ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF DOMESDAY TENANTS IN LINCOLNSHIRE

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

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

The Domesday inquiry was commissioned by William I at Christmas 1085 and the survey-work seems to have been completed within a year. Sawyer has described the compilation of Domesday Book as 'a remarkable achievement that depended as much on the English administrative apparatus as on the drive and efficiency with which the Normans manipulated it' (Sawyer 1978, 254). The process of compilation was complex and has been the subject of much
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Abel- and Abiel- respectively (Ström 1939, 109-11). Forms in -m might alternatively, have resulted from merging of a*g* and 0 in Medieval Latin orthography at Loss -l- from *Abiel* as a normal development. For Abiel- von Felitzen notes such forms from tenth- and eleventh-century sources, and they are common on coins of that date (PMB 92; Smart 1981, 101); the mechanism involved seems to have been a need to lighten the three-consonant group and prompting assimilation between the virtually homorganic (alveolar-dental) [l] and [m]. For Abiel- von Felitzen coin of Cnut survives with the moneyer’s name spel AbEiNd, and this similarly provides evidence for loss of -l- (PMB 86; Smart 1981, 9); again this seems to have come about through assimilation between two consonants, [l] and [m], with similar point of articulation. For both names, however, as without -l- show the late OE reduction, again by assimilation, of Abiel- >Abiel- >Abi- (Golman 1981; cf. Smart 1983).

The account of the fief of Jocelyn son of Lambert records that a pre-Conquest tenant called Edric, a name-form explained by von Felitzen as representing OE Fredric (PMB 234), held one carucate of land in Seaby LN and that there was netheland of this manor in North Witham LN (GDB 359a; 28/20.21). In the account of the fief of Ivo Tallboys, however, the land at North Witham is said to belong to the seke of Eris (GDB 350a; 14/7), a name-form explained both by von Felitzen and by the present writer as deriving from Scand Birkir (PMB 246; SPlyy 76). Since it is clear that Edric and Eris must both refer to the same man, it is tempting to explain his name as OE Fredric, with the final *g* of the latter form showing that the -1- is a vernacularisation of Old English (cf. PMB 82/20). On the other hand, Ead- is normally lost in DB before a second element beginning with a single (liquid) consonant, although the forms Ewardus rex in Devon (Exon 121) and regn Ewardi in Suffolk (DDB 238a; 17/07. Also 296a (4x); 33/9) are allowed to reflect Old French tendencies to efface medial dental (cf. Pope 3346/7, 374.11). There is, however, other evidence to show that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eris is not OE Fredric. There was a dispute about Jocelyn son of Lambert’s which is recorded in the Exon Domesday as Clamores as terram Erisic (GDB 376a; 70/18). The name lying behind the forms Edric, Eris and Eiric would thus seem to be Scand Birkir. The 2 in Eris probably represents, in the way suggested above, anglicised [l] for Scand [k] (cf. PMB 82/20). As to Ead- this may point to an Old English onomasticon responsible for the name, and it is possible that von Felitzen’s assumption that the -1- is a vernacularisation of OE Eardel has had a tendency to efface medial dental, and this may be where the confusion lies. It is possible also that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eris is OE Fredric.

Erisic, as it stands, seems to have been a powerful aggrandiser of a high status, and it seems likely that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eris is OE Fredric. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eris is OE Fredric. There was a dispute about Jocelyn son of Lambert’s which is recorded in the Exon Domesday as Clamores as terram Erisic (GDB 376a; 70/18). The name lying behind the forms Edric, Eris and Eiric would thus seem to be Scand Birkir. The 2 in Eris probably represents, in the way suggested above, anglicised [l] for Scand [k] (cf. PMB 82/20). As to Ead- this may point to an Old English onomasticon responsible for the name, and it is possible that von Felitzen’s assumption that the -1- is a vernacularisation of OE Eardel has had a tendency to efface medial dental, and this may be where the confusion lies. It is possible also that the name lying behind the forms Edric and Eris is OE Fredric.
ancestors in Lincolnshire was Laurie Olt ('the young') (GDB 363a; 63/1). If the Ledburne who held Gainborough and Epworth were identical with the Leicestershire Leuinus and with the father of Laurie, then the fact that the first element of the son's name is Lef- would suggest that the father's name was more likely to be OE *Lefwine than *Lefwine or ContGerm Leuvin. What lay behind this confusion may have been a tendency in rapid scribes to gloss words that could not be pronounced, to pronounce *Lefwine as [le:3f]wina. Since this was one of the most commonly used OE names, no English scribe would have been likely to take this pronunciation as an original. Moreover, while it is not certain how the name might have been pronounced in the Old French, if we accept the theory that in Old French, [l] became [l] and in most contexts was then effaced and also all medial groups consisting of a single consonant-[l] tended to be reduced by progressive assimilation (Pope 1954, 374.11), both processes affected ContGerm names involved by the French-speakers, so that Leuinus(us) and Leuvin(us) fell together under Leuvin(us) or Leuvinus). Of the two ContGerm elements Leuh- and Leuv- the latter occurs more frequently and would thus be the more likely to be chosen by a French-speaking scribe seeking to reconstruct a name encountered in phonetically-reduced form.

The pre-Conquest tenant of Gay of Craon's holding in Laughton LW is named as Virginus (GDB 367a; 57/7), a form explained by von Fellitzen and by the present writer as representing a Scand *Wifgrimr, although both note that no such name is recorded in Scandinavian sources and that the EB form might rather represent ContGerm Wulfgrimr, which is also mentioned in French sources (PMB 399; SPLY 325; Förstram 1900, 1651; Morlet 1968, 229-30). There was a dispute over the scribe of the land and it is recorded in the Clauses that Gay of Craon claimed this land through his ancestor Wilfrgrimr (PMB 410; cf. Förstram 1900, 1999). The forms Virginus and Wilfrgrimr must both represent the same name and it is likely that this is ContGerm Wulfgrimr. Peter McCluskey has suggested that Wulfgrimr may have been replaced by Wilfrgrimr because the scribe of the Clauses had been confronted with a written form such as Wilfrgrimr, easily mised as Virginus. It would perhaps be advisable to remove the Scand headword *Wifgrimr from the PMB and SPLY and assign all the entries recorded under that name to ContGerm Wulfgrimr.

The first element Wulf- is involved in another case of hitherto unrecognized identity in the Lincolnshire Domesday. The account of the city lists the twelve pre-Conquest lauien, the tenth of whom is Siuwardus proesbyteter (GDB 363a: p.2/1). There is also a list of the twelve pre-Conquest lauien in EB, and the tenth is Vinodus. The EB lists hold the old name also as a Scand PROSEBYTTR (GDB 363a: p.2/2). Since it is the name of a post-Conquest tenant, this particular instance of Vinodus is not treated in PMB but other instances are explained there as representing OE WuFod or Wulfod (PMB 422). A little further in the account of the city of Lincoln there is a rather enigmatic statement to the effect that Wunof (proesbyteter) had taken unlawful possession of a moiety of arable land in Lincoln and of the wife of Siuward the priest while the land had been in the seisin of the king on account of a fine laid on the land by Siuward (GDB 363a: p.5/13). It would seem that the priest who had taken possession of the land and of Siuward's wife and who is here called Wulfod is identical with the priest called Vinodus who was Siuward's successor in the same land. The name-form Wulfod has been explained as representing Scand Olafr, with Wulf- substituted for the nasalised O (Æuf) in the Scand name (PMB 335; SPLY 204). If the form Vinodus were to be derived from Wulfod, that might be done either by assuming aRathesis of n to l and subsequent deletion of the nasal consonant element -mn (here given a Latinized spelling), or else by supposing a scribe to have substituted the frequently occurring Wulfod for the rare Wulfod. There is, however, reason to believe that Wulfod is the more correct form of the lawman's name. A pre-Conquest tenant of Lenton in Nottingham who still held the land in 1086 is referred to in one and the same entry both as Wulfod and as Vinod (GDB 287b: 10/24), while a 1086 tenant of neighbouring Radford is called Vinod (GDB 287a: 10/15). The variation between forms may in part be the result of variation in rapid scribal abbreviations. The final f in Wulfod is probably a result of confusion of fricatives in a un unstressed final position, although it may reflect a sporadic change of p to f evidenced in late OE (PMB 8107); in wulfO such a change might have been a matter of regressive assimilation. It seems that all the four instances of Wulfod noted in PMB 335 under the heading Olafr should in fact be assigned to Wulfod. Similarly, it would seem advisable to treat the isolated instance of Wulfod, the name of the pre-Conquest tenant of Normanton on the Wolds in Nottinghamshire (GDB 289b: 9/64), as an abbreviation for Wulfan, rather than as a form of the Scand by-name Greir, as is done by von Fellitzen (PMB 334). The name of one of the tenants of neighbouring Plumtree was indeed Wulfod (GDB 286a: 9/82), a form which von Fellitzen derives from Wulfan, noting that for final X in the second element -bafh by far the most frequently occurring spelling in EB is -c, presumably an orthographical approximation for a sound for which the Frano-Latin spelling-system had no equivalent; other forms ascribed by von Fellitzen to Wulfan include Wulfis in Essex (LB 62b; 30/46) and Wulfeg in Gloucestershire (PMB 371) (PMB 420-21 and 447). The instance of Wulfod in Nottinghamshire is the only one to be found in EB. The spelling in WuFod- presumably reflects vocalisation of I before a consonant and subsequent substitution of WuFod- (PMB 816).

One of the tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire in 1086 was Robert the Bursar (Dispensator). The account of his fief includes fourteen items (GDB 363b; 38/13), the last item being the place name of the plantation of South Blakemere in Lindsey. No pre-Conquest tenants are named for the soke and berewicks among these but the tenant of the manors of Scrivelsby, Wood Enderby and Tathor is named as Siuward (38/7.12), that of the manors of Thornton and Holton on Bain as Achi (38/1.13), that of the manor of Addlethorpe as Wimlac (38/8) and that of the manor of Butyate as Wigele (38/10), while an entry in the Clauses reveals that the pre-Conquest tenant of the berewick Coningsby was Achi (GDB 376b; 69/34, cf. 38/4). The accounts of the fiefs of various tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire are recorded in PMB 373a: p.13) by a list of the names of the people who the TRE had had sako and toll and team in the county. These people included Achil, Siuward, and Wilac etc. in the term of Siuward and Wilac his brother in respect of their father's land. It seems that these are the same men as those whose lands had passed to Robert the Bursar and that they were also probably identical with those holding land in the South Riding that by 1066 was held by Wulfod (GDB 167b: 37/1) (PMB 372-73). The Wulfod of 1066 is probably represented Old Danish Sigwarh, although formally it could equally well be certain Scandinavians Aki (PMB 142; SPLY 3) but the varying forms in which the same name has been recorded leaves its true nature uncertain. Von Fellitzen treats Wigele and Wilac as separate names, considering the former to represent Scand Sigleir and the latter to be Wiete, while taking Wulfod either to represent a rare OE Wifgod or to be an error for Wixeal (PMB 404, 414, 416). Since Aki is certainly a Scandinavia name and probably so, it is tempting to assume that the third member of the family
also bore a Scand name, although by the middle of the eleventh century there is abundant evidence from Lincolnshire for a lack of consistency in the linguistic origins of the forenames given to the children of one family (SPLY LXIII-LXIV). The forms Wigelac and Wilac might represent the Scand name Vigelir, which had a side-form Wigelir of the second element developed under H (cf. SPly 337), or, alternatively, the second element of the name may have been replaced by the cognate OE element -Mæc. Since De Whitstable could take the form Wilac in DB (cf. Pnbn 413-14), the isolated instance of Wigelac (GDB 379a; 69/12) might be a scribe's erroneous reconstitution of the form Wilac with the element with the same sound. Alternatively, the ı might be a scribal error for c (cf. the recorded instances of -weit for -æg as a second element: cf. Pnbn 313). The most developed form Wilac in Wilac (GDB 379a; 69/12) is that of John Insley has suggested that the velar [r] of the Scand name might still have survived in 1086 if the bearer of the name were an eleventh-century immigrant from Scandinavia, and that this velar [r] might have acquired a substitute pronunciation [w], a substitution that Peter McClure has pointed out is evident from the twelfth and thirteen centuries respectively in forms of two Nottinghamshire place-names, Leverton ('legtena; Pnct 33-4) and Averham ('Aguram; Pnct 181). The bearer of the name in question, however, was the son of a resident in Lincolnshire and I am inclined simply to treat Wilac as another instance of erroneous reconstitution from a form in Wigelir.

A point of some interest is that one of the berwicks in Robert the Bursa's rief is called Wilksby (LS; Wilgesbi GDB 363b; 38/5). Cf. also Wilchesbi GDB 393a; 1/104. The specific of this name has been tentatively explained as a compressed form of the Scand personal name Vigelir (DeWh; Selden). Wilchesby, as I am tempted to identify the present writer (SPly 393; SPly 393). The identification of the name with Wigelac, son of Siuward and brother of Achi. The place-name Wilscby would then be an eleventh-century formation, parallel and roughly contemporaneous with the names in -wy whose specific is a Coxtorm personal name, for example Grimshay (LS; Grimaik GDB 339b; 1/84 and Grimoldi GDB 356a; 27/28).

One of the tenants-in-chief in Lincolnshire in 1066 was Walter of Aincourt, who held a number of estates in Kesteven (GDB 361a; 31/1-18). His ancestors in these lands were numerous but the one in Belton, Somery, Westorpe, and a lost Sobebille was a man by the name of Tori (31/1.1-7). There was a dispute about the land in Somery, and in the Glamorgan this is referred to as tera Thori (GDB 377b; 72/55). It is natural to take the forms Thori and Thori to represent the Scand personal name Torr or a side-form of it, as is done both by Folland and in the present writer (SPly 393; SPly 394/9). The identification of the name is not so straightforward however. Walter of Aincourt also held lands in Northamptonshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and the West Riding of Yorkshire; and among his ancestors a Tori appellation in one manor in Northamptonshire (GDB 226a; 38/1), in eleven in Nottinghamshire (GDB 288b; 11/2.4.6.8.9.11.18.20.22.24.25) and in Wombwell in the West Riding (GDB 326a). In the account of the borough of Derby it is recorded that an antecessor of Walter of Aincourt was called Stori (GDB 280a; 8/16), but Walter's listed lands in Derbyshire had all previously been held by Susan cilt (GDB 276b; 8/1.3-6), except for Brampton and Wadshelf, held by Wada (GDB 276b; 8/2). In the account of Walter's 'in the Dedke' the only antecessors who are named besides Tori are Suen (GDB 288b; 11/4.10) or Susan (GDB 288b-289a; 11/12.13.33; Vivic (GDB 288b; 11/1) and Haminc (GDB 289a; 11/26), but in the West Riding of Yorkshire Walter had been preceded not only by a Tori but also by a Stori in Rawmarsh (GDB 326a; 8/14). It is likely that the forms Stori and Tori refer to the same man. It is difficult, however, to decide what name actually lies behind the recorded forms. If the name were to be assumed to have been Torr, then the form Stori might be taken to show the frequent DB spelling of initial [p] as [r] (as in the form Tori), with subsequent prefixing of an unstressed element -g-, possibly explicable as an inverted type of French effacement, beginning in the eleventh century, of preconsonantal [s]. A difficulty here is that before voiceless consonants loss of [s] did not become general until the thirteenth century and, in particular, is not shown by place-names from Scandinavia into Norman French (Pope 3977-78, 1103); for instance, eleventh-century forms of the Norman place-name Turcaville, of which the first element represents the Scand personal name Mykryk, show initial [s] still preserved (Sturgaville c.1048; Adigard des Guitiers 1254, See. 119). It would thus seem that Tori and Stori in DB have been prefixed so frequently in the case of the name Tori in DB. It is possible that a scribe or a witness simply confused the form Tori = [pori] with the Scand personal name Torri. Although this latter name does not occur with this spelling in Scandinavia and is not found for Lincolnshire in sources other than DB (SPly 267), there would seem to have been a pre-Conquest tenant by the name. He is listed together with some other men listed under the name Tori (folius) and among these a name may have had the meaning of the name. For the name Torri, which is the commonest form, we have a pre-Conquest tenant by the name that the fact that two men, one called Tori and the other called Tori, are recorded as holders of land in Lincolnshire suggests that there were two different tenants.

The possibility also exists that the name of Walter's antecessor was in fact Tori. The form Torri might then reflect French loss of the -p - prefix, even though, as noted above, this loss did not become general until considerably later and usually left behind a prosthetic -p-. It would undoubtedly be more satisfactory to explain Tori for Stori as the result of a substitution of a common name for a rare one. It might be argued that Tori would be more likely to have been substituted for Stori than the rare Stori for the common Torri, but against this should be weighed the fact that Walter's antecessors were recorded in Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, while the only certain instances of the use of the name Torri for this man are as tenant of Rawmarsh in the West Riding of Yorkshire (GDB 326a) and in the statement that he was an antecessor of Walter in Derby (GDB 290a; 8/16).

The instances of hitherto unrecognised identification that I have discussed have revealed how many different factors can contribute to the representation of a name's specific in several different forms. Sometimes it is a question of whether or not a sound-development has taken place or whether the sound-development has been represented in the written form of a name, as when the first element Mæl- appears as Ed- or Ad- and Ed- or Al- as a result of a sound-development. Sometimes various developments have resulted in two names falling together under a single written form, as when the first elements Wigelac and Wilac come to be represented by the same word, as is possible, therefore, in a case where a scribal error has occurred. It is possible that the form Wigelac might have reconstituted this form now as Wigelac and now as Wilac so that a single man suddenly became endowed with two identities. Sometimes spreading may have resulted in an incorrect form, as when when Wigelac for [wilhak] was read as Wilac or when a
postulated form *Vufac for Wulfēah was read as Vufac. Sometimes a scribe or a witness would seem to have substituted one element for another, as when the Ei- of Scand Biririk has been replaced by Ed-, representing OE Ead-, a substitution which may have been encouraged because the second element of Biririk had already been anglicised to rir[']. Occasionally a whole name may have been replaced by one with which it had a superficial similarity, as when Tori [Pori] was replaced by Stori or, less probably, Storir by Tori.

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

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

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

JOHN McNEAL DODGSON

SOME DOMESDAY PERSONAL-NAMES, MAINLY POST-CONQUEST*

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

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

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

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

There is a minesfield 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 Cantabrigeniss (IOC, for Cambridgeshire) and the Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury (for Kent). So we have to allow for spellings which represent the mishearing, mispronunciation or 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.