of a genealogy for it (Redmonds 1976). While the toponymist would hesitate to interpret a place-name unless he had a range of forms on which to base an etymology, the anthroponymist often has to attempt to explain a personal name on the basis of a single recorded form. This form may be unambiguous. There is no reason to doubt, for example, that the forms recorded in Great Domesday Book (GDB) of the names of the pre-Conquest tenants of Gate Burton LW, Gonneuuate and Godric (347a; 12/1), represent Scandinavian Gunnhvatr and Old English Godric respectively. Some other pre-Conquest tenants' names are, on the other hand, recorded in forms which could equally well represent two or more personal names. The name of one of the tenants of Hackthorn LW, for example, is recorded as Aluunus (GDB 339b; 2/17). Von Feilitzen notes that this could represent any one of four OE names, Elfwine, Æðelwine, Ealdwine or the rare Ealhwine (PNDB 158-60). Identity of name-form is not in itself, moreover, proof that Aluunus of Hackthorn is identical with, let us say, Aluunus of North Ormsby LN (GDB 360b; 30/21). In fact there is no reason to believe that he is, and an anthroponymist, aware that the name-elements Elf-, Æðel-, Eald- and -wine are all very common, would never be tempted to identify the two tenants with each other simply because of the identity of name-form. Occasionally the recorded form simply defies interpretation. The name of the pre-Conquest tenant of Willingham by Stow LW, for example, is recorded as Deincora (GDB 353b; 20/4). Von Feilitzen, noting that this form is obscure, suggests that the first element might be Continental Germanic Thegan-, Degan- (PNDB 223). The cognate OE Pegen- and Scand Pegn- are other possibilities. No suggestions have been made about the second element.

There is a further problem connected with the name-forms in DB that has hitherto not been fully appreciated. In the course of an analysis of the pre-Conquest landowners in Lincolnshire, Peter Sawyer became aware that the names of several identifiable individuals appear at different points in the text in forms so disparate that they have been treated as separate names by von Feilitzen in PNDB and, where relevant, by the present writer in SPLY. Sawyer discussed his identifications with me in 1982, and at my suggestion he submitted a draft note on them to Nomina. This draft was read and commented on by Cecily Clark, John Insley, Brian Levy, Peter McClure and Alexander Rumble and their comments were communicated to Sawyer for his consideration. Partly because he was pressed for time and partly because he felt that the philological problems involved would best be dealt with by a name-scholar, Sawyer then asked me to prepare this material for publication. The Cambridge conference seemed to be a suitable occasion at which to present it to an audience for whom Sawyer's arguments for applying prosopographical evidence to the study of the personal names in DB would obviously be of the utmost significance and who might well have comments of their own on some of the problems which remain unsolved. I am grateful to Peter Sawyer for entrusting me with his draft paper and allowing me to deal with the material as I have thought fit and to expand the scope of the original note, and also to the scholars consulted for giving me permission to incorporate their comments into this paper.

The Domesday inquiry was commissioned by William I at Christmas 1085 and the survey-work seems to have been completed within a year. Sawyer has described the compilation of Domesday Book as 'a remarkable achievement that depended as much on the English administrative apparatus as on the drive and efficiency with which the Normans manipulated it' (Sawyer 1978, 254). The process of compilation was complex and has been the subject of much

discussion in recent years but it seems clear that it was based on existing English hidage lists, whose information was rearranged and supplemented with details supplied both in writing and orally by tenants-in-chief, their agents and sworn witnesses at hundredal and county courts (cf. Harvey 1971 and 1980). Sawyer's comparative study of the forms given to place-names in DB and in the related texts (the so-called 'satellites') has shown that the earlier stages of the Domesday inquiry in the main show better place-name forms than DB itself but that there is a tendency in GDB for the orthographical peculiarities that can be attributed to French scribes in the Exon Domesday to be removed and replaced by a more normal OE orthography (Sawyer 1956, 495, 506). Analogously, the DB forms of personal names may reflect either OE sound-developments and orthography, or the influence of French scribes and witnesses who were unfamiliar with the English language, or attempts by Englishmen to restore corrupt forms in their immediate source to more traditional spellings. At every stage of the survey there were opportunities for new errors to arise and some of these errors have in their turn misled modern scholars.

One of the pre-Conquest tenants of Burton by Lincoln LW was called Ednod in the account of the land of Sortebrand and other thanes (GDB 370b; 68/1) but referred to as Elnod in the Clamores (GDB 376a; 71/1). Von Feilitzen identifies the form Ednod with OE Eadnōð but says that the form Elnod in DB can represent Alfnōð, Æðelnōð or *Ealdnōð (PNDB 150, 233). Given the frequent use of d as a spelling for [ð], the most likely name to yield the two forms Ednod and Elnod in DB is Æðelnōð. The possibility cannot, of course, be ruled out that either the Ed- form or the El- form of the name of this tenant is the result of a graphic error or arbitrary confusion.

Adestan f(ilius) Godran (GDB 337a; p.13) was an important pre-Conquest landowner in Lincolnshire who was succeeded by Guy of Craon (GDB 367a-368a; 57/10-44). The form Adestan is explained by von Feilitzen as representing OE Æðelstān (PNDB 188). Towards the end of the account of Guy's fief, however, the GDB scribe stops referring to Guy's antecessor as Adestan and calls him Alestan (368a; 57/48-56), a form which von Feilitzen derives from OE Alfstān, Æðelstān, *Ealdstān or Ealhstān (PNDB 153). Guy's holding in Frampton LH is said in the account of his fief to have been held by Adestan (GDB 367b; 57/28), but a man referred to as Alestan de Frantone took part in the Domesday inquiry and offered to prove that he was the Adestan Godramesune who had held lands in Drayton LH and in Bicker LH (GDB 377b; 73/2). In the account of Guy's fief these lands are stated to have been held by Alestan (GDB 368a; 57/56) and Adestan (GDB 368a; 57/44) respectively. The spelling variations suggest that the name of Guy's antecessor was most probably Æðelstān. Similar variation in the first element of a name is noted by von Feilitzen in Devon, where the form Adestan(us), used of a tenant in the Exon Domesday (485a, 486b), has been changed to Alestan in GDB (118a; 52/16.17) (PNDB 188), while Alexander Rumble has drawn attention to the fact that the 1086 tenant of Soham in Cambridgeshire is referred to as Adestanus in GDB (195b; 14/73) but as Alstanus in the Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis (ICC p.7).

If the proposed interpretation of the interchanges between Ednod and Elnod and between Adestan and Alestan is accepted, then it follows that OE Æðel- might be represented in DB by (amongst other spellings) Ed-, El-, Ad- and Al-, with the medial -e- in the second name being an unhistorical vowel inserted to avoid having a cluster of three consonants (von Feilitzen 1969, 10; cf. Samuels 1972, 14-15). For the variation between A- and E- several possible explanations might be put forward. Both spellings may simply represent OE Æ-, or else they may reflect OE side-forms of Æðel-, that is

Æðel- and Eðel- respectively (Ström 1939, 109-11). Forms in E- might alternatively, have resulted from merging of æ (g) and e in Medieval Latin orthography. Loss of -l- from Æðel- is a normal development. For Æðelstān von Feilitzen notes such forms from tenth- and eleventh-century sources, and they are common on coins of that date (PNDB §62; Smart 1981, 10); the mechanism involved seems to have been a need to lighten the three-consonant cluster l-s-t, prompting assimilation between the virtually homorganic (alveolar-dental) [l] and [s]. For Æðelnōð a coin of Cnut survives with the moneyer's name spelt ÆDENOD, and this similarly provides evidence for loss of -l- (PNDB §63; Smart 1981, 9); again this seems to have come about through assimilation between two consonants, [l] and [n], with similar points of articulation. For both names the forms without -ð- show the late OE reduction, again by assimilation, of Æðel- > Æil- > El- (Colman 1981; cf. Smart 1983).

The account of the fief of Jocelyn son of Lambert records that a pre-Conquest tenant called Edric, a name-form explained by von Feilitzen as representing OE Ēadrīc (PNDB 234), held one carucate of land in Tealby LN and that there was sokeland of this manor in North Willingham LN (GDB 359a; 28/20.21). In the account of the fief of Ivo Tallboys, however, the land at North Willingham is said to belong to the soke of Eriz (GDB 350a; 14/7), a name-form explained both by von Feilitzen and by the present writer as deriving from Scand Eiríkr (PNDB 246; SPLY 76). Since it is clear that Edric and Eriz must both refer to the same man, it is tempting to explain his name as OE Ēadrīc, with the final z of the latter form showing z = [ts], used to render OE [tʃ] (cf. PNDB §122). On the other hand, the final d of Ēad- is not normally lost in DB before a second element beginning with a single (liquid) consonant, although the forms Euuardus rex in Devon (Exon 121) and regis eWardi, regis Euuardi in Suffolk (LDB 288a; 1/107. Also 296a (4x); 3/80.81.82.88) are recorded for King Edward (PNDB §103). Such forms might reflect Old French tendencies to efface medial dentals (cf. Pope §§346-7, 374.ii). There is, however, other evidence to show that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eriz is not OE Ēadrīc. There was a dispute about Jocelyn son of Lambert's holding in Tealby, which is referred to in the Clamores as terram Eiric (GDB 376a; 70/18). The name lying behind the forms Edric, Eriz and Eiric would thus seem to be Scand Eiríkr. The z in Eriz probably represents, in the way suggested above, anglicised [tʃ] for Scand [k] (cf. PNDB §122). The scribe responsible for the form Edric on fo.350a may have failed to recognise the Scand name and substituted for it the much more commonly occurring OE Ēadrīc, whose second element is, of course, cognate with that of Eiríkr. If pronunciation of the Scand name had already been anglicised, this error would have been easier to make.

Erroneous 'restoration' of the first element of a name would also seem to lie behind another instance in which entries referring to one and the same man appear under forms so disparate as to have been classified under separate names. One of Geoffrey of La Guerche's antecessors in Gainsborough LW and Epworth LW was named as Leduinus (GDB 369a; 63/2.5), a form explained by von Feilitzen as derived either from OE *Lēodwine or else from the corresponding ContGerm Leudwin (PNDB 310; cf. Förstemann 1900, 1049-51). In Warwickshire (GDB 243b; 31/1.2.3.12) and in Leicestershire at Burton on the Wolds (GDB 235b; 29/14) Geoffrey succeeded a man named as Leuinus, while in the latter county he had at one time held Thurcaston, also held before the Conquest by Leuinus (GDB 232a; 13/19). The form Leuinus would seem to stand for OE Lēofwine. The probability that Leduinus, Geoffrey's antecessor in Lincolnshire, is to be identified with the Leuinus of Warwickshire and Leicestershire is supported by the facts that Geoffrey also held Melton Mowbray in Leicestershire, which had previously belonged to Leuric [OE Lēofrīc] f(ilius) Leuini (GDB 235b; 29/18), and that one of his

antecessors in Lincolnshire was Leuric cilt ('the young') (GDB 369a; 63/1). If the Leduinus who had held Gainsborough and Epworth were identical with the Leicestershire Leuinus and with the father of Leuric, then the fact that the first element of the son's name is Lēof- would suggest that the father's name was more likely to be OE Lēofwine than OE *Lēodwine or ContGerm Leuduin. What lay behind the confusion may have been a tendency, in rapid or slovenly speech, to pronounce Lēofwine as [le:°winə]. Since this was one of the most commonly used OE names, no English scribe would have been likely to take this pronunciation as representing an OE *Lēodwine. A French-speaker might, however, have been confused. In Old French medial [d] became [ð] and in most contexts was then effaced and also all medial groups consisting of a single consonant +[w] tended to be reduced by progressive assimilation (Pope §§347, 374.ii); both processes affected ContGerm name-material used by French-speakers, so that Leubwin(us) and Leudwin(us) fell together under Leuvin(us) or Lewin(us). Of the two ContGerm elements Leub- and Leud- the latter occurs the more frequently and would thus be the more likely to be chosen by a French-speaking scribe seeking to reconstitute a name encountered in phonetically-reduced form.

The pre-Conquest tenant of Guy of Craon's holding in Laughton LW is named as Vlgrim (GDB 367a; 57/7), a form explained by von Feilitzen and by the present writer as representing a Scand *Ulfgrímr, although both note that no such name is recorded in Scandinavian sources and that the DB form might rather represent ContGerm Wulfgrim, which is attested in French sources (PNDB 399; SPLY 325; Förstemann 1900, 1651; Morlet 1968, 229-30). There was a dispute about the soke over land in Laughton and it is recorded in the Clamores that Guy of Craon claimed this land through his antecessor Wilgrim (GDB 376b; 71/14), a form taken by von Feilitzen to represent the comparatively rare ContGerm Wil(le)grim (PNDB 415; cf. Förstemann 1900, 1599). The forms Vlgrim and Wilgrim must both represent the same name and it is most likely that this is ContGerm Wulfgrim. Peter McClure has suggested that Wulfgrim may have been replaced by Wilgrim because the scribe of the Clamores had been confronted with a written form such as Wlgrim, easily misread as Wilgrim. It would perhaps be advisable to remove the Scand headword *Ulfgrímr from PNDB and SPLY and assign all the entries recorded under that name to ContGerm Wulfgrim.

The first element Wulf- is involved in another case of hitherto unrecognised identity in the Lincolnshire Domesday. The account of the city of Lincoln lists the twelve pre-Conquest lawmen, the tenth of whom is Siuuardus p(res)b(yster) (GDB 336a; p.2/1). There is also a list of the lawmen in 1086, of whom the tenth is Vlnodus p(res)b(yster) loco Siuuard p(res)byteri (GDB 336a; p.2/2). Since it is the name of a post-Conquest tenant, this particular instance of Vlnodus is not treated in PNDB but other instances are explained there as representing OE Wulfnōð (PNDB 422). A little further on in the account of the city of Lincoln there is a rather enigmatical statement to the effect that Vnlof p(res)b(yster) had taken unlawful possession of a moiety of arable land in Lincoln and of the wife of Siuuard the priest while the land had been in the seisin of the king on account of a fine laid by the king upon Siuuard (GDB 336a; p.5/13). It would seem that the priest who had taken possession of the land and of Siuuard's wife and who is here called Vnlof is identical with the priest called Vlnodus who was Siuuard's successor as lawman. The name-form Vnlof has been explained as representing Scand Óláfr, with Vn- substituted for the nasalised ō (< *anu) in the Scand name (PNDB 335; SPLY 204). If the form Vlnod were to be derived from Vnlof, that might be done either by assuming metathesis of nl to ln and subsequent replacement of the anomalous -nof by the common second element -nōð (here given a Latinized spelling), or else by supposing a scribe to have substituted the frequently occurring Wulfnōð for the rare Vnlof. There is,

however, reason to believe that Vlnod is the more correct form of the lawman's name. A pre-Conquest tenant of Lenton in Nottinghamshire who still held the land in 1086 is referred to in one and the same entry both as Vnlof and as Vlnod (GDB 287b; 10/24), while a 1086 tenant of neighbouring Radford is called Vlnod (GDB 287a; 10/15). The variation between forms may in part be the result of visual confusion of u and n in a form such as *Vulnod. The final f in Vnlof is probably a result of confusion of fricatives in an unstressed final position, although it may reflect a sporadic change of p to f evidenced in late OE (PNDB §107); in Wulfnōð such a change might have been brought about by regressive assimilation.

It seems that all the four instances of Vnlof noted in PNDB 335 under the heading Óláfr should in fact be assigned to Wulfnōð. Similarly, it would seem advisable to treat the isolated instance of Vnfac, the name of the pre-Conquest tenant of Normanton on the Wolds in Nottinghamshire (GDB 286a; 9/84), as an error for Vlfac from Wulfhēah, rather than as a form of the Scand by-name Ófeigr, as is done by von Feilitzen (PNDB 334). The name of one of the tenants of neighbouring Plumtree was indeed Vlfac (GDB 286a; 9/82), a form which von Feilitzen derives from Wulfhēah, noting that for final [χ] in the second element -hēah by far the most frequently occurring spelling in DB is -c, presumably an orthographical approximation for a sound for which the Franco-Latin spelling-system had no equivalent; other forms ascribed by von Feilitzen to Wulfhēah include Vlfeih in Essex (LDB 62b; 30/46) and Vlfeih in Gloucestershire (GDB 167b; 37/1) (PNDB 420-21 and §144). The instance of Vnfac in Nottinghamshire is the only one to be found in DB. The spelling in Vnf- presumably reflects vocalisation of l before a consonant and subsequent misreading of Vuf- as Vnf- (PNDB §61).

One of the tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire in 1086 was Robert the Bursar (Dispensator). The account of his fief includes fourteen items (GDB 363b; 38/1-14), thirteen of the places named being in the South Riding of Lindsey. No pre-Conquest tenants are named for the sokes and berewicks among these but the tenant of the manors of Scrivelsby, Wood Enderby and Tathwell is named as Siuuard (38/3.7.12), that of the manors of Thornton and Haltham on Bain as Achi (38/1.13), that of the manor of Addlethorpe as Wiuelac (38/8) and that of the manor of Butyate as Wiglac (38/10), while an entry in the Clamores reveals that the pre-Conquest tenant of the berewick Coningsby was Achi (GDB 375b; 69/34, cf. 38/4). The accounts of the fiefs of the various tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire are prefaced (GDB 337a; p.13) by a list of the names of the people who TRE had had sake and soke and toll and team in the county. These people included Achi f. Siuuardi et Wilac fr. eius super terram patris eorum (Achi son of Siuuard and Wilac his brother in respect of their father's land). It seems that these are the same three men as those whose lands had passed to Robert the Bursar and that they were also probably identical with ones holding land in the South Riding that by 1086 was in the possession of Earl Hugh (Witlac in Claythorpe, GDB 375a; 69/12. Cf. GDB 349a; 13/3), of William of Percy (Siuuardus in Stainfield, GDB 353b; 22/16. Also Wilac and Siuuard in Ludford, GDB 354a; 22/22), and of Gilbert of Ghent (Wiglac in Scremby, GDB 375b; 69/36: cf. GDB 355a; 24/47. Also Siuuard in West Ashby and Driby, GDB 355b; 24/72.73). The father's name probably represented Old Danish Sigwarth, although formally it could equally well represent OE Sigeward (PNDB 363; SPLY 236-39). One brother's name is certainly Scandinavian Áki (PNDB 142; SPLY 3) but the varying forms in which the other's name is recorded leave its true nature in some doubt. Von Feilitzen treats Wiglac and Witlac as separate names, considering the former to represent Scand Vigleikr and the latter OE Wihtlāc, while taking Wiuelac either to represent a rare OE Winelāc or to be an error for Wiglac (PNDB 404, 414, 416). Since Áki is certainly a Scand name and Siuuard probably so, it is tempting to assume that the third member of the family

also bore a Scand name, although by the middle of the eleventh century there is abundant evidence from Lincolnshire for a lack of consistency in the linguistic origins of the forenames given to the children of one family (SPLY LXIII-LXIV). The forms Wiglac and Wilac might represent the Scand name Vígleikr, which had a side-form -lákr of the second element developed under reduced stress (cf. SPLY 337); or, alternatively, the second element of the Scand name may have been replaced by the cognate OE element -lāc. Since OE Wihlāc could take the form Wilac in DB (cf. PNDB 413-14), the isolated instance of Witlac (GDB 375a; 69/12) might be a scribe's erroneous reconstitution of a form Wilac by association with the element Wiht-. Alternatively, the t might be a scribal error for c (cf. the recorded instances of -uuit for -wīg as a second element: cf. PNDB §133). The most difficult form to explain is the isolated Wiuelac (GDB 363b; 38/8). John Insley has suggested that the velar [ɣ] of the Scand name might still have survived in 1086 if the bearer of the name were an eleventh-century incomer from Scandinavia, and that this velar [ɣ] might have acquired a substitute pronunciation [v], a substitution that Peter McClure has pointed out is evidenced from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries respectively in forms of two Nottinghamshire place-names, Leverton (*legretōn; PNNt 33-4) and Averham (*ēagrūm; PNNt 181). The bearer of the name in question, however, was the son of a resident in Lincolnshire and I am inclined simply to treat Wiuelac as another instance of erroneous reconstitution from a form in Wi-.

A point of some interest is that one of the berewicks in Robert the Bursar's fief is called Wilksby (LS; Wilgesbi GDB 363b; 38/5. Cf. also Wilchesbi GDB 339a; 1/104). The specific of this name has been tentatively explained as a compressed form of the Scand personal name Vígleikr (DEPN; SSNEM 78), and it is tempting to identify the relevant bearer of this name with Wiglac, son of Siuuard and brother of Achi. The place-name Wilksby would then be an eleventh-century formation, parallel and roughly contemporaneous with the names in -bý whose specific is a ContGerm personal name, for example Grimald in Grimoldby (LS; Grimalbi GDB 338b; 1/84 and Grimoldbi GDB 358a; 27/28).

One of the tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire in 1086 was Walter of Aincourt, who held a number of estates in Kesteven (GDB 361a; 31/1-18). His antecessors in these lands were numerous but the one in Belton, Somerby, Westhorpe and a lost Svdwelle was a man by the name of Tori (31/1.3.5.7). There was a dispute about the land in Somerby, and in the Clamores this is referred to as terra Thori (GDB 377b; 72/55). It is natural to take the forms Tori and Thori to represent the Scand personal name Þórir or a side-form Þóri, as is done both by von Feilitzen and by the present writer (PNDB 393; SPLY 307-09). The identification of the name is not so straightforward however. Walter of Aincourt also held lands in Northamptonshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and the West Riding of Yorkshire; and among his antecessors a Tori appears in one manor in Northamptonshire (GDB 226a; 38/1), in eleven in Nottinghamshire (GDB 288b; 11/2.4.6.8.9.11.18.20.22.24.25) and in Wombwell in the West Riding (GDB 326a). In the account of the borough of Derby it is recorded that an antecessor of Walter of Aincourt was called Stori (GDB 280a; B/16), but Walter's listed lands in Derbyshire had all previously been held by Suain cilt (GDB 276b; 8/1.3-6), except for Brampton and Wadshelf, held by Wada (GDB 276b; 8/2). In the account of Walter's Nottinghamshire fief the only antecessors who are named besides Tori are Suen (GDB 288b; 11/4.10) or Suain (GDB 288b-289a; 11/12.14.33), Vluric (GDB 288b; 11/1) and Haminc (GDB 289a; 11/26), but in the West Riding of Yorkshire Walter had been preceded not only by a Tori but also by a Stori in Rawmarsh (GDB 326a). It seems likely that the forms Stori and Tori refer to one and the same man. It is difficult, however, to decide what name actually lies behind the recorded forms. If the name were to be assumed to have been

Þórir, then the form Stori might be taken to show the frequent DB spelling of initial [p] as T- (as in the form Tori), with subsequent prefixing of an unhistorical S- possibly explicable as an inverted spelling based on the French effacement, beginning in the eleventh century, of preconsantal [s]. A difficulty here is that before voiceless consonants loss of [s] did not become general until the thirteenth century and, in particular, is not shown by early borrowings from Scandinavian into Norman-French (Pope §§377-78, 1103); for instance, eleventh-century forms of the Norman place-name Turcaville, of which the first element represents the Scand personal name Styrkár, show initial S- still preserved (Sturgaville c.1048; Adigard des Gautries 1954, 139, 416). It would thus seem odd for an unhistorical S- to have been prefixed so frequently in the case of the name Tori in GDB. It is possible that a scribe or a witness simply confused the form Tori = [Þori] with the Scand personal name Stóri. Although this latter name does not occur particularly frequently in Scandinavia and has not been noted for Lincolnshire in sources other than DB (SPLY 267), there would seem to have been a pre-Conquest tenant by the name. He is listed together with a Tori f(ilius) Rold among the men having sake and soke in the county (GDB 337a; p.13). Some of Stori's lands passed to Ivo Tallboys (Belchford and Bolingbroke LS, GDB 350b, 351a; 14/45.65), while under the form Estori with prefixed unhistorical E- (cf. Pope §§361, 603) he is recorded as the pre-Conquest tenant of Countess Judith's land in Hougham LK (GDB 366b; 56/5). Stori had also held a messuage in the city of Lincoln (GDB 336a; p.4/9) and this was claimed both by Ivo Tallboys and by the Countess Judith, presumably because it was uncertain to which of the country estates the city messuage had been annexed (cf. DBL xxxi). Walter of Aincourt's antecessor Tori had also, of course, held land in Hougham and it is possible for this man to have been the antecessor also of Ivo and of Judith but the fact that two men, one called Stori and the other called Tori, are recorded as holders of sake and soke in Lincolnshire suggests that there were two different tenants.

The possibility also exists that the name of Walter's antecessor was in fact Stóri. The form Tori might then reflect French loss of S- before t, even though, as noted above, this loss did not become general until considerably later and usually left behind prosthetic e-. It would undoubtedly be more satisfactory to explain Tori for Stori as the result of substitution of a common name for a rare one. It might be argued that Tori would be more likely to be substituted for Stori than the rare Stori for the common Tori, but against this should be weighed the fact that Walter's antecessor is referred to as Tori in Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire, while the only certain instances of the use of the form Stori for this man are as tenant of Rawmarsh in the West Riding of Yorkshire (GDB 326a) and in the statement that he was an antecessor of Walter in Derby (GDB 280a; B/16).

The instances of hitherto unrecognised identification that I have discussed have revealed how many different factors can contribute to the representation of one man's name in several different forms. Sometimes it is a question of whether or not a sound-development has taken place or whether or not such a development is represented in the written form of a name, as when the first element Æðel- appears as Ed- or Ad- and El- or Al-. Sometimes various developments have resulted in two names falling together under a single written form, as when the first elements Wig- and Wiht- can both be represented as Wi-. It is possible, therefore, that a scribe confronted with the form Wilac might have reconstituted this form now as Wiglac and now as Witlac so that a single man suddenly became endowed with two identities. Sometimes misreading may have resulted in an incorrect form, as perhaps when *Wiclac for [wiçla:k] was read as Witlac or when a

postulated form *Vufac for Wulfhēah was read as Vnfac. Sometimes a scribe or a witness would seem to have substituted one element for another, as when the Ei- of Scand Eiríkr has been replaced by Ed-, representing OE Ead-, a substitution which may have been encouraged because the second element of Eiríkr had already been anglicised to [ritj]. Occasionally a whole name may have been replaced by one with which it had a superficial similarity, as when Tori [Pori] was replaced by Stori or, less probably, Stori by Tori.

The student of the personal nomenclature of Domesday Book must not then rest content with etymologising the individual forms as they occur. In the case of the names of the Lincolnshire tenants, a name-form recorded in an account of the fief of a tenant-in-chief can sometimes be compared with references to the same man in the Clamores dealing with the relevant lands. It has also proved useful to look at the names of all the antecessors of an individual tenant-in-chief, since the Norman tenants often succeeded to all or many of the holdings of their antecessor(s). Useful information has also been derived from the surveys of other counties, since succession to a pre-Conquest antecessor was not limited to lands in a single county. Occasional enlightening information has been derived from entries referring to the same vill in fiefs other than that involving a problematical name-form. The form Eriz recorded in the account of the fief of Ivo Tallboys, for example, supports the correctness of the Eiric of the Clamores against the Edric of the account of the fief of Jocelyn son of Lambert. Finally, where it can be proved that two different forms certainly represent one single name in the Domesday record of another county, it has seemed reasonable to assume that the same two forms represent the same single name in Lincolnshire, as when a Nottinghamshire tenant is referred to in one and the same entry as both Vnlof and Vlnod, supporting the argument that the forms Vnlof and Vlnod recorded in the Lincolnshire survey also both represent the same name. For counties for which earlier stages of the Domesday survey survive, such as the Exon Domesday for the south-western counties or the Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis and the Inquisitio Eliensis, comparison of the personal-name forms in DB with those in the earlier documents can yield vital evidence, since the earlier stages naturally tend to preserve better forms of names than those found in the final version, as demonstrated nearly thirty years ago by Peter Sawyer (Sawyer 1956).

If research were to be extended to sources other than the Domesday texts and if the earlier or later history of the individual holdings and fiefs could be traced, then further identifications would probably emerge. We have only to think how the circular tour from Youlthorpe recently conducted by Cecily Clark led to the probable identification of Aiulf the sheriff of Dorset as a Norman called Agi(w)ulf and to the consequent dismissal of the isolated Aiul(f)- spellings of the place-name Youlthorpe in GDB as Gallic aberrations, to the discomfiture of toponymists who had neglected to study the tenorial history of the township (Clark 1983-1984).

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

County abbreviations are those employed by the English Place-Name Society. LH = Parts of Holland. LK = Kesteven. LN, LS, LW = North, South and West Ridings of Lindsey.

DB = Domesday Book (2 vols., Great Domesday Book and Little Domesday Book). The name-forms quoted are followed by an indication of the folio on which they occur in the particular volume (GDB or LDB) and of the relevant numbered section in the following editions:

- Domesday Book, 18. Cambridgeshire, ed. A.Rumble (Chichester, 1981).
Domesday Book, 27. Derbyshire, ed. P.Morgan (Chichester, 1978).
Domesday Book, 9. Devon, (2 vols.), edd. C. and F.Thorn (Chichester, 1985).
Domesday Book, 7. Dorset, edd. C. and F.Thorn (Chichester, 1983).
Domesday Book, 32. Essex, ed. A.Rumble (Chichester, 1983).
Domesday Book, 15. Gloucestershire, ed. J.S.Moore (Chichester, 1982).
Domesday Book, 1. Kent, ed. P.Morgan (Chichester, 1983).
Domesday Book, 22. Leicestershire, ed. P.Morgan (Chichester, 1979).
Domesday Book, 21. Northamptonshire, edd. F. and C.Thorn (Chichester, 1979).
Domesday Book, 28. Nottinghamshire, ed. J.Morris (Chichester, 1977).
Domesday Book, 8. Somerset, edd. C. and F.Thorn (Chichester, 1980).
Domesday Book, 34. Suffolk, ed. A.Rumble (Chichester, forthcoming).
Domesday Book, 23. Warwickshire, ed. J.Morris (Chichester, 1976).
- DBL = The Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey, edd. C.W.Foster and T.Longley, Lincoln Record Society 19 (1924).
- DEPN = Eilert Ekwall, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names, 4th edn. (Oxford, 1960).
- Exon = Exon Domesday Book, ed. Sir H.Ellis in Domesday Book, iv, Additamenta (London, 1816), quoted by folio number.
- GDB = Great Domesday Book (see above, under DB).
- ICC = Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis, ed. N.E.S.A.Hamilton (London, 1876).
- LDB = Little Domesday Book (see above, under DB).
- PNDB = Olof von Feilitzen, The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book, Nomina Germanica 3 (Uppsala, 1937), cited by page unless otherwise indicated.
- PNNT = The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire, by J.E.B.Gover, Allen Mawer and F.M.Stenton, English Place-Name Society 17 (Cambridge, 1940).
- Pope = M.K.Pope, From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman, 2nd edn. (Manchester, 1952).
- SPLY = Gillian Fellows Jensen, Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, Navnestudier 7 (Copenhagen, 1968).
- SSNEM = Gillian Fellows Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands, Navnestudier 16 (Copenhagen, 1978).
-
- Adigard des Gautries, Jean, 1954: Les Noms de personnes scandinaves en Normandie de 911 à 1066, Nomina Germanica 11. Lund.
- Clark, Cecily, 1983-1984: 'Starting from Youlthorpe (East Riding of Yorkshire): An onomastic circular tour', Journal of the English Place-Name Society 16. 25-37.
- Colman, Fran, 1981: 'The name-element Ædel- and related problems', Notes and Queries N.S. 28. 295-301.
- Feilitzen, Olof von, 1969: Note in C.E.Blunt and Michael Dolley, University Collection of Reading: Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coins, Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles 11a. London and Stockholm.
- Forstemann, Ernst, 1900: Altdeutsches Namenbuch. I - Personennamen. 2nd edn. Bonn.

- Harvey, Sally, 1971: 'Domesday Book and its predecessors', English Historical Review 86. 753-73.
- Harvey, Sally, 1980: 'Recent Domesday studies', English Historical Review 95. 121-33.
- Morlet, Marie-Thérèse, 1968: Les Noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du VI^e au XII^e siècle. I - Les Noms issus du germanique continental et les créations gallo-germaniques. Paris.
- Redmonds, George, 1976: 'English Surnames research', The Study of the Personal Names of the British Isles, ed. H.Voitl. Erlangen. 75-82.
- Samuels, M.L., 1972: Linguistic Evolution. Cambridge.
- Sawyer, P.H., 1956: 'The place-names of the Domesday manuscripts', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 38. 483-506.
- Sawyer, P.H., 1978: From Roman Britain to Norman England. London.
- Seltén, Bo, 1972: The Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Middle English Personal Names: East Anglia 1100-1399, Lund Studies in English 43. Lund.
- Smart, Veronica, 1981: Cumulative Index of Volumes 1-20, Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles 28. London.
- Smart, Veronica, 1983: 'Variation between Ethel- and Ægel- as a name-element on coins', Nomina 7. 91-96.
- Ström, Hilmer, 1939: Old English Personal Names in Bede's History, Lund Studies in English 8. Lund.

NOTE

- * This is a revised version of the paper given on 23 March 1985 at the XVIIth Annual Conference of the Council for Name Studies held at Christ's College, Cambridge.

SOME DOMESDAY PERSONAL-NAMES, MAINLY POST-CONQUEST*

Since the death of John Morris in 1977 I have been concerned with the literary executor's duty, the completion of his projected county-by-county edition and translation of Domesday Book.¹ I have been much helped and supported in this pious obligation to a dead friend by a number of diligent and sympathetic scholars, some of them members of the Council and its conferences; and I have no doubt that they and many others might recognize in this present paper some hobby-horses they have seen me ride, and which they would have hoped to have seen put down ere this.

Domesday Book is a national monument; it is also a memorial to that magnificent achievement of administration, the great inquest which it reports. The whole operation - inquest, record, and report - was done at high speed between Christmas 1085 and September 1087. Perhaps partly as a result of this, it is not easy to recognize some of the names of people and of places in DB, or to etymologize them when recognized, i.e. to discern their form, language, origin, meaning and significance.

The available apparatus helps us with many of the personal-names in DB;² but it does not cover all the material. There are gaps where elucidation and improvisation and invention are required of the editor.

The chief problems are familiar to us. They arise from the fact that between 1066 and 1086 an indigenous landholding population which was Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian and, occasionally, Welsh (speaking Old English or Old Norse or Old Danish or Old Welsh; bearing personal-names belonging to the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian stock, or to the Welsh, Cornish or Irish; their clerks used to reading and writing in Insular Minuscule script as well as in the [relatively]recently imported Carolingian Minuscule) met a new landholding aristocracy which was Norman or French or Breton or Flemish or whatever other breed the Norman Duke's enterprise had enlisted - presumably speaking all sorts of languages as well as the lingua franca in either the Norman or the Frankish varieties; bearing names which were Franco-Danish, or French, or Continental Germanic, or Breton; whose clerks used the Carolingian Minuscule familiar in continental practice.

There is a minefield of garbled names in the DB text. Its negotiation requires recognition of the orthographic and phonetic transpositions which could arise at the linguistic interfaces between the languages current in eleventh-century England - especially where speakers of the varieties of French dictated or took down names which belonged to OE or ON; and it requires recognition of the mistakes likely to occur in reading and transcribing, when interchanging between the two varieties of script.

As Galbraith makes plain,³ Great Domesday Book (GDB) is an edited compilation, the result of abstracting and copying from written returns submitted first to regional offices, and then to a central office, by circuit commissioners who collected the particulars from both live and documentary sources in their localities. Such returns to regional and central offices are recognized in Little Domesday Book (LDB, for Essex and E. Anglia), the Exeter Domesday (Exon DB, for the SW counties), the Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis (ICC, for Cambridgeshire) and the Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury (for Kent). So we have to allow for spellings which represent the mishearing, mispronunciation or misreading which could have occurred at each stage in the process of transmission; to allow, that is, for French-speaking clerks taking down, dictating or reading aloud to themselves Anglo-Saxon names, and for continental-script readers reading insular script.