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 dear 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 variety; 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 (IOC, for Cambridgeshire) and the Domesday Monchorum of Christ Church, Canterbury (for Kent). So we have to allow for spellings which represent the mishearing, mispronunciation or mis-reading 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.
My current study of the proper names of Domesday Book, which follows from Peter Sawyer's pioneer article 'The place-names of the Domesday manuscripts', shows that there are more than thirty errors of transcription from confusion of letter-forms by the scribes compiling DB. Scipial conventions, literal error, and phonetic modification lead to various kinds of mistake. The most obvious problem concerns ambiguous name-forms:

(a) GNB AIRARD (fo.83r; Dorset 49,7) might be various things, such as a variant of the name ALLARD recorded in Devon (fo.114v; 34,53) or the Allard in Sussex (fo.23r; 11,8) - representing either OE ælærð or Ealard (PNB 184) or OG Adelard (Forstermann 170-1; Morlet 106-17a) or else OG Anlær (Forstermann 42; cf. Morlet 21b s.n. Acran).

(b) LDB ALGOT (gen.; fo.92v; Essex 61) could represent either Óganlæt or OG Ægelæt or OG Ægelæt (PNB 146,173-4). Likewise, as von Feilitzsch notes, it is difficult to be sure of the distinction between OE Ælfræt and OG Alfric I, II, III, etc. (e.g., Morlet 29b), especially in the MS counties where EXON DB and GNB both show forms Alfric(u), Alfric(u), Alfric as alternatives to Alfric, Alfric (PNB 176-80).

(c) GNB Aungest (fo.202v; Cambs. 38,5) may represent ON Aeogstra (PNB 105); but, if the N.E. here has y for n, we might represent it for OG Aungand (Morlet 29d). In LDB Norfolk, ON Angir is reflected in the spellings Aeg, Ayger, and Anger in spellings with -aeg, -agar, and -anger in spellings with -aeg, but one cannot be sure how far practice was consistent (cf. PNB 166-77).

(f) DB Edgdean, properly corresponding to OE Ædgena, could also represent OE Ægeðan: where GNB fo.97r (Somerset 32,2-3) has Edgena regina, EXON DB (fo.403r) has Edgand regina. This sort of confusion, which indicates approximate pronunciations between [i:d] and [i:d], or [i:d], and [i:d], makes it hard to separate the names of Edwina (Edgandu) the Fair, Harold Godwinson's mistress, and of Edith (Edgand) Godwin's daughter, queen to Edward the Confessor (PNB 239-32).

(g) DB Gunfrið could represent OG Gondofrud (Morlet 117a) or ON Gunnfrœðr (PNB 150). GNB Funulfus (fo.117v; Worc. 26,6) could represent OE Hnulfu, OHunulf (Morlet 131a), or OHunulf (PNB 295; cf. SPLY 145).

(i) DB Lenar could represent OE Lædnær or the more frequent Leodnam (PNB 309).

(j) GNB Líul (fo.53v; Hants (Wight) IOW 8,4) could be a typical Norn-French representation of either *Liuol* or *Liulid*. The former would represent OE *ælfeolif*, if such a name were known, rather than in the doubtful late-tenth-century Suffolk form Lofol (Selin, Anglo-Saxon Heritage II, 119, citing the O.G cognate Leubolf; cf. Morlet 158b). Líulid would represent the better-recorded OE Ælfoðlif (PNB 316) from Feilitzsch, Winton Domesday 64; Selén, Heritage II, 117).

(k) DB Oda, Ódo, Odo could represent OD Oda, Oddo (Morlet 45b), or ON Oddi (SPLY 2027, or OD Oddi (PNB 333; 334).

(l) DB Uðber could represent ON Æðbræg or OG Æðber (PNB 165, 339-9; cf. SPLY 18-19).

(m) GNB Reynald, Rainald, and Rainold could, it seems, indiscriminately, represent OE Ræineald or Ælfeolif, respectively (PNB 146-7 and SPLY 213).

(n) GNB Sebert (fo.125r; Cornwall 5,2420) could represent OE Sæbert (Selten, Heritage II, 113, cf. 143) or OE Sigefredi (PNB 360), or alternatively, OE Sigifred (PNB 360, or Spl B 360, or OE Sigfræt (SPLY 362-3), or ELSE OE Sigifreiðr (SPLY 353), or ELSE OE Sigfræt (Wh.Schlug, Die altsächsische Personenamen vor dem Jahre 1000 [Land, 162, 152]. DB Seuward, Seuwardan could likewise represent OE Sigbert or OE Sigward (SPLY 354 and 361-2; Selten, Heritage II, 138, 137), or Sigward (SPLY 236-9), or ELSE OE Sigward (PNB 1533; Morlet 199a).

(o) GNB Tafe (fo.105r; Essex B.3a) could represent OE Tat(e) or Ead(e) of OE Tat(e) fem. (Redin 54-5, 314).

(p) The DB spellings Varin and Varin could both represent OE Warin (Morlet 219b; Marynissen, 1, 350-1).

(q) GNB Wiger could represent OE Wætger, or ON Vinjar, or OG Wigger, Wiger (PNB 413, 414; SPLY 335; Forstermann 1592 and Morlet 225a).

Confusion of weakly stressed second elements, such as *gifu* and *gæ* in the case of Edeva and Edith, raises several problems. In GNB Lincoln, the Óban name Ketelþynn is recorded now as Chetelberht, now as Chetelberht (PNB 304-7; Spl B 171); this also occurs in GNB Works (fo.24v; 17,56) and Works (fo.49r; fol.109; 8,190). In LDB Norfolk (fo.109a) we find an interchange of Colebeornus with Colebeornus (cf. PNB 218), and in LDB Essex an interchange of Hægeðberht (spelt Hægelberht) with Hamberht (cf. Morlet 120a: Hægelberht). In various counties there is persistent alternation of Osbert and Osbern (cf. PNB 338-40). The latter interchange is especially notable in Kent, for the name of Osbern Passeifere, whom on several occasions GNB calls Oshert whereas the Domesday Monarch calls him Osbert. Also in Kent, GNB's Osbern son of Leodfrith is the same as GNB's Osbert son of Leodfrith, whom the Domesday Monarch calls Osbert. In GNB Beds (fos.213v; 23,27: 31) Osbert of Breut is also called Osbern of Breut. These *burh-bert* variations could perhaps be explained as reflecting an Anglo-Norman loss of [b] or [f] after [r]. On the other hand, alternatives like these may sometimes be the result of scribal uncertainty over an ambiguous abbreviation (cf. Turf* for Turbertus in LDB Essex fo.69v; 26,18) rather than over pronunciation.

A comparable palaeographical confusion may lie behind Exmund GNB Sussex (fo.24v; 1106) by error for the by-name Exmel (a Norman-French version, with prothetic e, of an OE nickname *seal*, a small, saltwater-like fish: figuratively, a fool, that is found both as by-name and as personal-name: OE 365; Redin 23; PNB 367). A scribe could have seen an abbreviated form, *Exm*., and expanded it incorrectly.

The difficulty which might arise from miscopying or by expansion of abbreviated forms can likewise be seen in LDB Norfolk (fo.181b; 9,100), where antec' Rad Biæng le might be expanded as antce[essor] Radulf[i] berjanglierl. This surname is difficult to explain and could be made the text of a long exegesis; but the original which lies behind what the LDB scribe mistakenly wrote was probably a badly written representation of Radulfing, for which
one should read Radbod lang, that is, the OG masc. personal-name Radbod (Morlet 181a; Fossen 203; cf. PMBE 344) with the OE by-name lang(æ) (‘tall’; GBE 380).

Another group of second elements persistently confused consists of OE and -wif- and -wine/OG -win- especially when Latinized as -wīs- and -wīnus (cf. PMBE 125). The names Alwīs and Alwine are much confused (cf. PMBE 157–60). One might suppose that a nominative form Alwīn, Latinized Alwine, could be the result of misreading or mispronouncing an abbreviated version of Alwine, Latinized Alwine, in which a non-initial w had been omitted or overlooked (e.g., Alwine Þ = Alwineus). In GBE Herefords. (fo.187r; 29.1) Yluiu òlīt (Wulfwīg) is also referred to, in the same entry, by the form Wulfwine, and in GBE Hants. (fo.203v; 2.7) we find Wulfwine, or at least a Northern form, as the name of the bishop of Dorchester (cf. PMBE 426-8). The -wīs-/-wīnus-/-wīnus alternation also appears in comparable pairs such as OE Ælwe_NM/-wine, ÆlweNM/-wine, Godwīg/-wine, and also OG Pulculúsus/-wine (e.g., ÆlweNM 269-73; Förstemann 569; Morlet 100b, cf. 349-50; thirteen- and fourteenth-century English records of it in Forsen 112).

In Somerset we find Exon DB (fo.163r) naming one Oswald where GBE (fo. 90r; 8.8) has Oswald (PMBE 340-1): this represents a familiar [11/1 FAC] interchange facilitated by weak stress. Which is the basic name here? Was the man called Oswald or Æwal or Oswald? In GBE Dorset (fo.80r; 7.1-416;8-11), Somerset (fo.91v,98b; 18: 3-4 and 39.1) and Cornwall (fo.124v; 5.17-19) the same name is named as Alnoth and as Alnoth. Presumably these are variant developments of OE Ælnoth (cf. PMBE 294); but it is not easy to determine whether they represent separate developments or are due to the treatment of the 'short diphthong' and of the consonant-group, or Norman-French modifications.

Another type of difficulty is caused by appearance of alternative names, rather than alternative forms of name, for the one person. In particular, the name Masculf or Masculf Munard who turns up in Bucks., Berks., Glos. OXON (Muskell 124v, 24; 263-73), one of his names, Masculf, is Breton (Oliver Padel denies this; Morris probably relied on Dauzat, Dictionnaire, 321, where the twelfth-century form cited is Harnscald). The other, Masculf, represents OG Æmcâulf (Morlet 42b; cf. PMBE 161).

A further case concerns Walter or Walsoin of Douai, who is recorded in DB now by his full first-name, now by the diminutive variant of it. He is referred to under his full name Walter (OG Wulf[er]): Fossen 243; Morlet 231ab) in GBE Surrey and some entries for Devon and for Somerset; but elsewhere, in GBE Dorset, Wiltz. and other entries for Devon and for Somerset, by the hypocoristic Wulsin (not discussed in PMBE or GBE). Walsoin is a French spelling of an OG diminutive *Walsin (cf. AN 37-8; and Forsen 39, s.n. Avelin, and 278-9); this form is a double-diminutive based on the protothome *Wald- (Walt-), being an -in derivative of the -suffixed form Walsin (cf. AN 547.1; 310.2; Förstemann 150; Fossen 243; and Marynisen, 1, 348, 349). The GBE clerk apparently knew that Walter and Walsoin were the same man, and often used the simple abbreviation W. For both names, there being no need to specify more closely. The clerk or clerks of
the -g as an unhistorical OFr nominative ending, we could then find the ON personal-name Fjeln (SPLV 82; Adgard des Gautries 203-4).

(xiv) The same /g/ substitution would transform the opaque GDB Polchard (fos.60v, 63v; Berks. 21.12 and 65.18) into OG Polchard, Pulchard (Mortel 95a; Forsamer 96b; PDB 256).

(xv) Confusion of f and g might also be the clue to the by-name of Wulfwin Hapra (LDB fo.64; Essex 62.3). Tengvik suggested a by-name derived from OE (ge)hap 'fit, seemly', with an -re suffix (OE 347). A putative OE personal-name *Relf(g)y might be devised; it would be cognate with OG Hefpo, etc. (Fritzen 763; see also the similar the-plural form Reimer (fo.20r; Sussex 9.109) may really be an erroneous reading by the GDB scribe of a spelling Reimerus for the OG personal-name Rainer (Mortel 184b-185a). Minim-confusions produce the LDB scribal form Gescelin for Gescelin (Mortel 1006b-107a) in fos.1r, 2r, 164 and 1.2). But an attractive alternative is to consider Hapra as a misspelling of *Hafra, an Anglicized form of OScand Hafri, a by-name derived from ON hafri 'he-goat' (SPLV 121; for the by-name currency of OE Becca 'he-goat', see OEB 358-369).

(xvi) About GDB Papulans (fo.49r; Hants 43.3), Forsamer evinces desperation, if not neglect, for his OE personal-name *Papelins might be devised; it would be cognate with OG Hefpo, etc. (Fritzen 763; see also the similar the-plural form Reimerus (fo.20r; Sussex 9.109) may really be an erroneous reading by the GDB scribe of a spelling Reimerus for the OG personal-name Rainer (Mortel 184b-185a). Minim-confusions produce the LDB scribal form Gescelin for Gescelin (Mortel 1006b-107a) in fos.1r, 2r, 164 and 1.2). But an attractive alternative is to consider Hapra as a misspelling of *Hafra, an Anglicized form of OScand Hafri, a by-name derived from ON hafri 'he-goat' (SPLV 121; for the by-name currency of OE Becca 'he-goat', see OEB 358-369).

(xvii) The GDB personal-name forms strepi and stremius (fos.74v, 69v; Wiltz. 68.22 and 24.19), unexplained by von Fellitzten as 'presumably Scandinavian' (PDB 376), would yield sense if we supposed a confusion of minuscule g and t. The forms *stremi and *stremi(us) invite identification with ON Skrein (SPLV 243).

(xviii) The same palaeographical operation may be involved in solving the puzzle of GDB Chemarucne (fo.61v; Berks. 35.1), wrongly printed -Hemic by Rix (Philol 112). The Philol.3 edition reads *Hemarcone without explanation. The problem, precisely, is whether to suppose that GDB Chemarucne represents the Olden personal-name Kenmarcne (recorded 1062x 1070; Oliver Padel in litteris cites Loth, Chestromatch, 116, 150, 197, with additional forms Kenmarcne 1067). In Kenmarcne 1067, in which equation the vowel of the final syllable would be omittable; or to suppose GDB Chemarucne a mistake for Chemarucne, which can be interpreted, again postulating assimilation of the nasal consonants, as a spelling for OE Cynemarucne. The by-name would be the OE adjective havet, hence 'bald, brusk' (cf. the name Edricus Chuet, Winchester 1066: OEB 125; also von Fellitzten, Winton Domesday, 209, but there explained as inexplicable).

(xix) A rather peculiar literal substitution is B for K in Rustic Capitals; necessary if we are to explain the GDB form Molec (fo.56v; Berks. B.7, B.5) for the surname of Hugo de Polebec (fo.56v; B.7, see OEB 73 and 127).

(xx) Substitution of I and L in Rustic Capitals would explain how form Lozr (fo.236v; Leics. 42.5) for the surname Lor (cf. OEB 94). The same applies to the GDB forms LVRI, Luri, for the surname of Hugo and Roger de LVRI (fo.83r, 224v; Dorset 54.1 and Northants. 24.11; see OEB 93). Supposing the same mistake and also confusion of g/y in minuscule, GDB Junen and Lune (fo.204v, 205r; Hants. 6.21 and 9.4) could represent *Louen for the OE fem. personal-name Leofwynn.

(xxii) Similarity of minuscule g and t offers opportunity for substitutions. The LOD personal-name Dynechae (fo.320r; Suffolk 6.101) is left unsolved in PDB (229). But, taken as a misreading of *Dynechae, it could be explained as ODhneh an OdS dressed -en as eoh *lyri kal; the simile ancestor of ME and MD s/dialekt kal 'left-handed', which is probably a loan from Scandinavian into English (see Reaney, OEB, s.n. Kay; OED, EUD, and MED s.v. caï; all of which might benefit a reference to the LOD personal-name thus reconstructed.

(xxiii) Palaeographical manoeuvres can also be fairly intensively at the lower level of ingenuity, the minim count, i.e., at the interchange and confusion of the minuscule letters l, b, m, b, w, u, and l, i, l, l. LOD Ingomus (fo.147v; Norfolk 4.30) could thus represent an OFr spelling Gulgoins for OG Wipian (Philol.3 has (as usual) the correctly the-plural form Remier (fo.20r; Sussex 9.109) may really be an erroneous reading by the GDB scribe of a spelling Remirius for the OG personal-name Rainer (Mortel 184b-185a). Minim-confusions produce the LDB scribal form Gescelin for Gescelin (Mortel 1006b-107a) in fos.1r, 2r, 164 and 1.2). But an attractive alternative is to consider Hapra as a misspelling of *Hafra, an Anglicized form of OScand Hafri, a by-name derived from ON hafri 'he-goat' (SPLV 121; for the by-name currency of OE Becca 'he-goat', see OEB 358-369).

(xxiv) The very odd LDB form Dubeil (fo.105r; Essex 8.3a, in the Colchester sec. 7) is written by a rather 3Dysyncratic hand) can be explained as a palaeographical misreading of Dubel, with an imperfect bow of a minuscule d having been masked by the following l so as to look like a Rustic Capital H. Dubel is an OFr by-name of uncertain connotation (see OEB 375, corrected by von Fellitzten, Winton Domesday, 210).

(xxv) GDB Osom (fo.486r; Hants 46.1) is unexplained in PDB (333); but by supposing confusion of t and g, of f and g, and of r and d, we could find a form *Oftefr, which could perhaps represent OF Ordrif (cf. Mortel 438; PDB 334).

(xxvi) Phenetic processes plus French orthography might explain GDB Unfac (fo.286r; Notts. 9.84), listed in PDB under OSwedish Ofeg (339). But, with the same confusion and given the tendency to vocalise dark [fl, it might also represent a miscopying of *Unfac for Vlfac for OE Wulfēah (cf. PDB 420-1).

(xxvii) GDB Sussex (fo.18r; 9.1) offers the spelling Werelc, which, if representing a form Werec for OE Waring (cf. Fritzenmann 1534), shows interchange of [l]/[n] as well as of final [k]/[g].

(xxviii) A less straightforward reconstruction of a personal-name on phonetic and orthographical lines is effected in that classic assault upon the credulity of scholar and layman alike, my elucidation of the GDB by-name of Williulfus Goisen(b)oden (fo.167v; Glos. 34; unexplained in OEB (390)). The second element I take to be O- ed, past participle of bodian 'to announce, to make public marches in a boding fashion'. Goisen -goes a sympathetic phonetician: goi could represent an OFr pronunciation [gwi] for initial [gi] and g (cf. [t]) could be used to render OE [tj]: orthography well attended by Zachrisson and von Fellitzten. So we could see Goisen(b)oden as representing an OE *Gose-n 'boden, to a witch, an or 'witch-cursed' *wiccan being the active singular of OE wicce fem. 'a witch'.

(xxix) The same OFr substitution of [g] or [gw] for initial [z] is invoked for Goisen(b)oden and in explaining the mistake Ingomus for Guilgoins (see xxii) can be aduced in explanation of the LOD by-name of Gudmon Cudhe(n), also spelt Gudben (fo.17v, 99r; Essex 9.5 and 90.1) - a by-name, unexplained in OEB (399), which again extends our lexicography. It is possible to take the form with initial [z] (cf. [k]) as a variant of the one with initial [g] (cf. [g]), and to read the G-form as an OFr rendering of one with initial [g]. This reveals a by-name wudhe(n), which supposes the currency of an unrecorded OE *wudu-henn 'a wood-hen', analogous with OE wudu-hana, wudu-coc. This invention would anticipate the OED's first instance of wood-hen, dated 1281.

(xxx) Another interesting by-name which is called to mind by *wudu-henn is LOD Vudebil (fo.105v; Essex 8.3a), from OE wudu-bil 'hatchet, chopper' (proposed by Köskerits in his review of PDB in Nova XXI, 96, and subsequently adopted by von Fellitzten, Winton Domesday, 311).
There is both a phonological and an editorial aspect to the interpretation of the GDB name Aluvianum 'rat' (fo.50r; Hats 69.16). J.H.Round suggested that rat might have been interlinearized here to Aluvianum to Alucretus, i.e., OE *Alu фине to OE *Alufrīs (VCH Hants I, 505); but Julian Musby (as editor of the Hampshire Phillimore volume) observed that -fin- was not marked for deletion, and that the interlinearization could well represent an added by-name, not noted in GDB. Formally, rat is quite acceptable as a by-name, being a possible OE dialect form of *rett 'a rat'; there is one Osbert Rat in the Darlington section of Boldon Book (ed. D.Austin, Chichester 1982, n.363).

This is phonetic speculation in the solution of the GDB name Alivialdese (fo.61v; Berks. 31.3). Von Feilitzen explains the form as a Latinized nominative of the OE fem. personal-name Alfirst, with a by-name suffixed (PNDB 175); the name is omitted from Ellis’s Index to DB and is not in GDB. Loss of post-consonantal final d is common in DB name-forms (see PNDB 99), and in the present composite might have been accelerated by dissimilation. The most obvious OE word ending in -des is the poetic ideae, -an, the weak-declension variant of idea 'a lady', the initial vowel of which might be elided after the Latinized a of Alisecond or after OE vocalic inflexions. Development supposed is Alflida ideae > Alflida des > Alflides, but the precise order of the process is not ascertainable. *Alflidh the lady may have been aristocratic, romantic or fanciful.

One can find further lexicographical interest in DB personal-names: the GDB form Friendy (fo.230v; Leics. 2.7) looks like the Old Frisian variant - with weak inflexion of the goddess-name - of Frisian used as a personal-name (GDB 218 does not deal with this variant).

(iiiii) Similar to *wood-hen' (see Xviii, above) in extending the record of a word are the DB names Masnerulp and Gropnell. Masnerulp, Masnerulpm (fo.39v, 102r; Essex 23.14 and 90.58) appears to be a by-name use of a noun deriv of the OE verb mascher 'to mix, chew up, mash'; the meaning would be 'little mixer', 'little mixer'. The word mascher would be a possible clue to the unidentified origin of the Mode verb mash-rule or mash-roll (first recorded by OE 1398x1440), the name of a brewer's tool, 'a paddle used by a brewer for stirring and mixing his mash'. Another implement in the DB by-name Grapnell (fo.44r; Essex 24.22); this represents by-name use of a diminutive of OE grapon 'a grapple, a grappling-hook'. According to OE, OE grapnel, grapnel does not appear in English use until the fourteenth century; here it is in 1066, as a by-name in Essex.

Xivv) It is by now painfully obvious that I am inclined to the thorough reconstruction of the unintelligible form, keeping in mind the potential phonetic and orthographic feasibility; so long as the resulting inferences make sense. The process is fraught with danger, as may be seen upon comparison of the GDB forms Gollam and Gollam (fo.194v; Camb. 14.34) with the IIC forms Gogan, for OE Godam (cf. B.Seltan, English Studies LXV, s.n.) or upon comparison of the GDB form Gogan at the same entry and the IIC form Gomannus, for OE Godamm (see PNDB 265-6). Without the IIC, would one have been able to reconstruct the correct forms from what the GDB scribe wrote? Here the GDB scribe uses more 'advanced' forms than the IIC; but elsewhere in the same county he uses a more traditional one: on f.194v (Camb. 14.45) he wrote Leuesue to represent Levesue OE *Leosophiu, whereas the IIC has Leuesiu, a bad copy for *Loufsiu, representing either OE L-Of 'of the land' or OE L-Of 'of the union analogous to that between Ellingth and Ealingth' (PNDB 345) OE *Lofogfju: a range of variant spellings representing sound-substitution and misreading which would indicate that this passage of the IIC is based on a dictated transcript.

We must always reckon with the possibility of mere lapsus calami. The GDB form Aliflet, for OE Alifliud, fem. (fo.198r; Camb. 26.21) corresponds to an IIC form Lefildas, which would seem to represent OE Lefliud, did we not recognize it as a metathesized form for Alifliud, a variant of Alifliden.

The GDB form Unluf (fo.287v; Notts. 10.24; entered under Olufl by von Feilitzen, PNDB 335) refers to the same man as an 'old Unol in the same entry. The scribe has obviously written Unluf for Unlold for Unlo (note the phonetic substitution of [f] for [l]). The same kind of metathesis appears at GDB fo.10v (Kent 5.158; 167), where Unlot alternates with Unlot.

So, the reconstruction of name-forms can be dangerous; see a disastrous instance in notes to the Phillimore Norfolk volume, sections 4.2 and 4.16. My reconstruction of the IDB forms Phoenix and Facson (taken to represent *Paenicon) into the ON personal-name Paratge, an exercise in fanciful futility, has subsequently been illuminated by von Feilitzen's observation of by-name use of OFr Fagon 'a small child' (Winton Domesday, 147, n.5). Nevertheless, in order to make onelettes... In order to construct useful possible interpretations of the unintelligible, some absurdities may be risked. Of course, all these proposed solutions are provisional and conditional, all immediately to be cancelled by better documentation, exactly like the attempt on Phoenix.
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