

scatter randomly. Put it like this: of course the total number of bearers of a particular surname outside its place of origin is much greater than the number still found at the place of origin – but only at the place of origin does the concentration remain high.

Of course, the converse is not true, either. It cannot be said that the surnames that are distinctively Sussexian or Kentish today have all migrated in from elsewhere. Even if this were true, historians would still want to account for the reasons why these particular surnames are so much commoner here than elsewhere.

Conclusion

If it does no more than stimulate historians to account for these peculiarities of distribution, the survey will serve a useful purpose, mapping the associations between surnames and regions.

As McKinley says, 'A list of surnames currently in use in any community, such as a telephone directory or an electoral register, will . . . show traces of the community's past history in various forms'.¹⁵ It is up to surname historians to account for that history, at least as regards the surnames whose present-day distribution suggests an association with a particular community. A *comparative* list of surnames is a useful guide to the surviving traces of a community's history and will pose many questions which can only be answered by scholarly historical research.

¹⁵ McKinley, *History of British Surnames*, p. 194.

Family-Entries in English *Libri Vitae*, c.1050 to c.1530: Part I

John S. Moore
University of Bristol

I. Introduction to *libri vitae*

My own interest in *libri vitae* as historical evidence is, I readily confess, of recent origin. When, in the late 1980s, I was investigating possible materials for the history of the Anglo-Norman family, I read Cecily Clark's seminal paper on the Thorney Abbey *liber* in *Anglo-Norman Studies*.¹ This was my first introduction to what I later discovered, and then demonstrated, to be not only a major source for the Anglo-Norman family but in fact the earliest such source. For, in the extracts which she printed from B.L. Add.MS. 40,000, was one which clearly described a contemporary family: ' . . . UUillelmus de Albinico, Cecilia uxor eius, filii eius UUillelmus, Rogerius, Matildis filia eius...'² My ignorance—shared, I am certain, with most other non-ecclesiastical historians—thus revealed and my appetite duly whetted, I was inspired to investigate *libri vitae* as historical records of demographic value, and, in doing so, to meet Cecily herself and profit from her immense learning given so freely and with such delightfully puckish humour. I very much regret that she did not live to see the final text of this series of articles which, as editor, she had accepted in principle for *Nomina* and which her knowledge and wisdom would certainly have improved; but she did see and approve the 'Corpus of Families extracted from English *libri vitae*' circulated at the Battle Abbey Conference in 1991. Before proceeding further with *libri vitae*, it is perhaps worth while briefly outlining why the history of the family is an important topic in English history

The size and structure of the West European family and household have long been a matter of interest to a variety of scholars. Historical

¹ Clark, 'British Library Additional MS. 40,000 ff. 1v-12r', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 7 (1985), 50-68.

² *ibid.*, p. 55. Compare the two married priests each with a wife and child, though they may have had other, unrecorded, children, *ibid.*, p. 64.

demographers needed estimates of average family or household size to use as 'multipliers' in converting contemporary enumerations of heads of household produced by ecclesiastical or fiscal authorities into estimates of total populations.³ Social historians and sociologists concentrated their attention more on the structure and role of the family, and thus needed to establish whether the typical family of pre-industrial Western Europe was the 'nuclear family' clearly predominant since the Industrial Revolution (i.e. parents and unmarried children, perhaps with one widowed grandparent) or was some more complex structure containing more than one married couple, either of the same or different generations, with all their children.⁴ Increasingly, a consensus seems to be emerging amongst historians that the typical West European family in the early modern and modern periods was indeed the small nuclear family, and hence that the normal household (i.e. the nuclear family plus unrelated co-residents such as lodgers, apprentices and servants) was also small outside the landowning classes, containing an average of about five persons.⁵ It has also long been known that landowners' households were much larger because of the number of servants needed to staff their houses, and this conclusion has recently also been documented for the medieval period.⁶ But the size of the normal family and household in medieval England has remained a matter of controversy even in the relatively well-documented period from the thirteenth

³ T. H. Hollingsworth, *Historical Demography* (London, 1969), especially pp. 118–22 and 125; J. S. Moore, 'Demographic Dimensions of the Mid-Tudor Crisis' (forthcoming).

⁴ M. Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500–1914* (London, 1980), especially pp. 22–38.

⁵ P. Laslett, R. Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1974); R. A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450–1700* (London, 1984), pp. 10 and 18–26. My own work argues that these conclusions are also valid for the period c.1050–c.1250: J. S. Moore, 'The Anglo-Norman Family: Size and Structure', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14 (1992), 153–96.

⁶ C. Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1987), chapter 4; K. Mertens, *The English Noble Household, 1250–1600* (Oxford, 1988), especially Appendix C; J. F. A. Mason, 'Barons and their Officials in the Later Eleventh Century', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 13 (1991), 242–60. See also F. M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066–1166*, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1961), chapter 2.

century onwards—one eminent historical demographer committed himself to 3.5 as an estimate of average size,⁷ though most medievalists have tended to accept as reasonable the early-modern average of 4.75 suggested by Laslett⁸—whilst the period before 1200 has remained *terra incognita*. Nevertheless, there was evidence from the Carolingian *polyptyques* that the average size of the peasant family in France, the Low Countries, Western Germany and Italy was also about five persons.⁹ We may note *en passant* that such evidence had begun to come into print before the French sociologist Frédéric Le Play adumbrated his theories about the complex family of pre-industrial Europe.¹⁰

Moreover, the interests of the present-day economic and social historian were not usually shared by the originators of the surviving medieval evidence. Two consequences follow. The first is that economic and social historians are often forced to use materials which were not intended for their purposes. The second is that these historians must not allow their particular concerns to blind them to the utility of types of evidence—such as *libri vitae*—which they would not normally consider to be useful because these sources were not intended to provide economic and social information (as noted above, *mea culpa*). Here modern historians are peculiarly likely to suffer from the inbuilt presuppositions of their own, largely Godless, age when trying to understand the Middle Ages. Whether or not 'all our ancestors were literal Christian believers, all of the time,'¹¹—a view which I query because it is totally unverifiable—the medieval Church, its institutions, beliefs and value-systems certainly permeated and

⁷ J. C. Russell, *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque, 1948), pp. 23–32, 50, 61–9, and 366.

⁸ See references cited in Moore, 'Anglo-Norman Family', p. 154, n. 7.

⁹ See references cited in Moore, 'Anglo-Norman Family', p. 154, n. 8.

¹⁰ F. le Play, *La réforme sociale en France déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens*, 2 vols (Paris, 1864) and *L'organisation de la famille* (Paris, 1871). On *polyptyques* see further R. H. C. Davis, 'Domesday Book: Continental Parallels', in *Domesday Studies*, edited by J. C. Holt (Woodbridge 1987), pp. 30–39, and J. Percival, 'The Precursors of Domesday Book', in *Domesday Book: a Reassessment*, edited by P. H. Sawyer (London 1987), pp. 5–27.

¹¹ P. Laslett, *The World We have Lost Further Explored*, 3rd edition (London, 1984), p. 71.

largely determined medieval life. Yet economic and social historians too often overlook records produced by medieval clerics for episcopal or monastic masters which both masters and clerics would indubitably have considered to have much greater significance than, say, manorial surveys, court-rolls or account-rolls. Monastic and capitular records, for example, only existed as a means to facilitate an end, the due performance of the *opus dei*. As I have tried to show elsewhere, the economic historian, and even more the social historian, who ignores apparently uninteresting records is thereby the loser, particularly when trying to investigate the medieval family. Moreover, there are other aspects of the history of the medieval family which I have not considered here or in my article in *Anglo-Norman Studies* but which are clearly important: these include the political aspects studied by historians since the days of J. H. Round, and by genealogists since at least the sixteenth century,¹² and intra-family attitudes centring on controversies about the disputed existence of marital and parental love within the family.¹³

Amongst the earliest, most important and least exploited sources for the demographic history of the Anglo-Norman family and household are the records of religious confraternity.¹⁴ These records

¹² For a recent study of the political importance of the family in the Norman period, see J. C. Holt, 'Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 32 (1982), 193–212; 33 (1983), 193–220; 34 (1984), 1–26; and 35 (1985), 1–28.

¹³ E. Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (London, 1976); L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (London, 1977); L. A. Pollock, *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900* (Cambridge, 1983); J. R. Gillis, *For Better, for Worse: British marriages, 1600 to the Present* (Oxford, 1985); A. MacFarlane, *Marriage and Love in England. Modes of Reproduction, 1300–1840* (Oxford, 1986); G. Duby, *Medieval Marriage* (Baltimore, 1978), chapter 1; B. A. Hanawalt, *The Ties that Bind: Peasant Families in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1986); C. N. L. Brooke, *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 55, 57, 128–33, 137–40, 177, and 228–47; B. Gottlieb, *The Family in the Western World from the Black Death to the Industrial Age* (Oxford, 1993); G. Duby, *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993); M. F. Wack, *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1990).

¹⁴ Other sources in the Anglo-Norman period include, besides the obvious ones, the unique *Rotuli de Dominabus* of 1185: *Rotuli de Dominabus et Puellis de XII Comitatus [1185]*, edited by J. H. Round, Pipe Roll Society, 35

came into existence because of the medieval belief, among both clergy and laity, in the spiritual efficacy of association or confraternity, especially with members of monastic orders whose prayers would benefit the souls of living and dead alike. Following the development of the doctrine of intercession, with its increased emphasis on the 'pains of purgatory', other forms of institution arose to fulfil the same end, notably the chantries from the thirteenth century onwards,¹⁵ but in the earlier period monasteries were the chief objects of such association, both among themselves and for the laity. Consequently, among the records produced by the medieval Western Church were what were known as *libri vitae*—'books of life'. The name originated in Biblical texts such as *Exodus*, XXXII, 32; *Psalms*, LXIX, 29; *Philippians*, IV, 3; *Revelations*, III, 5, XVII, 8, XX, 12 and XXII, 19. The original purpose of such books was to record the names of members of the community, but it was soon extended to include benefactors and other laity who were joined to the community by confraternity. Hence the preface to the Hyde Abbey *liber vitae* states,

in befitting order there follow the names of brethren, monks, admitted members and benefactors alive and departed, [so that] by the temporal record of this writing they may be written in the page of the Book of Life, . . . for a daily remembrance in celebrating of the mass or the singing of the Psalter—the names to be presented daily by the subdeacon before the altar at matins or the principal mass, and recited, as far as time will permit, in the presence of the Most High; and afterwards the chief priest who celebrates may commend them most humbly to Almighty God for their advancement in glory according to their merits.¹⁶

(London, 1913). The earlier sources are analysed in Moore, 'Anglo-Norman Family'. The later medieval sources are listed *ibid.*, p. 154, n. 7. True 'listings' start only with the Coventry City enumeration of 1523 and the Lichfield Abbey confraternity register of c.1532–33: C. Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1979), especially Appendix 1; A. Kettle, *A List of Families in the Archdeaconry of Stafford, 1532–3*, Staffordshire Record Society, 4th series, 8 (1976).

¹⁵ K. L. Wood-Legh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain* (Cambridge, 1965); J. T. Rosenthal, *The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy, 1307–1485* (London, 1972), especially chapters 1–3; A. Kreider, *English Chantries: the Road to Dissolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979); S. Raban, *Mortmain Legislation and the English Church, 1279–1500* (Cambridge, 1982), especially chapters 5–6.

¹⁶ Translated from W. de G. Birch, *Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of*

Presumably most medieval monasteries would once have maintained such records, but nearly all English examples have vanished as a result of the Reformation, and only three are now known to survive, for Durham Priory, for Hyde Abbey and for Thorney Abbey. The Durham *liber* developed at Durham out of a record begun at Lindisfarne;¹⁷ another began at New Minster, Winchester, and was continued at Hyde Abbey;¹⁸ the third was maintained at Thorney Abbey.¹⁹ Several confraternity agreements, some of which include details of families, are also included in the twelfth-century *Textus Roffensis* of Rochester Cathedral Priory.²⁰ Moreover, the chronological coverage of these surviving records differs. As full records of confraternity with laymen, all start in the eleventh century, but at Thorney the *liber vitae* appears not to have any new entries after the 1190s; the Hyde *liber* went out of use rather earlier, but a few entries were added in the five decades before the Dissolution; at Durham additions were still being made to the *liber vitae* down to the end of the fifteenth century,²¹ whilst its use as a memorial at the high altar was still remembered in an account written in 1593:

There did lye on the high altar an excellent fine booke verie richly couered with gold and siluer conteinige the names of all the benefactors towards St Cuthberts church from the first originall foundation hereof, ... the layinge that booke on the high altar did show how highly they esteemed their founders and benefactors, and the dayly and quotidian remembrance they had of them in the time of masse and diuine service did argue not onely their gratitude, but also a most diuine and charitable affection to the soules of their benefactors as well dead as liuinge, which booke is as yett extant declaringe the said use in the inscription thereof.²²

New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, Hampshire Record Society, 5 (1892), 11–12.

¹⁷ B.L. Cotton MS Domitian A. VII, printed in *Liber Vitæ Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis*, edited by J. Stevenson, Surtees Society, 13 (1841), pp. 1–134.

¹⁸ B.L. Stowe MS 944, printed in Birch, *Liber Vitæ of Hyde Abbey*.

¹⁹ B.L. Add. MS 40,000; an edition started by Cecily Clark is to be completed by Dr J. H. Insley.

²⁰ H. Tsurushima, 'The Fraternity of Rochester Diocese, c.1100', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14 (1992), 313–37. I hope to analyse the families appearing there in a future joint publication with Professor Tsurushima.

²¹ A. Hamilton-Thompson, *Liber Vitæ Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis: a Collotype Facsimile of the Original Manuscript*, Surtees Society, 136 (1923), p. ix.

The Durham *liber vitae* also preserved a copy of the prayer said when new additions were made to its contents: 'We pray you, O Lord and Holy Father, through your son Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit, that their names may be written in the book of Life'.²³

Later, as Hamilton-Thompson noted,²⁴ the *liber vitae* often developed into a more specialised *liber confraternitatum*,²⁵ supplemented by obituary and mortuary rolls²⁶ and letters of confraternity,²⁷ whilst the notes of gifts sometimes found in a *liber vitae* were subsequently elaborated in cartularies. These cartularies may contain agreements for confraternity as at Thorney (occasionally) and Rochester (frequently).²⁸ The *libri vitae* are of considerable historical value from several viewpoints, including onomastics, etymology and prosopography, as Cecily Clark herself showed in several articles,²⁹ but for historical demographers their interest lies in their occasional inclusion of the wives and children of lay donors (and in the eleventh

²² *ibid.*, p. xxviii, citing J. T. Fowler, *The Rites of Durham*, Surtees Society, 107 (1903), pp. 16–7.

²³ Translated from Stevenson, *Liber Vitæ Dunelm.* (1841), p. 18.

²⁴ Hamilton-Thompson, *Liber Vitæ Dunelm.* (1923), pp. xiv–xxv and xxvi.

²⁵ e.g. Kettle, *List of Families in the Archdeaconry of Stafford* (n. 14, above).

²⁶ e.g. Birch, *Liber Vitæ of Hyde Abbey*, pp. 135–52; J. Raine, *The Obituary Roll of William Ebchester and John Burnby, Priors of Durham*, Surtees Society, 31 (1856); W. H. St John Hope, *The Obituary Roll of John Islip* (London, 1906); M. V. Taylor, *Liber Luciani de Laude Cestrie* (Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, 64, 1912).

²⁷ e.g. Stevenson, *Liber Vitæ Dunelm.* (1841), pp. xv–xvi, 32–3 and 71–3; Birch, *Liber Vitæ of Hyde Abbey*, p. 293; Raine, *Obituary Roll of William Ebchester*, pp. 106–20; J. Sheppard, *Literæ Cantuarienses*, Rolls Series, 85, (London, 1887–89), I, 10–13; II, 456–57; III, 137–38, 140–43, 152, 288, 315 and 368–69; J. H. Bloom, *Liber Ecclesiæ Wigornensis*, Worcestershire Historical Society, 28 (1912), 52.

²⁸ Thorney: 'Red Book' (Cambridge University Library, MSS 3020–1); Rochester: *Textus Roffensis*, edited by T. Hearne (Oxford, 1720), pp. 62–242, and *Textus Roffensis*, part II, edited by P. Sawyer, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, XI, (Copenhagen, 1962).

²⁹ Clark, 'British Library Additional MS. 40,000' (n. 1, above); C. Clark, 'The *Liber Vitæ* of Thorney Abbey and its "Catchment Area"', *Nomina*, 9 (1985), 53–72; C. Clark, 'A Witness to Post-Conquest English Cultural Patterns: the *Liber Vitæ* of Thorney Abbey', in *Studies in Honour of René Derolez* (Ghent, 1987), edited by A. M. Simon-Vandenberg, pp. 73–85.

and twelfth centuries of a few married clergy as well). There was no legal or customary rule which required the inclusion of kin other than children—unlike the contemporary French *laudatio parentum* and the later French *offre aux parents, retrait lignager* and *réserve coutumière*³⁰—and most frequently male donors are listed either alone or with only their wives, but the context suggests that when children were mentioned, usually all were included who were alive at the time. (Again, there is a contrast with France, where, although challenges to monastic donations were normally confined to the wives or widows, sons, daughters and sons-in-law of donors, the presence of other kin means that there can be ‘no routine equation’ of kin with the co-residential family, though there was an ‘overwhelming preponderance of conjugal pairs and full or truncated conjugal kin’.)³¹ Even more valuably from a demographic viewpoint, such information, sparse though it admittedly is, comes mainly from the eleventh and earlier twelfth centuries when little other information on the size of families is available.

Even as liturgical documents the three surviving English *libri vitae* have not received overmuch attention. The original edition of the Durham *liber* did little more than provide a usable text, and its palaeographical element was rudimentary; a re-edition did not proceed beyond a useful, albeit rather poor quality, facsimile; and the promised second volume which was to contain a new transcription of the text together with a proper study of the various handwritings and a prosopographical index never materialised.³² The edition of the Hyde Abbey *liber*, whilst again giving a usable text, was hardly notable for its palaeographical expertise, despite its editor’s reputation, as well as citing the wrong reference for the original MS,³³ and neither the Durham nor the Hyde *liber* was collated with the available cartularies,³⁴ a task which Cecily Clark in her preliminary studies of

³⁰ Compare S. D. White, *Custom, Kinship and Gifts to Saints: the Laudatio Parentum in Western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill, 1988), pp. 3, 53 and 198–9. I am most grateful to Dr Marjorie Chibnall for bringing White’s work to my notice.

³¹ White, *Custom, Kinship and Gifts to Saints*, pp. 62, 96, 119 and 124–26.

³² Hamilton-Thompson, *Liber Vitae Dunelm.* (1923), p. vii.

³³ Birch, *Liber Vitae of Hyde Abbey*, p. i.

³⁴ The cartularies are listed in G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain* (London, 1958), pp. 39–41 (Durham Priory) and 121 (Hyde Abbey).

the Thorney Abbey *liber vitae* showed was essential to the successful identification and dating of the individuals mentioned. The necessity for collation with the evidence of cartularies, original charters and any other external dating-material arises from the fact that, although entries would originally have been made in chronological sequence on each MS folio, any spaces left blank were likely to be filled at a later stage, sometimes decades or even centuries later.³⁵ In other cases, such confraternity records did not reach the *liber*.³⁶

We must next ask how far entries in *libri vitae* are likely to be representative of the whole population. As we have already noted, there was no legal or moral compulsion on the laity either to enter into confraternity with a monastery or to ensure the mention of family members alongside the individual *confrère*, and in fact the vast majority of secular entries in all three *libri vitae* refer to individuals. The impulse came from the potential donor, leading one eminent Scottish historian to describe the Durham *liber vitae* as ‘That incomparable tourist Visitors’ Book’.³⁷ The corollary is that it is difficult to regard the people entered in a *liber vitae* as in any sense a random sample. Geographically, as might be expected, the visitors to Durham come overwhelmingly from north-east England and southern

The numerous Durham cartularies are all unprinted, as are the post-Conquest cartularies of Winchester Cathedral, Hyde Abbey and Holy Cross Hospital; the last three, however, contain very few copy-deeds and virtually none before the thirteenth century. The Hyde Abbey chronicles contain no information on the abbey’s dealings in land in the Anglo-Norman period: E. Edwards, *Liber Monasterii de Hyda*, Rolls Series (London, 1866). The other major source of relevant documentary evidence, the WintonDB, is edited in M. Biddle, *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1976).

³⁵ Hamilton-Thompson, *Liber Vitae Dunelm.*, pp. xiv–xv and xxvi. Family entry no. 8 in the Hyde Abbey *liber* is a late thirteenth-century addition to a page otherwise containing entries recorded in a hand of the first half of the twelfth century.

³⁶ Birch, *Liber Vitae of Hyde Abbey*, p. 148, prints a twelfth-century confraternity-agreement for Ansketil Fitz Gilbert from the rear paste-down of a Durham obit-book. Clark noted that at Thorney, ‘No one is more amply represented by confraternity-records than the Huntingdonshire landholder Odo Revel . . . but whether he figures anywhere in the *liber vitae* is uncertain.’ Clark, ‘Additional MS. 40,000’, p. 65.

³⁷ G. W. S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 158–59.

Scotland, those to Hyde from southern England and those to Thorney from the East Midlands.³⁸ Although a full social classification is impossible since not all persons can be sufficiently identified, in all three places the visitors are mostly from the baronial and knightly groups, with a sprinkling of local freeholders and townsmen. Analysis has, however, shown that the families of the barons and knights do not seem to be markedly different in either size or composition from the families of the freeholders and townsmen, though admittedly the number of the latter is too small to be a satisfactory sample.

It is also clear from the sex-ratio (i.e. the number of men per 100 women) that men are considerably over-represented in the reconstructed families at all three centres. These sex-ratios are 151 (Durham), 163 (Hyde) and 182 (Thorney). Now it is not necessary to indulge, as French historians did when confronted with the same apparent sexual imbalance in the Carolingian *polyptyques*, in fantasies about massive female infanticide: where they were observed, the feast-days of the Eleven Thousand Virgins (22 August and 21 October) were not occasions for culling surplus young girls. The truth is more prosaic: it is not that women were missing, rather that men were more likely to be represented, for the very obvious reason that men, both as heads of families and households and as individuals, did matter more in the feudal age.³⁹ Visits to all three religious houses may well often have followed, and been in thanksgiving for, the birth of a son and heir, which was vital to the family's survival. The over-representation of men is thus entirely explicable in terms of the value-system and ethos of the lordly classes in 'the first century of English [and Scottish] feudalism'; it does not weaken the value of the *libri vitae* for historical demography. Hence what is available constitutes a small but useful sample of families in three widely separated regions of Anglo-Norman England, the North (Durham Priory), the East Midlands (Thorney Abbey) and the South (Hyde Abbey).⁴⁰ But an essential preliminary to using the entries in the *libri vitae* for any historical purpose is close

³⁸ Clark, 'Liber Vitae of Thorney Abbey'.

³⁹ E. R. Coleman, 'Medieval Marriage Characteristics: a Neglected Factor in the History of Medieval Serfdom', in *The Family in History*, edited by T. K. Rabb and R. I. Rothberg (New York, 1976), pp. 4-13, and D. Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (London, 1985), pp. 62-8, on the illusory surplus of men on the estates of St Germain des Prés in the ninth-century *polyptyque*.

⁴⁰ See also n. 20, above, for Rochester Cathedral Priory in this context.

dating of these entries. Because of the possibility of entries being inserted at a date much later than the events they record, and because close dating of entries on palaeographical grounds alone may be unsafe (since the 'horizon' or 'catchment period' of the entries may be up to a century before they were recorded),⁴¹ we must try to date all entries as precisely as possible by identifying the individuals involved, i.e. by prosopographical methods. As already remarked, this necessarily involves the collation of the *libri vitae* with cartularies and original charter-materials which may throw light on the particular event recorded and, in addition, the establishment of a chronological context by reference to other records which date the individuals concerned, or by witnesses to deeds, or, in default, by adjoining entries relating to single individuals who are not otherwise relevant to the entries referring to families. Such dating of undated medieval documents, or of parts of them such as individual entries in *libri vitae*, is one of the more tedious tasks of the medieval specialist: it is a necessary chore. Moreover, I have not attempted a full prosopographical study of any of the English *libri vitae*, desirable though such a study would be. As a student of historical demography, I have confined myself to an attempt at direct dating of the entries, recording families and, in default, to dating of the surrounding entries, with due regard for changes in handwriting, to establish a probable period. Perhaps my efforts may stimulate others to take on the full prosopographical study of the Durham and Hyde *libri vitae*: this would be an invaluable adjunct to English medieval studies alongside Cecily Clark's edition of the Thorney *liber* to be completed by John Insley.

As already noted above, the *libri vitae* are also of value for other purposes. They can be used to determine the 'catchment area' of the three institutions with surviving *libri*, as Cecily Clark herself demonstrated for Thorney Abbey.⁴² They are one of the major sources for indicating the prevalence of married clergy in late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England, as shown by entries nos 1, 5 and 14 in the Hyde Abbey *liber* below.⁴³ They provide significant evidence for

⁴¹ Clark, 'Additional MS. 40,000', pp. 57-64.

⁴² Clark, 'Liber Vitae of Thorney Abbey'.

⁴³ A. L. Barstow, *Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy: the Eleventh-Century Debates* (New York, 1982); J. Barrow, 'Hereford Bishops and Married Clergy, c.1130-1204', *Historical Research*, 60 (1987), 1-8. References to the continuation of the practice into the thirteenth century are

intermarriage between Norman and English (e.g. nos 1, 4–5, 13, 16, 18, 20, 24 and 27 below, which can be supplemented by names of couples recorded in the *liber vitae* without children and therefore not included in section 3 below) and for the adoption of Norman forenames by English parents soon after the Norman Conquest (e.g. nos 4, 13 [?], 15, 17 [?], 22 and 29 below; note also *Leofricus vel Hugo* as the name of one of Ascer's sons in no. 22). Both of these themes have been developed by Cecily Clark.⁴⁴ The results of a fuller study of intermarriage are set out in the Appendix (Table I) in which the forenames of husbands and wives have been classified as Insular and Continental.

Finally, when more work has been done on the names of all the identifiable people in the *libri vitae*, not just the heads of families, onomastic scholars will doubtless be able to detect regional differences in name-patterns as Old English evolved into Middle English, yet again following in Cecily's footsteps.⁴⁵

II. The Hyde Abbey *liber vitae*

With the Hyde Abbey *liber*, there is a reasonable hope of identifying most of the heads of families and other individuals commemorated. To begin with, there are the obvious national sources and authoritative reference works based on them (which are equally useful for the other two *libri vitae*). The original sources include Domesday Book and its 'satellites'; the Pipe Rolls (Exchequer accounts, 1129–30 and from 1155); the Red Book of the Exchequer (including the *cartae baronum* or feudal returns of 1166 which list the knightly subtenants of most major barons who were tenants-in-chief of the Crown); the Book of Fees containing further feudal returns of barons and subtenants from 1198 to c.1250; original charters in the Public Record Office, of which many early examples were printed by J. H. Round in his 'Ancient Charters' and the 'Ancient Deeds' have mostly been calendared either in print or

assembled in J. S. Moore, 'The Sudeley and Toddington area in Domesday Book', in *The Sudeleys—Lords of Toddington*, edited by Lord Sudeley (London, 1987), p. 72, n. 19.

⁴⁴ C. Clark, 'Willelmus Rex? vel alius Willelmus?', *Nomina*, 11 (1987), 7–33; for an attempt to develop the historical implications of this linguistic analysis, see J. S. Moore, 'The Norman Yoke?', *Bulletin of the Manorial Society of Great Britain*, n.s., 2, i (1993), 5–13.

⁴⁵ Cf. Clark, 'Liber Vitae of Thorney Abbey'.

in typescript; the *Cartae Antiquae* rolls containing transcripts of charters, the first 20 volumes having been printed; confirmations and authenticated copies of charters in the printed *Calendars* of the Charter and Patent Rolls, the *Curia Regis Rolls*, printed from 1194 to 1236, and the associated Feet of Fines, printed for most counties.⁴⁶ Useful reference works include the three volumes of royal charters and writs from 1066 to 1135 (*Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*); Round's *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France*; the *Complete Peerage*; Sanders' *English Baronies*; *The Heads of Religious Houses, England and Wales, 940–1216*; and the Victoria County History series.⁴⁷

In addition, there is a large amount of documentation available for the Winchester monasteries: the cartularies (of which one for Winchester Cathedral is in print) are augmented by the surveys of c.1057, c.1110 and 1148 in the 'Winchester Domesday' so superbly edited by Frank Barlow. Besides these cartularies and the WintonDB, there exist a useful printed calendar of the Winchester College muniments, a good typescript list of the medieval charters of Winchester Cathedral by Dr Nicholas Vincent, and Dr Michael Franklin's superb edition of the Winchester episcopal *Acta* for the period 1070–1204.⁴⁸ Several cartularies and collections of deeds for

⁴⁶ Most of the Pipe Rolls from 1155 to 1221 are printed in the Pipe Roll Society series, which also includes Round's 'Ancient Charters' and the first two printed volumes of the 'Cartae Antiquae'; the publications of the Public Record Office and its predecessors are conveniently listed in *H.M.S.O. List 24: British National Archives*. Details of both the Pipe Roll Society series and the official publications are given in E. L. C. Mullins, *Texts and Calendars*, 2 vols (London, 1958, 1983).

⁴⁷ *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, edited by H. W. C. Davis, H. C. Johnson, H. A. Cronne and R. H. C. Davis, 3 vols (Oxford, 1913–68); a new edition of Vol. I is in the press; G. E. Cockayne and V. Gibbs, *The Complete Peerage*, 14 vols (London, 1910–59); J. H. Round, *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France* (London, 1899); D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke and V. London, *The Heads of Religious Houses, England and Wales, 940–1216* (Cambridge, 1972); I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: a Study of their Origin and Descent, 1086–1327* (Oxford, 1960).

⁴⁸ Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain*, pp. 120–22, though this omits three cartularies in the Cathedral muniments; Biddle, *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 32–141; S. M. Himsworth, *Winchester College Muniments*, 3 vols (Chichester, 1976–84); *English Episcopal Acta, VIII: Winchester, 1070–1204*, edited by M. J. Franklin (Oxford, 1993).

religious houses in Hampshire and the adjoining areas of neighbouring counties are also in print, including those of Abingdon Abbey, Beaulieu Abbey, Boxgrove Priory, Carisbrooke Priory, Chichester Cathedral, Quarr Abbey, Reading Abbey, Selborne Priory, Sele Priory, God's House and St Denys's Priory at Southampton, and Southwick Priory.⁴⁹ Finally, the early medieval MSS in the Hampshire Record Office (fairly few, but including the Mottisfont Priory cartulary) have been checked, as have both the incomplete 'Index Locorum to Charters' in the British Library and the *Calendar of Ancient Deeds* in the Public Record Office—in both cases with little positive result—but lack of time has precluded extensive investigation of charters and other original materials in the Public Record Office or the British Library, apart from the unprinted cartularies of Christchurch Priory and Wherwell Abbey (both of which have little private material in the eleventh and twelfth centuries). Nevertheless, most heads of families in the Hyde Abbey *liber vitae* can be adequately identified and fairly closely dated; their size and composition have been analysed elsewhere.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, edited by J. Stevenson, 2 vols (Rolls Series, 1858); *Two Cartularies of Abingdon Abbey*, edited by C. F. Slade and G. Lambrick, Oxfordshire Historical Society, n.s. 32–33 (1990–91); S. F. Hockey, *The Beaulieu Cartulary*, edited by S. F. Hockey, Southampton Record Series, 17 (1974); *The Cartulary of Carisbrooke Priory*, edited by S. F. Hockey, Isle of Wight Records Series, 2 (1981); *The Cartulary of the High Church of Chichester*, edited by W. D. Peckham, Sussex Record Society, 46 (1946); *The Charters of Quarr Abbey*, edited by S. F. Hockey, Isle of Wight Records Series, 3 (1991); *Reading Abbey Cartularies*, edited by B. R. Kemp, Camden Society, 4th series, 31 and 33 (1986–87); *Calendar of Charters and Documents Relating to Selborne*, edited by W. D. Macray, Hampshire Record Society, 4 (1896); *Calendar of Charters and Documents Relating to the Possessions of Selborne*, edited by W. D. Macray, Hampshire Record Society, 9 (1894); *The Cartulary of God's House, Southampton*, edited by J. M. Kaye, Southampton Record Series, 19–20 (1976); *The Cartulary of the Priory of St Denys near Southampton*, edited by E. O. Blake, Southampton Record Series, 24–25 (1981–82); *The Cartularies of Southwick Priory*, edited by K. A. Hanna, Hampshire Record Series, 9–10, (1988–89). Historians should not be misled by the title of H. D. Liveing, *Records of Romsey Abbey* (London, 1906), a rather poor history including very little record-evidence.

⁵⁰ Moore, 'Anglo-Norman Family', pp. 174–83.

III. Family-entries in the Hyde Abbey *Liber Vitae*

The discussion of each entry in the following list is necessarily compressed. Page references are followed by entry numbers within brackets. Birch's comments on the dating of the entries have been cited. The transcript of each family entry in the *liber*, printed in bold type and numbered for ease of reference, is followed by a discussion of the evidence for identification and dating.

1. **Godwinus presbiter et eius coniunx Erenburch et filius [sic] eius Stigandus et Tove.**

(Birch, p. 30: hand eleventh or twelfth century)

A Godwin the priest held Farringdon in 1066 (*DBHants*, 5, 1). No such person is mentioned in the WintonDB in c.1057 or c.1110, so he is probably not the man of the same name whose heirs in 1148 owed rent for lands outside the west and north gates of Winchester: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 88 (no. 241) and 94 (no. 325). In any case, Stigand is not a baptismal name very likely to be given to a boy in England after Archbishop Stigand's deprivation in c.1070, though it is found as a personal name in pre-Conquest Normandy (*The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, edited by M. Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969–80), II, 119, n. 6), and a Stigand the Priest appears in England as late as 1147 (Franklin, *Winchester Acta*, p. 74). The preceding entry but one is for an Æpelwinus Sacerdos, almost certainly the 'Ailwin halt-priest' who occurs in the WintonDB in 1057: Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 68 (no 291). Given this dating and the role of Winchester in royal administration, it is possible, even probable, that Godwin the priest can be identified as the witness of the same name to royal charters in the period 1050–54: Stevenson, *Chron. Abingdon*, II, 454, 469 and 472.

2. **Alfuuinus et Eadgyþa uxor eius et Æpeliua filia eorum.**

(Birch, p. 30: hand eleventh or twelfth century)

Alfwin cannot be identified with certainty in either the WintonDB or *DBHants*. There were at least three men called Alfwy (including Alfwy son of Saewulf and Alfwy son of Thurber) who held land in Hampshire in 1066 or 1086 (*DBHants*, Index). Although *Alfuuinus* should not formally represent Alfwy, Alfwy son of Thurber is almost certainly the Alfwin son of Turbert alias Alfwin de Wadedene who

was recorded in c.1180 as the former holder of Flexland and Watton in Soberton (Hanna, *Southwick Priory*, I, 20–21; II, 111 and 129). In addition there were several men called Alwin (including Alwin Frost, Alwin son of Wulfgeat, Alwin Still, Alwin Rat and Alwin White) similarly holding land in 1066 or 1086 (*DBHants*, Index). The only DB entry which perhaps implies the existence of a daughter is that relating to Hambledon, which ‘William de Perci . . . acquired with his wife’ (*DBHants*, 25, 1), but she cannot have been Alwin’s daughter, since William’s wife is known to have been Emma de Port. The entry is preceded (four entries earlier in Birch, but immediately preceding it in the MS) by one for ‘Godfrey prior’, who is Godfrey of Cambrai, prior of Winchester Cathedral in 1082–1107 (Greenway, *Fasti*, p. 88). The names ‘Edith . . . Will[elmus]’, which appear in the MS after ‘uxor eius et’, are a later insertion.

3. Hermannus et Coleruna uxor eius et filii et filie eorum.

(Birch, p. 30: hand eleventh or twelfth century)

Herman cannot be the *Heremanus* recorded in the WintonDB in 1148 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 80, no. 117), since the writing of this entry is independently dated as ‘late 11th c[entury]’ (Biddle, *ibid.*, p. 153); nor does he appear in *DBHants*. It is most unlikely that the fifteen individual names following this entry are the names of Herman’s children, since they are added in a different hand.

4. Eaduuinus de Freondestaple et eius coniunx Oriald et eorum filii [sic] (Rodbertus) et filie et fratres eius Siboda et Alfricus.

(Birch, p. 30: hand eleventh or twelfth century)

The earliest record of a family named ‘Frendstaple’, from the place which is now Stakes Farm in Farlington, is in 1210: Hanna, *Southwick Priory*, I, 57 and 99. The history of both Farlington and Stakes is obscure before c.1200 (*VCHHants*, III, 140, 148, 150 and 166; Himsworth, *College Muniments*, II, 788); and no Edwin is recorded as a holder of the neighbouring DB manors of Bedhampton, Cosham or Wymering. Edwin may possibly be the Edwin who had held Nateley Scures and Bartley in 1066 and still held Oakhanger in Selborne in 1086 (*DBHants*, 23, 8, and 69, 4–5), though none of these places is near Farlington. Edwin cannot be certainly identified in the WintonDB. It

may be noted that since *Siboda*, like *Oriald*, is a continental forename, he is probably Edwin’s brother-in-law rather than his brother. *Rodbertus* is interlined in the MS. Alfricus, however, is probably Edwin’s brother.

5-6. Aelfelmus presbiter et Osmundus et eorum uxores et filii et filie eorum.

(Birch, p. 30: hand eleventh or twelfth century)

No *Ælfhelm* occurs in the WintonDB, and the *Alfhelm* who held Steventon in 1066 (*DBHants*, 69, 48) is not stated to be a priest. An Osmund occurs in 1148 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 125, no. 794), who may well be the Osmund of this entry since the seventh entry following it, a later insertion, is one for Richer, archdeacon of Winchester from c.1116 to c.1138, when he probably died, having become a monk at Hyde Abbey (Greenway, *Fasti*, pp. 91–92; Franklin, *Winchester Acta*, p. lv).

7. Radulfus cocus episcopi et uxor eius et filii et filie eorum.

(Birch, p. 50: probably before King Henry I’s second marriage in 1121)

‘Ralf the cook’ appears in the WintonDB in 1148 but not c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 76, no. 61). Sometime in the period 1153 × 1171 he was succeeded as bishop’s cook by Roger, who by 1171 had in turn been succeeded by Robert (Winchester Cathedral MS Allchin II/Hen.III/18 [iii and vi]; Franklin, *Winchester Acta*, 90). He cannot therefore be the Ralph *cocus* who accounted for the goods of the abbot of Hyde in 1182 and 1183 (*PR 28 Hen. II*, p. 140; *PR 29 Hen. II*, p. 142), or the Ralph *cocus* who had a house in Little Minster Street, Winchester, in the 1220s (Blake, *St Denys Cartulary*, II, 262). The entry is preceded by one for *Walterius pincerna episcopi* and his wife; this Walter does not witness any episcopal charters but fills the gap between Robert *pincerna* (1128–29) and Richard *pincerna* (1154 × 1171) (Franklin, *Winchester Acta*, pp. 9 and 65).

8. Johannes laicus et Johanna coniunx eius et Johanna et Katerina filiarum [sic].

(Birch, p. 51: probably before 1121)

This entry is an addition in a late thirteenth-century hand. There are several couples John and Joan recorded as Winchester property-holders

in the period c.1270 to c.1330 in Keene's 'Biographical Register' (Keene, *Survey*, II, 1143-1397); however, all but two can be eliminated because their recorded children do not include Joan or Katherine. The two remaining couples, without recorded children, are John de Anne, city clerk, died c.1316, and his wife Joan (*ibid*, p. 1147), and John de Ocham, citizen, died c.1338, and his wife Joan (*ibid*, p. 1309). The former is the more likely identification, both on palaeographical grounds and because the *laicus* of the MS may be a deliberate attempt to emphasise that John was a secular, married clerk, not a 'cleric'.

9. **Herbertus et omnes filii eius.**

(Birch, p. 51: probably before 1121.)

Herbert cannot be certainly identified in the WintonDB, and there were at least four men called Herbert holding land in Hampshire in 1086. Herbert the Chamberlain (of the Treasury in Winchester), who at that date held of St Peter's Abbey (the predecessor of Hyde Abbey) Brockhampton (part of Micheldever), Rhode and Soberton (*DBHants*, 6, 16; 23, 35, and 55, 1-2), was an important landholder in Winchester in c.1110 and died in c.1128 (Biddle, *Winchester*), would be the most obvious identification; he can be ruled out since he appears earlier on the same page of the MS as *Herbertus camerarius*. The choice lies between Herbert son of Remigius, who held only Farley Chamberlayne (*DBHants*, 54, 1-2), Herbert the Forester, who held a single virgate in Lyndhurst (*DBHants*, 1, 31) or the Herbert(s) holding Clanville, East Dean and Selborne (*DBHants*, 23, 48 and 47, 2-3). Since the entry does not name Herbert's sons, the issue cannot be resolved by studying the later descent of these estates. Herbert the Forester is the least probable identification on account of the small size of his holding.

10. **Hugo vicecomes et eius coniux Hadeuuisa et Simon [et] alii filii et filie.**

(Birch, p. 51: probably before 1121.)

Hugh the sheriff of Hampshire occurs in 1086 (*DBHants*, 30, 1); he can be identified as Hugh de Port, a major Hampshire landholder in 1086 (*DBHants*, Index), but he occurs with a wife Orence at Birch, p. 73. The Hugh of this entry is therefore Hugh Fitz Grip, sheriff of the

neighbouring county of Dorset, who died before 1084: *DBDorset*, Index; *Regesta*, I, 28 (no.109), 55 (no.203); J. A. Green, *English Sheriffs to 1154* (London, 1990), pp. 37 and 44; his unnamed wife still held many Dorset manors in 1086 (*DBDorset*, Index). This wife is named in a charter of 1074 × 1082 as Hawise (*Haduuda*), daughter of Nicholas de Bascherville: (*Gallia Christiana*, edited by P. Piolin, revised edition, 16 vols [Paris, 1744-1877], XI, 'Instrumenta', 329E-330A); this will be the *Hadeuuisa* of the *liber*. Their son Simon evidently predeceased his mother, since the descendants of her second husband, Alfred of Lincoln, inherited her estates.

11. **Gysfreat filius Mort et filii et filie eius.**

(Birch, p. 51: probably before 1121.)

Geoffrey Fitz Mort is not recorded by that name in WintonDB, but may well be the Geoffrey the clerk mentioned c.1110: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 44 (no 66) and 53 (no 130). The entry is followed by one for Robert son of William. This might be Robert the baker, son of William, recorded in the WintonDB in c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 45, no 73); another Robert, son of William de Thoca, witnessed a charter of c.1130 (J. H. Round, 'Bernard, the King's Scribe', *English Historical Review*, 14 (1899), 417-30, at p. 424); and another Robert son of William had a widow, Emma, who held land in Dorset and Wiltshire in 1130 (*PR 31 Hen. I*, pp. 14 and 21). The dating of all these possible Roberts to c.1110-c.1130 tends to support the identification of Geoffrey Fitz Mort as Geoffrey the clerk.

12. **Atselina et filii et filie.**

(Birch, p. 51: probably before 1121.)

Atselina, presumably a widow, appears in the WintonDB in 1148 but not in c.1110: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 82 (no 143) and 99 (no 421).

13. **Osmunt de Witefel, Mabilia coniunx, filii eorum et filie. Mabilia.**

(Birch, p. 52: probably before 1121.)

Osmund de Witefel cannot be identified with certainty as either the Osmund who occurs in the WintonDB in 1148 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 125, no 794) or the Osmund Croc who occurs in Hampshire regaining

his land at *Vadun* (Watton in Soberton parish) in 1130 (*PR 31 Hen. I*, p. 38). *Witefel* is not easy to identify. It should have developed to a modern form Whit(e)field, or the like, but the only such place-name in or near Hampshire is Whitefield in Brading parish (I.o.W.), which was *Witesfel* in 1086 (*DBHants*) and *Witefeld* or *Whitefeld* from c.1160 onwards (H. Kökeritz, *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight* (Uppsala, 1940), p. 62). But this manor was held by Robert de Witvill *temp.* Henry I, and then by his son Hugh who gave it to Quarr Abbey in c.1158 (*VCHHants*, V, 159; S. F. Hockey, *Quarr Abbey and its Lands, 1132-1631* [Leicester, 1970], pp. 30, 90 and 126), so that our Osmund cannot belong to that family. The second *Mabilia*, though entered on the next line of the MS, is doubtless one of Osmund's daughters.

14. Rodbertuus presbiter et eius coniunx nomine Æmma et filia eius Adelina et Owinus filius eius.

(Birch, p. 65: in a later hand, perhaps of the twelfth century.)

'Robert the priest' occurs in the WintonDB in 1148 but not c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 112, no 595). A man so named, of Winchester, appears as a witness to a charter of c.1130 (Round, 'Bernard, the King's Scribe', p. 423), and may well be the Robert the priest witnessing charters to Abingdon Abbey by William de Curcy II, in c.1114-c.1130 (Stevenson, *ChronAbingdon*, II, 55). The third entry preceding this (a later insertion) is one for *Tomas presbiter*, probably Thomas the clerk, who was dead before 1148 when his widow and sons occur in the WintonDB, the sons as tenants of the abbot of Hyde: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 73 (no 32) and 93 (no 317).

15. Colemann et eius coniunx et Henricus filius eius et Ricardus filius.

(Birch, p. 65: in a later hand, perhaps of the twelfth century.)

Coleman is not mentioned in the WintonDB. However, an Avice, widow of Coleman, and her sons (unnamed) paid a fine of 60s. to hold her land in Surrey peaceably in 1130 (*PR 31 Hen. I*, p. 50). This must mean that Coleman had been a minor tenant-in-chief of the Crown in Surrey, but no connection can be established with the 'Oswold and the other thegns', who held Crown lands there in 1086. But the alliteration of names suggests that Coleman might be a son of Cola who in 1066

had held that part of Coombe (in Kingston-upon-Thames) held in 1086 by Ansgot the Interpreter (*DBSurrey*, 36, 8). Coombe was held after 1164-65 of the royal manor of Kingston (*VCHSurrey*, III, 502), but there is no evidence for the manorial descent between 1086 and 1164 to prove a connection between Cola in 1066 and Coleman in c.1130. Nevertheless, Ansgot is known to have forfeited his lands (*VCHSurrey*, IV, 96), so perhaps Coleman was then able to reassert any hereditary claim he had to Coombe.

16. Æaduinus uenator et eius coniunx Odel[in]a et Eadulf et Æadmund [et] Ælfuine.

(Birch, p. 67: twelfth century.)

Edwin the hunter held two hides in Kingsclere hundred in 1086 (*DBHants*, 69, 41), probably the later manor of Edmundsthorp Benham, which by 1133 × 1165, when Ruald de Woodcott gave lands in Kingsclere to Godstow Abbey, was held by the de Edmundsthorp family (*VCHHants*, IV, 260). Edmundsthorp is almost certainly named after Edwin's son Æadmund. Edwin is not mentioned in the WintonDB. Birch read *Odelina* as *Odelma*.

17. Ælfnopus et eius coniunx et duo filii eius.

(Birch, p. 67: twelfth century.)

Ælfnoth occurs in the WintonDB as 'Alnodus Stud' in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 53, no 129); he is not mentioned in *DBHants*. *Nithulf puer*, who precedes him, and *Mauricius*, who follows him on the same line, both written in a different hand from the main entry, are not likely to be the two sons.

18. Gyrebeard et eius coniunx Sereþe et filii eorum Gilebeard et Hugo.

(Birch, p. 67: second half of the twelfth century.)

Gyrebeard is probably the Gibart whose eldest son Gilbert occurs as *Gisl' Gibart* in the WintonDB in c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 44, no 63). The second entry preceding is one for *Rannulfus capellanus regis*, who is either Ranulf Flambard, King's chaplain before he became Bishop of Durham in 1099, or Ranulf, King's chaplain until he became Henry I's chancellor in 1107 (*Regesta*, II, x).

19. *Ælfwine et eius coniunx Gode et filii et filie.*

(Birch, p. 67: second half of the twelfth century.)

Al(f)win cannot be certainly identified in WintonDB or in *DBHants*. Details of the men called Alwy who appear in *DBHants* are given above, under entry no.2; this entry clearly refers to a different man.

20. *Gaufridus pincerna regis et Leauuin' uxor eius et Hugo filius eorum cum omnibus aliis filiis et filiabus eorum.*

(Birch, p. 72: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century. Birch read the wife's name as *Le. . .*; *Leauuin'* is a tentative restoration, resulting from examination of the MS, which has been severely cropped.)

The succession of royal chief butlers is well-known: Roger D'Ivry (died 1089), William d'Aubigny I (died 1139), William d'Aubigny II, Earl of Arundel (died 1176: *Regesta*, I, xxvii, II, xiii, and III, 18). 'Geoffrey the king's butler' can therefore only be a deputy or under-butler. He cannot be safely identified with any known under-butler (E. G. Kimball, *Serjeanty Tenure in Medieval England* [New Haven, 1936], pp. 34-5); and he is unlikely to be the Geoffrey de (la) Hose who in 1130 regained Great Farringdon (Berks) (*PR 31 Hen. I*, p. 123), and whose surname indicates a connection with the butlery (J. H. Round, *The King's Serjeants and Officers of State* [London, 1911], pp. 177-83), since that man's successor in 1166 was Bartholomew de la Hose. Nor can Geoffrey be identified with Geoffrey de Mandeville I, a tenant-in-chief in several counties in 1086, who died in c.1100, and whose second wife was called Lescelina, since Geoffrey had no sons by Lescelina, had no known son called Hugh, and, though custodian of the Tower of London, was not connected with the butlery (*Westminster Abbey Charters, 1066-c.1214*, edited by E. Mason, London Record Society, 25 [1988], Index; C. W. Hollister, 'The Misfortunes of the Mandevilles', *History*, 58 [1973], 19-20). Geoffrey, however, may well be the Geoffrey *Pincerna* who witnessed a charter in favour of Robert de Clere, a Hampshire landholder, in 1129 × 1171 (Franklin, *Winchester Acta*, p. 25). Geoffrey *Pincerna*'s son Hugh is almost certainly the Hugh *Pincerna* who in 1166 held knights' fees from, among others, Adam de Port II, grandson of Hugh de Port (see entry no 10), William de Curcy, dapifer, and Henry Fitz Gerold, chamberlain (*RBE*, I, 25, 280 and 355). Since the abbot of Hyde did not

return a detailed *carta* in 1166 (*ibid.*, p. 207), it is not known whether Hugh *Pincerna* then held lands from Hyde abbey, but in 1208-13 Herbert *Pincerna*, probably Hugh's son, who had probably succeeded his father by 1171 when he accounted for the Hyde Abbey estates during a vacancy (*PR 17 Hen. II*, p. 42), was a free tenant of Hyde Abbey in Northington, Preston Candover and Weston Colley (in Micheldever parish), and a tenant by knight's service at an unnamed place (*BF*, I, pp. 46-48), which can be identified as Totford in Northington parish, held by Philip le Butelyr in 1242-43 (*ibid.*, II, 701); at about the same time Herbert's son Richard le Buteiller quitclaimed all his lands in Candover, Northington, Weston and Hilton to Abbot Walter (1222-48) and the monks of Hyde Abbey, whilst Richard's uncle Robert *Pincerna alias* le Butteler held land in Candover, and John *Pincerna*, Ralph *Pincerna* and William *Pincerna* all occur as holding land in Micheldever under Abbot Walter (BL Cotton MS. Domitian A. XIV, fols 58r, 58v, 60r, 95r, 95v and 154r).

21. *Radulfus de Keuille et Adheles uxor eius et Hugo et Hinri filii eorum et Mathilda et Heluis filiabus [sic] eorum.*

(Birch, p. 72: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century.)

Ralph does not appear in WintonDB, but his widow may be the 'Adelaide (*Adelidis*), sister of Henry de Port' who appears in c.1110 and, in 1148, as 'Adelaide' in close proximity to other members of the Port family: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 63 (no 239) and 104 (no 104 and n. 2). This suggestion is strengthened by the occurrence of the names Hugh and Henry as Ralph's sons, since these were the names of Adelaide's father and brother (Sanders, *English Baronies*, p. 9). (As Round pointed out (Round, *The King's Serjeants*, p. 183; J. H. Round, 'A Butler's Serjeanty', *English Historical Review*, 36 (1921), 46-50), *Keuille* can be identified as Quévilly (Seine-Inférieure), which appears in 1112-13 as *Chevilla* (*Regesta*, I, 325), in the 1170s as *Chiuilli* (*The Cartae Antiquae Rolls, 1-10*, edited by L. Landon, PRS, n.s., 17 (1939), 42; *The Cartae Antiquae Rolls, 11-20*, edited by J. C. Davies, PRS, n.s., 33 (1960), 74), and in twelfth-century French sources as *Chevilli*, *Chivilli*, *Kevilli* and *Kivilli* (C. de Beaurepaire and J. Laporte, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de Seine-Maritime*, 2 vols (Paris, 1982-84), II, 824-25, a reference I owe to Cecily Clark.)—and the Kivilly family, later of Writtle, held Boreham and Little Waltham

(Essex) as a butler-serjeanty. In 1086 both manors were held by Lambert (*DBEssex*, 20, 55–56), whom Hugh's father Ralph must have succeeded before 1110, since there is no mention of Ralph at any of these places in 1086. Ralph's son Hugh can thus be identified as the 'Hugo de Chiuilli' who appears in the WintonDB in c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 48, no 91) and died in or shortly before 1130, when Robert Fitz Siward paid a fine for his widow and his office (*PR 31 Hen. I*, p. 53).

22. Ascerus miles Gaufridi Croc et eius uxor et filii ac filiae eorum Walterus, Landri, Hærsæn, Aldul, Damesænt, Leofricus vel Hugo.
(Birch, p. 72: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century.)

Ascerus is probably the 'Atser' (*Ascor*) who appears in the WintonDB in c.1110, and whose son Ernold and his unnamed wife are recorded in 1148: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 114 (no 631) and 138 (nos 1050 and 1053). He is probably also the 'Atso of Winchester' who was one of the witnesses to a grant by Ranulf the chancellor in c.1121–22 (*Regesta*, II, 180; Round, 'Bernard, the King's Scribe', p. 423). Geoffrey Croc is probably another son of Croc the Hunter who held North Manor in South Tidworth and Crux Easton in 1086 (*DBHants*, 60, 1–2) and thus the younger brother of Reginald son of Croc who held Woolston and part of Wilmingham in 1086 (*DBHants*, 59, 1; *IoW*, 1, 6). The history of Reginald's lands in the twelfth century is unknown (*VCHHants*, III, 298); Croc's lands were held by Matthew Croc, c.1160–c.1200, and by Matthew's son Ellis who transferred North Manor and the forestership of Chute to his daughter Avice on her marriage in 1208 (*VCHHants*, IV, pp. 312 and 393); Matthew Croc's father is now known to be Walter Croc (Blake, *St Denys Cartulary*, II, 236–7), who was alive in 1130 (*PR 31 Hen I*, pp. 72, 76, 106 and 108) and thus could well be another son of Croc the Hunter. Geoffrey Croc is therefore more probably a son of Reginald son of Croc, especially if 'Ascerus miles' is correctly identified as Atser, since Reginald's manor of Woolston lay in St Mary Extra parish adjoining Winchester, and, as already noted, 'Atso of Winchester' witnessed a grant in c.1121–22. It is puzzling that his (presumably) eldest son Ernold is not mentioned, unless, like *Leofricus vel Hugo*, Ernold was also known as Walter and is here mentioned under that name.

23. Albericus et coniunx eius necnon filii et filiae.
(Birch, p. 74: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century.)

Alberic is probably to be identified rather with Alberic the cook, who is recorded in the WintonDB in c.1110 and whose son is recorded in 1148 (Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 47 [no 82], 60 [no 191] and 109 [no 562]), than with Alberic the chamberlain, who held land in 1086 (*DBHants*, 68, 9) and was still alive in c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 49, no 102), since the latter's title is more likely to have been recorded in the *liber vitae*. The fourth entry preceding this is one for *Magister Adam de Latton*, who can probably be identified as Adam the canon of Essex (*PR 31 Hen I*, p. 60)—a cleric omitted in Greenway, *Fasti. Ædmundus, Matildis, Galfridus*, entered on the next line of the MS in a different hand, are probably not Alberic's children.

24. Teotselinus laicus et eius coniunx Ealdgida et Folcuinus eius pater.
(Birch, p. 74: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century.)

Teotselin ('Tesselin') held Boarhunt and 'Applestead' (in Southwick parish) in 1086 (*DBHants*, 23, 33–34); he was a witness to a charter of Abbot Riwallon, 1080 × 1087 (Birch, p. 164), but is not recorded in the WintonDB and was certainly dead by 1133, when Henry I regranted 'Applestead' to Southwick Priory (*VCHHants*, IV, 164). Since Teotselin's father Fulkwin in 1086 held Hinton Admiral, Lymington, *Oselie*, Sway, and Walhampton from Earl Roger of Shrewsbury (*DBHants*, *NF*, 3, 2, 6 and 8–10), all of which (except *Oselie*, absorbed into the New Forest) were amalgamated with the Earl of Shrewsbury's estates before 1102 (*VCHHants*, IV, 619–20 and 644–45; V, 95 and 126), this suggests that Teotselin had in fact died childless by 1102. Whether Fulkwin lived with his son or was merely commemorated by him in this entry is unknown.]

25. Æscbriht et eius uxor et filii et filie eius Brunman, Olaf, Cyrpi.
(Birch, p. 74: eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century. Birch read the fourth name as *Cyrels*, but examination of the MS suggests *Cyrpi*.)

Æscbriht is not recorded in the WintonDB or in *DBHants*. A few entries preceding this one is an entry for *Godwine Great seod*, who

occurs, as Godwine *Gretsud*, in the WintonDB in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 64, no 243). The names *Brunman*, *Olaf*, *Cyrpi*, immediately following this entry, are those of Aescbriht's children, since they are written on the same line and in the same hand as the rest of the entry. The last name on the next line, *Eadwine Goldwines* [unu], is added in a different hand.

26. Godnothus de puteo [et eius uxor] Algipa [et] filii et filie eorum.

(Birch, p. 123: late twelfth century.)

Godnod, perhaps one of William I's moneyers, occurs in the WintonDB in c.1057: Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 43 (no 57) and 59 (no 182); above *Godnothus* the words *de puteo* are interlined, which may perhaps be a nickname derived from his minting-forge.

27. Ansketillus et Eadgyfu uxor eius [et] Willelmus filius eorum.

(Birch, p. 125: late twelfth century.)

William son of Ansketil occurs in the WintonDB in c.1110 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 42, no 46). He is almost certainly the 'son of An[s]ketell' who witnessed a charter *ex parte Philippi [de Braose]* at Salisbury in 1103 (J. C. Davies, *The Cartae Antiquae Rolls*, 11–20, PRS, n.s., 33 (1960), 151), since William son of Aschetil witnessed another grant by Philip de Braose in 1096 (J. H. Round, *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France* (London, 1899), p. 401; L. F. Salzman, *The Chartulary of the Priory of Sele* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 3). This would date Ansketil to c.1070 or a little earlier, which would agree with the surrounding entries: the seventh preceding entry is of *Brihtuine de Hylle*, who is probably the *Brithwinus* recorded in the WintonDB in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 62, no 227), whilst the third and fourth succeeding entries refer to Almolde the priest *de Waldritune*, also recorded in the WintonDB in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 39, no 31), and to Osbern the priest, who is perhaps the 'Osbern, king's chaplain', who witnessed a charter of Edward the Confessor to Westminster Abbey in 1065 (Davies, *The Cartae Antiquae Rolls*, 11–20, pp. 192–7), but is not recorded in the WintonDB. Although William is not likely to be a name given by an Englishman to his son before 1066, Ansketil, being of Norse derivation, could be either an English or a Norman name.

28. Muriel et [p]ater eius Fithel et mater Restra

(Birch, p. 136: probably twelfth century.)

The house of *Ficel* is recorded in the WintonDB in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 51, no 110). The fact that Muriel is recorded as head of the family suggests that both her parents were incapacitated by old age or were dead. It is worth noting that Muriel's parents both bore Continental names, indicating that they were (presumably) immigrants from before the Norman Conquest.

29. Alfricus filius Caecci et Godgipa eius coniunx et Radulfus, Gilebertus, Gregorius, eorum filii, AEiluui Filia ipsorum.

(Birch, p. 137: probably twelfth century.)

Alfric's father is probably the Ceca recorded in the WintonDB in c.1057 (Biddle, *Winchester*, p. 58, no 171). Whether Alfric himself as one of the numerous men of that name recorded in *DBHants* is impossible to determine.

30. Johannes Matirdale, Katerina uxor eius. Willelmus, Hexy Et Johanna.

(Birch, p. 177.)

This entry was probably made between 1484 and 1489, since it is placed between entries dated to those years in the MS. John Matirdale was a citizen and tailor of St Michael Bassishaw, London, who died in November, 1498: his will mentions his wife Katherine and son Sir Thomas Martirdale, but no other children (PRO PROB 11/11, 219r). His widow Katherine died in June, 1506: her will mentions no children at all (P.R.O. PROB 11/15, 68v–69r). It is therefore perhaps doubtful whether William, Hexy and Joan were children of John and Katherine Martirdale, in which case this is not a family entry but two unrelated entries; nevertheless the three names were written by the same hand and rubricated as a single entry.

31. Robert Wyzhte, Margrett uxor eius, Robert Wyzhte filius eius, Anne Wyzhte filia eius.

(Birch, p. 178.)

This entry was made between 1488 and 1529, *Tempore Ricardi Halle Abbatis*. Robert Whyte, horseman, occupied a cottage and garden on

the east side of College St, Winchester, in 1515–17 (Keene, *Survey*, II, 980 and 1385).

32. Antonius Lovell, Johanna uxor eius, Adam filius eorum.

(Birch, p. 188.)

This entry was made between 1529 and 1538, since it is in the section starting on p. 180 headed 'Richard Rumsey Abbot', who was the last abbot of Hyde. Anthony Lovell was an alien merchant who held land on the north side of the High Street, Winchester, in 1529–39; he was already resident in 1515, and was sworn into the guild merchant in 1526 (Keene, *Survey*, II, 511 and 1287).

33. Thomas Parker, Elizabeth uxor eius, Johannes Parker filius eius.

(Birch, p. 189.)

This entry was also made between 1529 and 1538, since it is in the same section headed 'Richard Rumsey Abbot'. Thomas Parker, fuller, was resident in Winchester by 1524; he held property in Wongar St (now Middlebrook St) and Tanner St, and died in 1575 (Keene, *Survey*, II, 724, 795 and 1315]

Acknowledgements

My debt to Cecily Clark, whose studies of the unpublished Thorney Abbey *liber vitae* (see references cited in n. 29) are fundamental to all work on this class of document, will be apparent to all readers; I shall always remember with gratitude her extended discussions and help with the research underlying this series of articles as well as my earlier contribution to *Anglo-Norman Studies*. It is good to know that her edition of the Thorney *liber* will be completed by Dr John H. Insley of Heidelberg University. The necessary inspection of MSS in Durham, London and Winchester was aided by two generous grants by the Twenty-Seven Foundation (now the Scouloudi Foundation). I am also grateful to Dr Michael Franklin of Wolfson College, Cambridge, to Dr Nicholas Vincent of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and to Dr Alex Rumble of the Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, University of Manchester, for their help in answering enquiries, and especially to my friend Dr Ann Williams (London) and my friends and colleagues in Bristol, Dr Marcus Bull, Dr Brendan Smith and Mr Ian Wei, for kindly reading and commenting on a late draft of this paper at very short notice. Needless to say, I am responsible for any remaining faults. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the

help and the stimulating comments of participants at the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies in 1991.

Abbreviated References

- BF. *The Book of Fees*, edited by H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, 3 vols (London, 1921–31).
 Biddle, Winchester. M. Biddle, *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages*, Winchester Studies, 1 (Oxford, 1976).
 Birch. *Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, edited by W. de G. Birch, Hampshire Record Society, 5 (1892).
 Blake, *St Denys Cartulary. The Cartulary of the Priory of St Denys near Southampton*, edited by E. O. Blake, Southampton Record Series, 24–25 (1981–82).
 BL. British Library, Department of Manuscripts.
 DB. Domesday Book: cited from the Phillimore edition, with a county abbreviation, chapter number (in italics), and entry number.
 EPNS. English Place-Name Society.
 Franklin, *Winchester Acta. English Episcopal Acta, VIII: Winchester, 1070–1204*, edited by M. J. Franklin (Oxford, 1993).
 Greenway, *Fasti. Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, edited by D. Greenway, II (London, 1971).
 Hanna, *Southwick Priory. The Cartularies of Southwick Priory*, edited by K. A. Hanna, Hampshire Record Series, 9–10 (1988–89).
 Himsworth, *College Muniments*. S. Himsworth, *Winchester College Muniments*, 3 vols (Chichester, 1976–84).
 IoW. Isle of Wight (Domesday Book).
 Keene, *Survey*. D. Keene, *Survey of Medieval Winchester*, Winchester Studies, 2, 2 vols (Oxford, 1985).
 NF. New Forest (Domesday Book).
 PN. . . *The Place-Names of . . .* (see EPNS).
 PR 31 *Hen I. Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I*, edited by J. Hunter (London, 1833).
 PRS. Volumes of the Pipe Roll Society.
 RBE. *Red Book of the Exchequer*, edited by H. Hall, 3 vols, Rolls Series, 3 vols (London, 1893–6).
 Regesta. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, edited by H. W. C. Davis and others, 3 vols (Oxford, 1913–68).
 Sanders, *English Baronies. I. J. Sanders, English Baronies: a Study of their Origin and Descent, 1086–1327* (Oxford, 1960).
 Stevenson, *ChronAbingdon. Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, edited by J. Stevenson, 2 vols, Rolls Series (London, 1858).
 VCH. *Victoria County History*, followed by a county abbreviation.
 WintonDB. *Winchester Domesday*, edited by F. Barlow, in Biddle, *Winchester*, pp. 32–141.

APPENDIX: TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF NAMES OF MARRIED COUPLES
IN THE HYDE *LIBER VITAE* (11th-12th CENTURIES)

Names are classified as Insular (I) or Continental (C); entries are arranged in approximate chronological order.

<i>Birch,</i> <i>page</i>	<i>Entry</i> <i>number</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>
67	—	— c.1060	Leofred (I)	Burewyn (I)
74	—	— c.1060	Godwine (I)	Wendelburh (I)
123	26	c.1060	Godnothus (I)	Algīpa (I)
136	28	c.1060	Fithel (C)	Restra (C)
30	1	c.1070	Godwinus (I)	Erenburch (C)
67	19	c.1070	Ælfwine (I)	Gode (I)
125	27	c.1070	Ansketillus (I/C)	Eadgyfu (I)
125	—	c.1070	Eaduinus (I)	Aldgīpa (I)
137	29	c.1070	Alfricus (I)	Godgīpa (I)
30	2	c.1080	Alfuuinus (I)	Eadgyþa (I)
50	10	c.1080	Hugo (C)	Hadeuuisa (C)
67	18	c.1080	Gyrebeard (C)	Serethe (C)
74	24	c.1080	Teotselinus (C)	Ealdgida (I)
30	3	c.1090	Hermannus (C)	Coleruna (C)
67	16	c.1090	Æeaduinus (I)	Odelina (C)
72	—	c.1090	Ælfric (I)	Eadgyuu (I)
73	—	c.1090	Hugo (C)	Orence (C)
30	4	c.1100	Eaduinus (I)	Oriald (C)
72	20	c.1110	Gaufridus (C)	Le[] (I?)
72	21	c.1110	Radulfus (C)	Adheles (C)
52	13	c.1130	Osmunt (?C/I)	Mabilia (C)
72	—	c.1130	Ruthald (C)	Anhand (C)
65	14	c.1140	Rodbertus (C)	Æemma (C)

Society for Name Studies in Great Britain and Ireland

First Annual Study Conference: Belfast, 1992

The first annual study conference organized by the Society for Name Studies in Great Britain and Ireland, in succession to the former Council for Name Studies, was held at the Queen's Elms Halls of Residence, Queen's University of Belfast, from 10th to 13th April 1992. The programme of papers was drawn up by Dr Kay Muhr of the Department of Celtic, Queen's University, who is to be congratulated not only for a lively programme, but for re-forging links which had fallen away in recent years between the Society and scholars in both parts of Ireland.

Appropriately, given the close involvement of its hosts in the Northern Irish Place-Name Project, proceedings had a strong Celtic and/or toponymic flavour, beginning on the Friday evening when Dr Art Hughes (Belfast) spoke on 'Place-names of Strangford Lough and the Ards'. He described the Ards peninsula as 'a microcosm of place-names and Ireland', and provided both specimens of the special sources of Anglo-Irish history and a splendidly detailed townland map to show how they worked at microcosmic level. Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones (Bangor, North Wales) spoke on 'Bangor (in Wales)', canvassing the various etymologies that have been suggested for that and other Bangors; he thought that a fish-weir rather than a wattle fence was likely to have been the original meaning of the North Welsh name.

The Saturday began with an innovation in the conference format, a formal series of reports on the place-name surveys of the British Isles by Ian Fraser (Edinburgh), Carole Hough (Nottingham), Bedwyr Lewis Jones (Bangor), Gregory Toner (Belfast), and Dónall Mac Giolla Easpaig (Dublin). A common factor was the computerization of the various surveys, all for slightly different immediate purposes and with distinctly different computer systems. Dr Nollaig Ó Muraíle (Dublin) spoke on 'Irish genealogies as an onomastic source'. He considered their wealth of material not likely to be computerizable, instancing one man's name which appeared in the sources in fourteen different