Post-Conquest English personal-name fashions have scarcely had their due. Between the late eleventh century and the mid thirteenth, the baptismal-name stock was almost wholly renewed, forms like Ælfgifu, Godwine, Gunnild, Léofrýð, Óc cyt e l and Wulfstán being discarded in favour of ones still current today, such as (to give their modern forms) Alice, John, Margery, Robert, Susan and William. Little close study has, however, been made of this process, let alone of its social context. Unannotated data-bases of restricted availability apart, there is, for instance, as yet no onomasticon for the 1086 stratum of Domesday Book. It is as though historians and philologists alike were — with some honourable exceptions — taking it as natural and inevitable for true-born Englishmen to be called Alan, Geoffrey, Henry, Richard, Simon, Thomas, Walter, and so on; too natural and inevitable to need investigation. This disregard contrasts with the enthusiasm as well as learning lavished upon pre-Conquest name-styles and their brief post-Conquest survival.

The shift of fashion was swift, comprehensive, and quasi-permanent. Even among the peasantry, names of post-Conquest types appear in, for instance, a Bury St Edmunds estate-survey datable possibly as early as c. 1100: a date which, if accepted, implies — unless we postulate post-baptismal renaming — christenings ante 1080. Renaming could occur: thus, in perhaps the early 1130s, the future St Bartholomew of Farne, a Northumbrian boy baptized by the Anglo-Scandinavian name of Tótti, was constrained by his playmates’ mockery to adopt the more up-to-date one of William. Yet, even if renaming were conceded to play some part, the chronology based on the extant records would need adjusting only by a dozen or so years; and, more importantly, the renaming would itself testify to the dominance of the new fashions. These spread apace, so that by c. 1200 names of pre-Conquest types had become rare except among the peasantry, and were within two further generations virtually extinct. A few, notably Edmund and Edward, did survive into the later Middle Ages and beyond, but these were mostly ones tacitly reclassified as ‘saints’ names’, and especially royal saints’ names popularized through readoption by later royalty.
Received wisdom concerning this change seems to be that it reflects 'fashion': a banal aping by the lower orders of the customs of their betters. True enough, no doubt; but matters cannot rest there. Which of their betters were twelfth-century English people aping? Why, in the aftermath of a conquest followed by widespread expropriations, were they moved to imitate their new masters at all, let alone as early and as eagerly as they did? In any detail, 'Why?' must be unanswerable; but 'Whom did post-Conquest English people imitate?' may not be beyond all conjecture. Among the peasantry, acquaintance with the styles characteristic of the foreign settlers must have come from two main sources: from the lords of their own and of neighbouring vills; and from rumours of magnates further afield.

The greatest magnate was the king, and for the first thirty-five years after the Conquest the two successive kings were called William. That name soon became favoured in post-Conquest England, among all classes, being by the 1130s, as noted, commonplace enough for the future Bartholomew of Farne to adopt it as protective colouring. Other instances from Vitae of its adoption in non-aristocratic English milieux involve St William of Norwich, the apprentice furrier supposedly martyred in 1144, and, two generations earlier, St Godric of Finchale's brother, probably baptized in the 1080s. In thirteenth-century estate-surveys, William regularly figures among the most frequent names. Was it then mainly royalty whom humberl people were aping? A seeming parallel might be adduced with Normandy itself, where names associated with the ducal house enjoyed a great vogue and Guillaume alone accounted for some 12% of the men's names recorded during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in, for instance, Évreux. For neither country can one, however, be sure what models and motivations underlay recorded usages. The Conqueror and Rufus were merely the most prestigious of many Williams to be found in late eleventh-century England. Only a little less prominent were the tenants-in-chief of that name, including several bishops; lower down the scale, but far from inconspicuous in their own neighbourhoods, there were many under-tenants so named, and that is without counting lesser clergy or foreign merchants. When evidence does survive of the inspiration behind a christening, the model may prove to have been near at hand: thus, the half-French boy who grew up to be the chronicler Orderic Vitalis received his Old English name of Órdric in compliment to the priest who baptized him. That instance, dating from 1075, admittedly goes against the tide, but it by no means follows that its social, human motivation was atypical.

The Bury list of (?) c. 1100 offers only a single instance of Wilhelrn, beside two each of Raulf and of Salomon and over half-a-dozen of Rod(ber): this hardly suggests royalty as the chief influence. Nor are any pre-Conquest kings' names much favoured there: Alfred occurs once, Edgar and Edward twice each, Edmund three times, Cnut and Harold not at all. Nor, in later times, did Henry become more than moderately frequent, despite having been borne by two twelfth-century kings and an early thirteenth-century one who were all effective and respected rulers. These observations likewise point to models near at hand rather than far afield in distant courts.

Determining the dominant name-models for any particular district will not be easy. As at Orderic Vitalis's christening, such a model might have been a parish priest or other person of merely local prestige and of whom no record need therefore survive (for women, under-recording affects even the nobility). Motivation is more speculative still. A name like Robertus filius Siflet, showing a man as bearing a post-Conquest name even though his mother had had the purely Old English one of Sigefried, might inspire a guess as to his possibly being the illegitimate son of an immigrant after whom he had been named: plausible perhaps, but unverifiable. Even less verifiable is another possibility: that sometimes a peasant woman might have named a child of her own after an aristocratic one that she had nursed.

The best to be hoped for is documentary evidence suggesting links between early instances of Continental-type names in use among the native English, the peasantry especially, and styles current among local nobility, gentry and clergy. Demonstration can never be exact, partly because no early medieval records offer more than partial and, onomastically speaking, random samples of the population, and also because little can be said about transmission of the overwhelmingly frequent names like Robert and William. If, however, sporadic and imperfect correspondences between peasants' names and those of local gentry have any value for socio-onomastic history, some can be exhibited.

The Bury St Edmunds survey of (?) c. 1100 preserves the names not only of the feudati homines holding by knight-service (all but a few corresponding with those listed in Little Domesday Book) but also of over 600 peasant landholders (free, paying rent, holding parcels of land ranging from a quarter of an acre to more than eighty acres, and some also following other occupations besides farming). This latter schedule covers, however, only three out of the eight and a half hundreds over which the abbey had special rights, and so, given the variation in name-choice from vill to vill,
offers an incomplete view of current usages. Interpretation of it also presents problems. The only surviving text, preserved in Cambridge University Library MS. Mm.iv.19, fos 134v-143v, postdates compilation by about a century. Its vernacular orthography is — as often at such a date — capricious and ambivalent: the only Anglo-Saxon letter retained is æ, ɛ represents [ʌ] as well as [ɛ], and r represents [ɔ] as well as [ɛ]; it stands for [v] and for [w] as well as for [u]. Some confusion occurs between reflexes of OE æfel-, which regularly gave late OE æfel- or æfel-, and those of OE ælf-, which before a deuteretheme beginning with a consonant could sometimes give ælf-. Certain originally Scandinavian items might in theory be classed either as Norman imports or as naturalized into late Old English (the low incidence here of unambiguously post-Conquest items, which account for only some 8% of the stock, suggests that most belong in the latter category). Other items are classifiable alternatively as native (or naturalized) Old English or as adopted from Continental Germanic. Uncertainties arise also from the structure of the survey: some peasants held more than one plot, sometimes in more than one will, as is on occasion signalled by use of item to introduce a supplementary entry or else of a toponymic byname that identifies a landholder as domiciled in a different parish, but systematically such signalling was carried through is not clear. Precise figures are thus out of the question; and such statistics as are offered below will intentionally be couched in terms so vague as to engender no illusions about the exactitude attainable. The shortcomings of the Bury document are all the more frustrating because of its precision in other respects. As well as being poised upon the cusp of a major shift in name-fashions, this is one of the earliest known English estate-surveys to be compiled upon a territorial plan, vill by vill; and thus furnishes some of our earliest insights into name-distributions as perceived in everyday life. The familiar assertion, based mainly upon attestations to royal diplomas, of a late Old English loss of variety from personal-naming has never been claimed as more than a half-truth, uncertainly applicable to the peasantry. Here, such loss of variety as appears is specific and limited. The pre-Conquest name-styles represented consist — apart from some extraneous items to be discussed below — of a mixture of Old English forms and Scandinavian ones, with the latter accounting for some 18% of the stock. Between 160 and 165 masculine name-forms are distributed among about 600 men: although falling short of the `one name — one person' principle generally supposed by modern scholars to have been the old Germanic ideal, such a level of variety might — on the assumption that it was complemented by a comparable range of feminine forms — seem ample for any group numbering up to some 350 souls all told, i.e., for a village of fifty to seventy households. Onomastic behaviour here was, however, neither systematic nor wholly traditional. Observance of the Germanic tradition in its supposed original form would have entailed generating enough additional names to obviate repetition within any local group. Systematic deployment of 165 names among 600 men would have meant bestowing them in rotation, at maximum geographical as well as chronological spacings, and thus using each three or four times. In fact, Godwine occurs in the Bury lists over forty times, Godric over thirty times, Elfric, Elfwine and Wulfric between twenty-five and thirty times each. Conversely, about half the names in the stock occur only once each, and a further 15% only twice each. Popular names and rare ones alike tend, besides, to occur in local clusters, thus further reducing the variety experienced in practice. The inclusions of this habit of repetition were mitigated — in this document, at all events — by using bynames to aid identification of almost half those listed: at Hinderclay, for instance, four out of the eleven men were called Godric and were distinguishable by patronymic and occupational bynames. Of the bynames found, about half are of familial kinds, mainly patronymic; and the baptismal names involved set the current stock in some perspective. As recorded here, the current names are mainly dithematic; of the rare single-element forms, about half look Anglo-Scandinavian. Among the smaller corpus of patronyms, single-element forms are relatively more frequent and include a higher proportion of Old English ones: a contrast, as it happens, in keeping with common, but inadequately tested, assumptions about non-aristocratic Old English name-styles. Such a seeming shift of fashion raises the question whether, between the christenings of the present tenants’ fathers and their own, the Bury peasantry had come partly to eschew short-forms; if so, the shift might be taken as a delayed reflection of the similar one alleged to have affected aristocratic usages c. 900. That is not, however, the only explanation possible: patronyms might have been recorded in more colloquial a style than were current baptismal names — a practice not unknown in later Middle English times; and this view is supported, albeit shakily, by a brief list of Bury peasants’ names from (probably early in the Conqueror’s reign. However that may be, no great statistical weight should be laid upon patronyms, which often provide only small samples (that here being hardly more than a fifth the size of
the current stock) and are likely to be biased towards the rarer, more distinctive forms. This caveat lends an ambivalence to the observation that, already among the patronyms, Ælfsine, Godric and Godwine were, at five instances each, disproportionately frequent (and not one of these, be it noted, had ever been a characteristically royal name).

The development of disproportionate frequencies was, at all events, what had given the current name-stock its monotonous look. The currency here of a good few rare forms, and especially of Anglo-Scandinavian hybrids, implies little loss of ability to create fresh forms or of willingness to accept them from outside.31 Nor had element-permutation been abandoned, for in some two dozen instances a man’s name echoes an element from a relative’s, usually his father’s.32 Probably this latter practice was indeed what produced disproportionate frequencies, because within any familial or local group the element-range must generally have been so limited as to put expressions of onomastic piety at constant risk of repetitiveness. Whatever its causation, repetitiveness was no purely English problem, but manifested itself throughout the old Germanic area, and already characterized the styles which the Norman Conquest was about to introduce into England,33 Repetition of whole names had, in short, come to out permutation as the chief means of marking familial links.

Such was, in outline, the late-eleventh-century Suffolk name-system upon which this Bury survey shows post-Conquest fashions as having, probably by c. 1080, begun to impinge. In practice, detecting new adoptions is less straightforward than the summary may have made it sound; for several strata of non-native (or uncertainly native) forms have to be dissected out.

Some names shown by phonology or distribution (or both) to be of Continental-Germanic origin had by 1066 been known in England for up to a century. Fulcard had in the mid to late tenth century appeared in East Anglia as a moneyer’s name and also that of a landholder associated with Ely Abbey. The naturalization of Grimbald is underlined by its appearing here in patronymics that qualify classic Old English names and date probably ante 1060 (at latest, ante 1080), possibly even as early as c. 970. Sebode represents the CG Sigiboda seen in the name of Æthelred II’s moneyer Siboda (the same unEnglish -boda figures also in the rare Tritbud, apparently a reflex of CG Theodiboda). Ærcerbiht, although in late Old English usage apparently an import, is Anglicized in a way implying naturalization. A further name that for practical purposes belongs in this category is the originally OR

Col(eman), adopted into German usage and known in England from at least the early eleventh century.

Against that background, certain other forms look explicable, often almost indifferently, as either Continental or native (which latter category embraces, in this context, Anglo-Scandinavian forms as well as purely Old English ones). Formally, the parental Theod is ambiguous in gender as well as in etymology.34 Harduin could represent either CG/OFr Harduin(us), or an OE *Heardwine: the latter seems supported by the occurrence in the same vell of the analogous Hardman, the former by that of a Hardwinnus among the otherwise Continental-named followers of a pre-DB Bury under-tenant called Peter. Ulbern might, in the orthography of this document, represent CG Wulfbern, or Anglo-Scandin WFbeorn < Wulfhjorn, or else a fresh compound between OE Wulf- and Anglo-Scand -beorn. For Fretern, here denoting at least two, possibly three, individuals and found several times in other post-Conquest materials, the etymologies suggested involve either an OE *Fróbeorn a or a Gallicized reflex (sc. with the intervocalic dental effaced) of CG Fridefern/Fredebern: against the former are alleged both the rarity of OE Fréo- and the uncertainly native standing of -beorn; in favour of the latter stands the occurrence in Suffolk TRE, not only of Fridebern, but also of its supposed OFr reflex Friebern, given as the name of an Edwardian king’s-then (LDB, 25/28, 32/6). A French form need not be incongruous in the latter context (the Confessor’s earl of Norfolk, to look no further, bore the CG/OFr name of Raulf); nor would its reappearance among the Bury peasantry conflict with the present thesis of name-transmission through local gentry. Yet native origins cannot be ruled out, for the Scandinavian-influenced Bury name-stock certainly included -beorn, and for Suffolk TRE OE Fréo- seems attested by the form Frewinus (LDB, 7/121). There is also a middle road: recreation in native terms of the CG/OFr Friebern. As for Osbern, formally explicable as Anglo-Scandinavian, as Norman, or as Old Saxon, it may, or may not, be relevant to its appearance five times in the Bury survey that already in the Confessor’s reign (although not, it seems, specifically in East Anglia) it had become associated with immigrant nobles and churchmen.

An etymological decision (if to be taken at all) may thus depend upon weighing probabilities, sometimes upon accepting some convergence of influences. The masculines Godle, found twice here and several times elsewhere, and Redlef, deducible from a patronym here, are commonly ascribed to Low-German origins, on the grounds that, although Léof- is among the most frequent of
OE protothemes, no corresponding masculine deuteronym is securely attested; yet, with the -le(o)lf compounds recorded in England numbering over half a dozen, that argument itself could be deemed insecure. Gisulf, explicable variously as a Gallicized spelling (sc. with G- for W-) of Anglo-Scand Wifgulf < Wigulf, or else as an OFr reflex either of the Normanno-Scand equivalent or of CG Wigulf, perhaps might be taken as French, in so far as G- for W- does not otherwise occur in the list of free peasants (though it does in that of the Bury knights), not even in certainly Continental names; this interpretation would, if accepted, bear upon that of the Gutifulus found, in addition to Wicifulus, in Suffolk TRE (LDB, 8:56). Odin, found five times here, could represent either CG Othin(us) or ODanish Óðin < Aðunn; the frequency in Abbot Samson's late-twelfth-century Kalendare of an apparent OFr reflex of the former, to wit, Öhin(us), might support assigning the present examples also to an Old-French etymology.

That, then, is the already variegated background against which must be studied the names that the free peasants of Bury shared with the abbey's feudati homines: Durand, Fulcher, Hubert, Ralph, Reeri, Richard, Robert, Walter, Wart, William, and perhaps Pedro, as well as the famous late-eleventh-century abbot's own name of Baldwin. Although accounting for only 8% of the recorded stock and a yet smaller proportion of occurrences, these are the crucial names both for later developments in English personal-naming and for the present investigation into possible lines of transmission. Again interpretations prove less straightforward than at first sight they might have seemed.

Not all these names were post-Conquest novelties. Baldwin and Durand had both appeared sporadically in pre-Conquest England, as names of minor landholders as well as of moneys. Durand — seemingly current TRE mainly in East Anglia52 — perhaps ranked among naturalized imports; in post-Conquest Suffolk it looks to be more commonly found among the more modest class of landholder.

Many of the shared names fall, besides, among those too frequent, in Normandy as well as in England, to have traceable transmission-patterns. William, some two dozen bearers of which figure in the Suffolk Domesday material, is a prime instance of this, despite the neatness of its appearing once among the Bury knights and once among the peasants. So too with the post-Conquest name most frequent among the latter: Robert, the nine instances of which denoted probably six or seven individuals. As well as figuring in England as a tenth-century moneyer's name, this had, during the Confessor's reign, been borne by the quasi-national figure, Robert (Champart) of Jumièges, bishop of London from 1044 and archbishop of Canterbury 1051–1052, and also by the Suffolk landholder Robert fitzWymarc, a supposed kinsman of the king and probably sheriff of Essex.53 Post-Conquest Suffolk magnates of the name included Robert Corbucion, Robert Geron, Robert Mael, Robert of Mortain, Robert of Tosny, Robert of Verly and, in particular, Robert Blund, not only a major tenant-in-chief, but also one of the abbey's 'feudati homines'. Raulf (so spelt in the Bury survey, just as in the contemporary ASC annals), the three instances of which here denoted two individuals, had also long been familiar in pre-Conquest East Anglia, partly through the Confessor's Breton earl, Ralph the Staller, and then through the latter's son, Ralph of Gaël, banished for treason in 1075,54 for Suffolk TRW it appears as the name of some half-dozen tenants-in-chief as well as of the abbey's under-tenant, Radulfus Crassus, and of a good few others of similar rank. Walter, not apparently known in pre-Conquest Suffolk (the TRE instances in Domesday Book all concern the Lotharingian bishop of Hereford), had by 1086 well over a dozen bearers recorded there, ranging from the magnate Walter Giffard to an indeterminate number of under-tenants, among them Bury's 'nepos of the clerk'. Thus, in late-eleventh-century England, names like Ralph and Robert were simply in the air, trailing clouds of prestige, and scarcely traceable to specific models. Often their adoption by English people may have been of multiple inspiration: Hugo, for instance, appears twice among our free peasants, although not at all among the relevant feudati homines; Domesday Book shows it as borne TRW by Suffolk magnates like Hugh of Avranches, Hugh of Grandmesnil and Hugh of Montfort, as well as by some half-dozen under-tenants throughout the county.

Surprisingly, Richard does not, in the present context, exhibit a like degree of over-frequency: in the TRE stratum of Domesday Book it refers mainly to the protégé whom the Confessor settled in the Welsh Marches; and, even for 1086, the Suffolk record offers only the magnate Richard fitzGilbert of Clare and a few under-tenants, among them Bury's Ricardus Catros and Richard Houserel/Hourel. For certain other names, still sparser distributions — at all events, as far as the records go — suggest some possibly significant connections. Fulcher (or, given the ambivalence of the -cl- spelling here, Fulcker) appears twice among the Bury peasants; Suffolk Domesday offers only two bearers of the name, Fulcher the Breton and Fulcher of Mesnères, both under-tenants of the abbey. For Hubert, found once among the free peasants and once for a post-Domesday knight of Bury, the
only Suffolk bearer recorded in Domesday Book is a minor tenant-in-chief, Hubert of Mont-Canisy. For Warin, also found once among the peasants and once among the Bury knights, the only Suffolk bearers in Domesday Book are two or three under-tenants, the abbey’s man among them.

The problems of frequency pale beside those of rarity. Names attributed to Bury peasants include Fredo and Reeri; both reappearance, applied to others, in Abbot Samson’s Calendar. Each presents a cryptic similarity with an anomalous variant of an under-tenant’s name: Fredo appears in Domesday Book as a variant, or error, for Frodo, the name of Abbot Baldwin’s brother, a major East-Anglian landholder as well as an under-tenant of the abbey (LDB, 14/65); Reeries occurs in the abbey’s own schedule of under-tenants as a variant, or error, for the name elsewhere Latinized as Roricus (possibly, but not certainly, an OFr reflex of *CG Hrodricus*). The problem seems each time to be one that is too often glossed over: the discrepancy between spoken name-forms and their conventional Latinizations, Rauf/ Radulfus being a classic instance. Fredo is, in itself, an authentic form, a shortening of CG dithemic names in Frīde- Fredes- like the Fredeberh already cited. The questions are, first, why an LDB scribe on just one occasion substituted it for an otherwise regular Frodo and, second, how the form Fredo came to be ascribed to several Bury peasants. The former seems scarcely answerable. The latter could perhaps be met by supposing documentary Fredo here to represent an Anglicized reflex of Scand Frith. Reeri remains enigmatic.

For three non-Germanic names of post-Conquest types, problems lie not with etymology but with transmission. The two entries of *Salomon* in the survey have an uncertain relationship with the mentions in Bury documents datable 1121 × 1148 and 1148 × 1156 of a Salomon *clericus*. The specifically OFr Russel (etymologically a nickname, ‘small man with red hair’) was familiar elsewhere in eleventh-century England, including Colchester. Then there is Crispin, given as the patronym of a man with the unambiguously Old English name of Stānimær. For such a saint’s name to have been borne by an English peasant baptized probably before 1060 — and, at that, one apparently without clerical connections — would be unexpected; even more so would be occurrence here of the Old French nickname ‘curly’ (the byname *Crispin* given to a witness of a Bury document datable 1186 × 1198 can have no bearing on the form in the survey). Provisionally, a scribal explanation might be proposed: later ‘improvement’ of a less exotic Latinized *Crispi filius*, as seen elsewhere in the survey.

That does not exhaust the problems. A major flaw in the evidential pattern is that only a minority of the early knights’ names reappear among the free peasants of (?) c. 1100. Given the selectivity of the record, such negative evidence is not to be pressed. Indeed, later Bury records fill some of the gaps, showing further knightly names, including Anselm, Beaud, Burghard, Elias and Peter, appearing among people of English stock. Even so, the thesis of name-transmission through local gentry looks less cogent than it did when tentatively put forward a dozen years ago. Coincidence of the sort exhibited bear little weight, because ones no less close can be found almost at random: late-eleventh-century records from, for instance, the Norman town of Sées, offer parallels for the peasants’ names Baldwin, Durand, Fulcher, Harduin, Hubert, Hugo, Osbern, Ralph, Richard, Robert, Walter and William — but no-one claims any special relationship between Bury and Sées. Failure to substantiate the thesis by no means, however, discredit localized studies of the present kind. For, if fuller understanding is to be achieved of historical socio-onomastic processes, it must surely come from focusing upon local (or, perhaps, professional) groups, rather than, as in the pioneering days of anthroponymics, upon particular categories of names. Signs are that continuities of name-choice may be traceable within individual vills.

In the broader sense, too, focusing upon name-fashions of the immediate post-Conquest period is salutary. At this time, as a mainstream historian has recently acknowledged, name-usage constitutes ‘a better indicator of attitudes to foreign rule than are isolated statements in chronicles’. True, we cannot uncover the motivations behind eleventh- and twelfth-century English christenings; we cannot find out whether the English followers of imported name-fashions were moved by simple snobbery, by desire to curry favour, by the charm of novelty, or by genuine admiration for the name-bearers whom they copied. What we can observe among these Suffolk peasants is what Ekwall observed forty years ago among the contemporaneous bourgeoisie of London: apparent absence of any nationalistic or xenophobic reaction against the cultural patterns associated with the new rulers and settlers.
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1. The earlier name-stock, comprising Anglo-Scand as well as native OE items, will be termed ‘pre-Conquest’ and the later, consisting chiefly of CG items and ones with Christian associations (both types often Gallicized), either ‘post-Conquest’ or ‘Continental’, according to context.
11. Cf. 'A fact of . . . significance is that "William" became and remained the single most common recorded name in the twelfth century, which suggests that William the Conqueror and William Rufus were not as unpopular as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle made out': M. T. Clanchy, England and its Rulers 1066–1272 (London, 1983), 57.
12. M. Le Pesant, 'Les noms de personne à Évreux du xiiie au xive siècle', Annales de Normandie VI (1956), 47–74, esp. 55. The fashions go back well into the eleventh century: e.g., Fauroux offers almost five columns of Willelmus and four of Robertus, beside single entries for many other names.
15. For the names in fact disproportionately favoured here, see above, 11.
16. See, e.g., E. Ekwall, ed., Two Early London Subsidy Rolls, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis Humanorum Litterarum Lundensis XLVIII (Lund, 1951), 35 (1292: Henry 33%, John 14%, William 11%) and 36 (1310: Henry 61%, John 43%, William 24%). Note that KS and other documents show the popularity of a saint's name before it was a king's, as beginning well before 1109.
18. R. M. Thomson, The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk Record Society XXXI (Woodbridge, 1980), item 1277, 119–21, dates the extant copy post 1207. (I am grateful to Miss Jayne Ringrose of Cambridge University Library for her advice concerning the manuscript).


23. Feminine names (including metronymy) found here represent between 30 and 35 forms (of which, about 15%), are probably of Scand origin, accounting for 50 to 55 occurrences. The most frequent are: Ealplæd, Ealigifu, Beorhtflæd, Beorhtgifu, Godgifu, and Wulfgifu. They are none of post-Conquest types. Both instances of Speorhacoc occur in Trositon, and clusters of names in -celcet appear in Hunnington and in Coney Weston; for the frequency of Godric in the Hindclay list, see the following paragraph.

25. FDB 40–1.

26. The current short and single-element names found here are: Achy (Scand Ab: SPLY, 3–5), Ælic (PNDB, 182), Ælic (Redin, 150–1), PNDB, 172, Ælo (PNDB, 205 and n. 1; F&B, 189–91; cf. Schaufler, 179, 11, 63–4); Bond (Scand Bond: SPLY, 60–1; PNDB, 206), Brother (SPLY, 65; cf. PNDB, 208), Brun (Scand Brun: SPLY, 11–12; PNDB, 209; cf. SPLY, 66), Bruning (Redin, 165; PNDB, 210; SMS, 86–7; PNWD, 152; ELPN, 22–3), Chalil (Scand Kalil: AS, 57–8), Chetel (Scand Kettil: SPLY, 166–70), Cole (OE Cole: PNDB, 217–8; or Scand Koll(i): SPLY, 176–7), Fader (SPLY, 79; cf. PNDB, 210), Goding (PNDB, 285), Hagen (Scand Hagni: SPLY, 122–3; PNDB, 282; ELPN, 7), Hune (OE Hun: Redin, 67; PNDB, 195; ELPN, 49; and cf. DBS, s.n. Hun; or Scand Humin: SPLY, 145–6; PNWD, 152), Hunting (NoB XXXIII, 84), Lobbe (Scand Lobbe: AS, 58), Lotene (Scand Lobinn: NPE, 92–3; SPLY, 190; PNDB, 321), Luniting (SN, 9), Luittning (2x; Redin, 174; PNDB, 322; cf. Scand Luitt, Luitt: AS, 58; PNDB, 191), Mamne (OE Mama: Redin, 32; PNDB, 354; or Scand Manni: SPLY, 194–5), Neue (cf. OE nefa or Scand nef ‘nephew’; cf. DBS, s.n. Nœare), Oppe (cf. KS, 14; SN, 10), Tate (OE Tåt masc. Tåt fem.: Redin, 114; SN, 11, s.n. Twit; cf. Scand Teitr: PNDB, 382), Twuidda (SN, 12), Swarche (also KS, 47; ? short

for Scand Svarthollr: PNDB, 379; SPLY, 276; cf. n. 31 below), Úlf (Scand Úlf: SPLY, 321–4; or OE Wulf: Redin, 114–5). For some further Scand forms, see n. 27 below. Names from the survey by no means exhaust the local stock of Scand short-forms: e.g., Threm (FDB, 138, 147–8; KS, 50, also 49, where Threm is a misprint) represents Scand Eþrm (NPE, 154).

27. Distinguishing between postposed nicknames and asyndetic patronyms is not easy. The short and single-element names best taken as patronymic are: Ade suna (OE Adéa: Redin, 81–2). Edsfæder (cf. LDB Æda: PNDB, 171–2; also cf. OE Ædda, Ældi: Redin, 82, 131), Æliccune (n. 26), Becce f[ilius] 2x (OE Becca: Redin, 84; Tengvik, 173; DBS, s.n. Beck; cf. Anglo-Saxon *Bekki: SPLY, 31), Boie f. (n. 26), Brun f. 2x/Brunne suna/Brunne steþpuna (Scand Bruni: SPLY, 66; PNWD, 152; cf. OE Brum: n. 26), Bruningi f. (n. 26; cf. DBS, s.n. Bruning) Celing (Tengvik, 301; cf. OE Cluolþa: Redin, 40), Chebbel (Tengvik, 301; PNWD, 209; 315; cf. DBS, s.n. Kebbl, Kételi (n. 26), Chippini f. (OE Cypping: Redin, 173; PNDB, 221–2; PNWD, 153), Cobbe (cf. LDB, 7/36: ? OE *Cobba, or short for Colbein, as at FDB, 39; cf. Tengvik, 305–6, and DBS, s.n. Cob), Cocce suna (OE *Cocca: Tengvik, 153; cf. DBS, s.n. Cock), Cole suna (n. 26), Craune f. 2x (OE Cræne: PNDB, 219 — Suffolk; or OE Cræne fem.: Redin, 115; cf. DBS, s.n. Crune), Crite (cf. OE Cretta: Redin, 90, Tengvik, 208), Dæg (cf. ? Scand Dæg: n. 31, and Tengvik, 258). Derf (OE Deroa: Redin, 47; PNWD, 154), Dod/Dod/Doddes (OE Dod, Dodda: Redin, 16, 62; PNDB, 223–5; cf. Tengvik, 154, 179, 208, 310–11), Frott (Tengvik, 376; NoB XXXIII, 80; PNWD, 157, s.n. Forst; DBS, s.n.); cf. Scand Frosti: SPLY, 87–8), Gode f. (OE Gód: Redin, 49, cf. n. 114; PNDB, 25; DBS, s.n. Good), Gotti (? Scand Gatu: SPLY, 98, PNWD, 162; cf. DBS, s.n.); Grelling (Redin, 164), Tengvik, 147–8), Herr (OE Heart: SN, 8), Hunt (OE Hun: Redin, 67; PNDB, 195; ELPN, 49; and cf. DBS, s.n. Hun; or Scand Humin: SPLY, 145–6; PNWD, 152), Hunting (NoB XXXIII, 84), Lobbe (Scand Lobbe: AS, 58), Lotene (Scand Lobinn: NPE, 92–3; SPLY, 190; PNDB, 321), Luniting (SN, 9), Luittning (2x; Redin, 174; PNDB, 322; cf. Scand Luitt, Luitt: AS, 58; PND, 191), Mamne (OE Mama: Redin, 32; PNDB, 354; or Scand Manni: SPLY, 194–5), Neue (cf. OE nefa or Scand nef ‘nephew’; cf. DBS, s.n. Nœare), Oppe (cf. KS, 14; SN, 10), Tate (OE Tåt masc. Tåt fem.: Redin, 114; SN, 11, s.n. Twit; cf. Scand Teitr: PNDB, 382), Twuidda (SN, 12), Swarche (also KS, 47; ? short

for Scand Svarthollr: PNDB, 379; SPLY, 276; cf. n. 31 below), Úlf (Scand Úlf: SPLY, 321–4; or OE Wulf: Redin, 114–5). For some further Scand forms, see n. 27 below. Names from the survey by no means exhaust the local stock of Scand short-forms: e.g., Threm (FDB, 138, 147–8; KS, 50, also 49, where Threm is a misprint) represents Scand Eþrm (NPE, 154).

Alongside the prevailing ‘filius’-formulæ, all three vernacular patroymic strategies occur: asyndetic apposition; gen. phrases in doktor/sum; simple gen. of the parental name.

Willetmus Rex?
28. Redin, 184–9; cf. n. 22 above.
29. On the assumptions (a) of a date c. 1100 for the survey and (b) of a life-span of up to 65 years, the current tenants might be supposed to have been baptized at dates ranging from c. 1035 to c. 1080, and their fathers at dates ranging from c. 970 to c. 1060 (c. 1055–c. 1100 and c. 990–c. 1080 respectively, if the document be assigned to its latest possible date of 1110).
30. FDB, 151–2 (a notification of enfeoffment, datable 1066 × 1087, ‘probably early’ in that period), offers a list of peasants’ names containing nine OE dithematic masc. forms, four Scand and two additive ones, plus Brother (also one CG dithematic masc. form, three OE dithematic fem. ones, the apparently fem. OE monothematic Leafe and two blundered forms).
31. Unusual names here include: Achulf (also FDB, 151 [cf. n. 30 above]; PND, 140, from Norfolk and Suffolk), Ganguil (patronym: AS, 55), Glaud (patronym, also KS, 19; SMS, 93), Godluge (DBS, s.n. Goodheu; cf. AS, 57), Goldrau (NoB XXXIII, 82; cf. the monevers’ names Goldcyta, Goldhacve, Hofnung (NoB XXXIII, 82), Lechertel (PND, 313; SPL, 186), Lethein (SMS, 97), Letimode (patronym or metronym: NoB XXXIII, 83), Mantat (SMS, 97–8; Will of Æthelgifu, 6), Merviu 2x (cf. OE *Mërwio or *Mërewino; PNDB, 327), Moregrim (also, as patronym, KS, 13; PND, 329), Morstan (NoB XXXIII, 86), Mundingus (PND, 330), Selimode (patronym or metronym: NoB XXXIII, 88), Scand (NoB XXXIII, 88), Spleman (PNWD, 173), Strangman (NoB XXXIII, 89), Stubbard (PND, 376–7; SMS, 103), Suthachel (cf. for Scand Sveartholl or *Swarthel[till]; cf. Scharoe in n. 26 above), Winterhard (CG: Forssner, 238), Udela (patronym: SMS, 106).
32. E.g., Ælacric Ældefle [f. 28, 29]; Ælricus Stryctric [f. 42; Godwin Althin f. 25; Goding Goduatu f. 25; Lemmer Brithmer, 29; Ordvic Úlúrichtnepos, 26; Stuan Lefistani f., 29. For 12th-cent. East-Angl. def. by predecessors, see Sellon I, 2–5.
34. Almost certainly masc., like most other gen. forms in -e found here (e.g.), OE weak -ac or else due to fusion of gen. -s with the initial of following -sue.
35. Not too much should be read into contrasts in name-distribution between LDB and GDB, because these may reflect only the former’s wider social coverage.
37. Ralph the Staller is discussed in DNB, 757, under his son Ralph Guader (= ‘of Gael’); see also Complete Peerage, IX, 568–71, and Barlow, Confessor, 165, 101.
40. References to the same individuals apart, less frequent names reappearing in the same localities include: Coleman (FDB, 35; Rushbrooke: KS, 21, 22); Hagen/Ehahene (FDB, 42; Hopton: KS, 31, 52); Othn/Ohin (FDB, 40, 23: Hepworth: KS, 45; cf. below and also 14 above); also the apparently patronymic byname Glauard (FDB, 28; Rougham: KS, 19); but the occupational cropere/ (p)er may be descriptive rather than onomastic (FDB, 28, with second- or probably diptographic: Rougham; KS, 18, where the whole name is in gen.; cf. MED, s.v. cropere).
41. Continuities in name-stock help to confirm emendations: e.g., Thurberd (f.) Hurehda is backed by the Turuerd (f.) in the earlier list for the same vil (KS, 46; Watsifficid: FDB, 39), plus the Harretel for Harkefeld found elsewhere in KS itself (14).
43. ‘There is no trace in London of such an opposition [s. to. Normans] or its English national consciousness in the history of personal nomenclature’: ELPN, 91–6, 98–100.

ONOMASTIC APPENDIX

N.B. The manuscript of the Bury survey of (?) c. 1100 in general capitalizes the initial of the first item only in any group. In transcribing, capitalization has been extended to all regular names, recognizable patronyms included.

Terra Aelun, KS, 69 (Melford). Possibly < OE Æðelhān (so Sellon II, 30; cf. OEPN, 156, and PND, 154, s.n. Ælun); but in KS OE Ædel- usually appears as Ael- or Enche-, Confessor, 165. In LDB an apparent OPfr cas-objet form Aeloms corresponds with the unusual Adelund used elsewhere of the same Bury u-t (14/32, 36, 58, 98) and with Adeo in FDB (21; for this as hypocoristic of CG names in Adel-, see Schlauf I, 169, Marynissen, 50–1, and Morlet I, 19a).

Godic anger, FDB, 36 (Timworth, 4 acres); Lefumine anger, FDB, 41 (Barningham, 4 acres). The byname anger could represent either a nickname based upon the Scand loanword meaning ‘distress, wrath’ (von Feilitzen in NoB
XXVII, 126; cf. MED, s.v.) or an asyndetic patronym; but, although LDB has Angarus (32/4, 66/100) varying with Angorus and Eagnarus for the name of Egar the Staller, an Anglo-Dane who was a major TRE landholder in East Anglia and elsewhere (PNDB, 166-7; cf. below n.s. Åger), colloquial currency of Norman An- < Scand An- (< Ås-) may seem unlikely in pre-Conquest England.

Anselmi (gen.), FDB, 148 (son of Oswald; fl. at Thurston a generation ante 1156 × 1186); Anselmus colt, KS, 12; CG Anshelm (Schlau I, 71; Morlet I, 39a), borne not only by the abbots of Bury 1121-1148 but also by the abbey’s 1086 u-t. Anselmus homo Frodontis (LDB, 14/139; cf. FDB, 10). (Owu[erald], not uncommon in the Bury vills, is either OE or Anglo-Scand [PNDB, 340-1; SPLY, 35-6; Selten II, 129] rather than OSaxon [as Schlau II, 140]).

Åger, FDB, 31 x. Read: Åeger.
Åger/Eagar, an 11th-c. Danish reflex of Scand Ageir; introduced into England under the Cnutian hegemony (PNDB, 166-7; SPLY, 22-4; J. Insley, in NoB LXX (1982), 77-93, esp. 82; cf. above n.s. anger).

Ælfgild, FDB, 35. Read: Æalgid.
Therefore cancel note at EENS, 48.

Æcebricht, FDB, 41 (Hindercay, 1 acre).
Whereas OE Eorecbeorht seems confined to the early period (OE PN, 166; not in PNDB), CG Eacenebricht is widely, though not heavily, attested (Schlau II, 79; TV, 69; Morlet I, 80a; for pre-Conquest English occurrences of other CG names in Eacne-, see: Forssner, 75-7, PNDB, 247; Smells, ‘973-1016’, 256, and Index, 203). Borno also by a minor 1086 u-t of the abbey and by a monk of Bury witnessing in 1112, it reappears in Rushbrooke in the later 12th cent. (LDB, 14/24; FDB, 154, cf. 128; KS, 21-2).

Baldwin, FDB, 25 (Barton, 3 acres); cf. Folcardus f. Baldowin, KS, 94 (former landholder in Barton; ante 1182 × 1200).
CG Baldwin (Schlau I, 73; TV, 40; Morlet I, 50b; Fauquoy, 479-80) found sporadically in England from mid 10th cent. on, mainly as a moniker’s name (Forssner, 41-2; PNDB, 191; FKB, 188; Smells, Index, 16). For Baldwin, abbot of Bury 1065-1098, a former monk of Saint-Denis and prominent at the Confessor’s court, see Gransden, ‘Baldwin’ (n. 5 above).

Berardo (dat.) f. Aldstani, FDB, 116 (kinsman Wulrici Aqueneunae; 1121 × 1148), 126-7 (1134 × 1148); Berardus nepos [of Leomar of Beringeham], 15 (witness; 1121 × 1138).
CG Berhard (Morlet I, 52a; cf. Forssner, 28a), borne by a 1086 u-t of the abbey (LDB, 14/16; cf. FDB, 20). (Ácein or Aévin fem., Aldstán, Æðmar and Wolfrin are all typical OE forms [PNDB, 242, 313, 423-4; SMS, 85]).

Godwine blurft, FDB, 27 (Pakenham, 3 acres).
The byname blurft may be a blundered asyndetic patronym, perhaps OE *Bræwilf (deduced from place-names: NoB XXXIII, 76) via a spelling *Briwilf (Bræn appears in the same vill and also, together with related compounds, elsewhere in the survey: cf. nn. 26, 27 above).

Brihted, FDB, 26 (Rougham, 1 acre); Brihteld at Stuard, 34 (Whelneyham, 30 acres).
Brihted, found also elsewhere, represents OE Beorht[æ]lfe[adm]. (so FDB, index, 1992) with the consonant-group at the element-juncture simplified (analogous with Æfl[æ]lfe and Læð[æ]lfe might have aided acceptance of -led as a second element); so cancel note at SMS, 86.

Burcharddes, FDB, 111 (brother of Lemmerus; witness, 1114 × 1119).
Either OE Bur(h)eard(e) (PNDB, 211-12; Selten II, 51-2) or CG Burghard (Schlau I, 76-9, II, 67; Morlet I, 62ab; cf. Forssner, 53-4). A Burcharddes/Burcaard, said to have a brother Peter, was the abbey’s 1086 u-t in Bardwell, Barningham and Hunston (LDB, 14/81, 82, 95; cf. 14/17 and FDB, 19). (The witness’s brother Lemmerus [OE Leófmar] might have been the one at Barningham with a nepos called Berardus [q.v. above].)

Coleman, FDB, 35 (Rushbrooke, 1 acre).
Ultimately < Ór Columbanus (LHEB, 509) but adopted in Germany, perhaps in memory of the saint martyred at Würzburg c. 689; found in England from mid 10th cent., mainly as a moniker’s name and with a distribution including ENGlia (Forssner, 55-6; PNDB, 28; ELIN, 24; Smart, ‘973-1016’, 256, and Index, 25). Borno also by a minor 1086 u-t of the abbey and by a monk of Bury witnessing in 1112, it reappears in Rushbrooke in the later 12th cent. (LDB, 14/24; FDB, 154, cf. 128; KS, 21-2).

Stannus crispini,f., FDB, 42 (Hopton, 4 acres).
A patronym involving the saint’s name Crispin (Morlet II, 37) would be unexpected at this date and social level, especially with an OE baptismal name like Ælmaðr; so, equally, would be nickname use of the OF adj. crispin ‘curly-haired’, the explanation given by the family itself for the Norman family-name Crispin (J. Armitage Robinson, Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster [Cambridge, 1911], 13-18; cf. von Feilitzen in NoB XXVII, 127). Perhaps the form here represents scribal ‘improvement’ of a patronym like that of Odin crispis f. (see below), that is, a re-Latinization of the OE byname based on the Latin loanword crisis/cyrps ‘curly-haired’ (Tengvik, 179; PNWD, 210).

Albaina duluerf, FDB, 27 (Rougham, 15 acres).
The byname could represent miscopying of chiluerf, a frequent spelling for Anglo-Scand *Ketilfroðr (NPE, 81; ZEN, 54; PNDB, 215; SPLY, 171; but Tengvik, 217, suggests Poðfróð).
Durand _Edelmari f., FDB_, 38 (Langham, 9 acres).

Romance-based Durand (Morlet II, 43; cf. I, 76b; Fauroux, 494), found in England from mid-10th cent., mainly as a moneyer's name, with a distribution including Suffolk (Forssner, 62; PNDB, 220; PNWD, 155 and n. 3; FDB, 193-4; Smart, '973-1016', 223, and Index, 28). The abbey's 1086 u-ts included a Durandus clericus (LDB, 14/119; cf. FDB, 11, 24). (The patronym is OE _Æðelmær_ (PNDB, 184-5.).)

Elyas f. Leftwine, KS, 133 (minor landholder; ante 1182 x 1200).

The Biblical name (Morlet II, 45b). An Helias de Baloniana witnessed a Bury charter of 1121 x 1148, and an Helias de Presseini (? Pressigny, dep. Seine-Maritime), who held by knight-service, witnessed one of 1156 x 1178 (FDB, 125, 169 n. 9). The diminutive Elvot also occurs among late-12th-cent. Bury peasants (KS, 4, 13). (The patronym is OE _Læftewine_ (PNDB, 317-19.).)

Ermand, FDB, 20 (Rougham, 18 acres).

Perhaps representing CG _Ermeno_ or CG _Her(e)man_ (Morlet I, 83b, 126ab; Forssner, 8o).

Stanos Ewenguie f., FDB, 20 (Rougham, 16 acres). Read: _cuenguie_.

So cancel note at NoB XXXIII, 79. OE _Cwngwih_ fem. (PNDB, 220; SMS, 87; Selten II, 57) was borne by a TRE tenant of the abbey, and evidently underlay the late-12th-cent. entry for Rori (gen.) f. _siæhæu_ (LDB, 14/117; cf. FDB, 16, KS, 4; see further _sub_ _Reeri_ below).

Panri, FDB, 33 (Woolpit, 14 acres). Read: _Tanri_.

John Inley, who has independently established this reading, suggests that it may represent CG _Thanhkar_ (Schlaug I, 82, II, 159).

Freber, FDB, 31 (Hessett, 16 acres); 35 (Timworth, 60 acres); Freber presbiter, 43 (Huntefelde, 5 acres).

For a possible OE *Fréobearne, see SMS, 92, also s.n. *Fréone, and Selten II, 83. For CG _Fredeburn_ and its appearances in England, see Schlaug I, 94, II, 87 (the name is not in Morlet or Fauroux) and PNDB, 233-4, esp. 254 n. 2.

Fredo et frateres sui, FDB, 27 (Pakenham, 19 acres jointly).

This name reappears in the late 12th cent., denoting several individuals, one of them at Pakenham (KS, 4, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, 52). Although there was a CG _Fredo_, short for names in _Frid_ - _Fridu_ (Marynissen, 118; Morlet I, 948), here this form might represent a reflex of Scand _Frith_ (SPLY, 87; ELPN, 76; Adigard, 204-6, classes it as ambivalently Scand/Frankish).

Fulcard, FDB, 26 (Barton, 15 acres); Fulcardus presbiter (de Bertonia), 134, 133 n.10, 135 (witness; 1121 x 1148, 1148 x 1156, 1156 x 1160); cf. Oberto (dat.) f. Fulcardi de Bertonia, KS, 94 (grantee; 1182 x 1200); see above also _sub_ _Baldwin_.

CG _Folcard, Fulcard_ (Schlaug I, 93, II, 84-5; TV, 43; Morlet I, 958), found in England, mainly as a moneyer's name, from mid 10th cent. on (Forssner, 98; PNWD, 256 and n.2 - all from Suffolk; FDB, 193-4; Smart, '973-1016', 234 - Norwich, 244 - Thetford, and Index, 36.).

Fulcher, FDB, 38 (Honington, 2 acres); 41 (Hopton, 6 acres); Fulcherius frater Godrici, 111; cf. Fulcherius frater Edrici, 110 n. 9 (witnesses, in lists otherwise similar; 1114 x 1119; FDB records an Edric and a Godric for Honington and a Godric for Hopton); cf. Godwine f. Fulcheri, KS, 51 (Hopton).

CG _Fulchare_ (Schlaug I, 93, II, 85; TV, 62; Morlet I, 958), seemingly hardly known in pre-Conquest England (not in Forssner; PNDB, 256 and n. 6; cf. PNWD, 157, and ELPN, 112-13), borne by two of the abbey's 1086 u-ts (LDB, 14/11, 78, 80 [Hopton]; 89, 99, 99, cf. FDB, 17-18; LDB, 14/22, cf. FDB, 21).

Gulif cum fratibus, FDB, 43 (Huntefelde, 30 acres jointly).

A Gallicized spelling either of the 10th-cent. 'English' _Wulf_, probably < the rare Scand _Uulf_ (not in NPN, SPLY or Adigard; see PNWD, 404-5 and n., with instances all from _EAnglia_), or of CG _Wigulf_ (Morlet I, 123b).

Godlef crepandre heistel, FDB, 28 (Barton, 4 acres); Godleof equarius, 32 (Woolpit, 4 acres); cf. Ulmer Rodollei f., 39 (Wattsfield, 14 acres).

Godleof(, found in England as a moneyer's name from late 10th cent. (Smart, '973-1016', 237, and Index, 38-9 - Stamford, Huntingdon, Thetford, London), is usually attributed, along with other masc. names in -leof(, to CG origins (_EENS_, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58; but cf. SMS, 93, 99, and esp. Selten II, 156, 185; whether Scand -leof( might be implicated seems unexplored).

Grimbald Ulurici f., FDB, 28 (Rougham, 5 acres); Godui Grimbaldi f., 25 (Barton, 7 acres); Lefaine Grimbaldi f., 28 (Rougham, 20 acres); cf. Grimbaldus presbiter, 151 (1066 x 1087).

CG _Grimbold_ (Schlaug I, 97; Morlet I, 1154), known in England from the early 10th cent. (Forssner, 130-1; PNDB, 275; PNWD, 160).

Hardein, FDB, 25 (Barton, 4 acres).

Either CG _Hardcin_ (Schlaug I, 106, II, 99; TV, 17; Morlet I, 124ab; cf. Forssner, 143, and PNDB, 186-7, with instances all from _EAnglia_ or OE _Heardein_ (Selten II, 95-6; in FDB, _Hardman_ (in the same list). A Hardwimun figures 1066 x 1087 among witnesses, otherwise all with Continental names, to a document for an u-t of the abbey called _Peter_ (FDB, 152).

Hared, FDB, 37 (Troston, 5 acres).

PNDB, 287 and n. 1, refers Hared, also from Suffolk, either to OE _Hered_ or to OE _Her(e)adur_(-)ed; other possible etyma include OE...
Heardrad (ELPN, 47), with assimilation and simplification of medial [rd], and OE Héardrad.

Hubert faber, FDB, 32 (Woolpit, 2 acres).

CG Hugbert (Schlaug I, 115, II, 116; TV, 77; Morlet I, 140a), probably unknown in pre-Conquest England (not in PNBD; cf. Forssner, 156, and PNWD, 162), was borne by a post-DB u-t of the abbey (FDB, 22; no corresponding entry in LDB).

Hugo, FDB, 30 (Wattsfield, 3 acres); Hugo Ælrici f. 44 (Littlechurch, 15 acres); cf. Hugo f. Alstani, 157 (witness; 1154).

Either CG Hugo (Schlaug I, 205, II, 117; TV, 124; Morlet I, 140a; cf. Forssner, 157–8, PNBD, 204, and PNWD, 162) or for ÆScand Hughe (cf. AS, 57). (The patronyms here represent respectively OE Ælfric and either OE Ælfstan or OE Ældæstan.)

Odin, FDB, 40 (Hopworth, 9 acres); 41 (Hopton, 4 acres); Ælfwine cum Odino, 41 (Coney Weston, 7 acres jointly); Odin crispi f., 40 (Hopworth, 1½ acres); Odin Mum, 42 (Hopton, 1 acre); cf. Æthelwardus f. Odin', 120 (witness; 1121 × 1148).

Either the CE diminutive Odin/Odinus (not in Marynissen; Morlet I, 45; Faourux, 523) or the ODan Othin < Aubrun found, e.g., as a York moneyer’s name (NPE, 100–3; ZEN, 66–7; PNBD, 170; Smart, Index, 16), the latter origin seeming consonant with its appearance as patronym to OE Æadun(eard). Yet, Æthunin(a), apparently the former's Gallicized reflex, later enjoys localized currencies including some of the same villa (KS, 45; Hopworth 2 × 47–8; Wattsfield, 3 or 4 × 4 [for Othia here, read Othinus]; cf. PNWD, 166–7 and nn. 9, 1, 2).

Odric Tederi, FDB, 26 (Barton, 3 acres).

Either OE Odris (PNBD, 366–7), with the first r lost by scribal error or by dissimilation, or else CG Odric < Aedric (Schlaug II, 137; Morlet I, 44b; cf. EENS, 55, and PNWD, 167, s.n. Oricus). The byname, if taken to represent an early OFR reflex of CG Theodric (see below; but Tengvall, 209, proposes OE Beodhere), would support the latter; but a byname is, in this text, normally used only with a baptismal name duplicated in the same vill, and an Odric Ucuthriche nepos occurs a few entries earlier.

Osbernus, FDB, 28 (Rougham, 5 acres); Osbern, 35 (Timworth, 7½ acres); Osbern cum fratre, 42 (Hopton, 6 acres); Osbern rusfa, 38 (Langham, 9 acres); Osbern cottanesse, 38 (Langham, 3 acres).

A classic case of multiple ambiguation — Anglo-Scand, Normanno-Scand, or OSeaxon: see J. Insley, in NoB LXX (1082), 27–93, esp. 79–81 and references there given. Here Anglo-Scand origins seem most likely.


The Biblical name (Morlet II, 90a), borne by three of the abbey’s feuda prinom: the steward, the brother of Burchard (q.v.), and the magnate Peter of Valognes (FDB, 18, 19, 23). (Hugenot may represent miscopying, not uncommon in KS, of Hugenot item.)

Rauf, FDB, 36 (Livemere, 7½ acres); Raoulus de Livemere, 36 (Timworth, 4 acres); Raoulus clericus, 35 (Rushbrooke, 2 acres).

Raulf < CG Radulf (Schlaug I, 138, 11, 143; Morlet I, 182b; Faourux, 539–50) was found in England as a mid-10th-cent. moneyer’s name (F&B, 189; Smart, Index, 62); its OFR reflex RAFulf, borne by the Confessor’s EAnglian staller (n. 37 above) and by a 1086 u-t of the abbey, was generally current in the district (LDB, 14/3, 53; cf. FDB, 18, 24, also index, 226; PNBD, 345, PNWD, 169, and ELPN, 91–2).

Reeri, FDB, 30 (Hessett, 48 acres); Rerius, 110 (witness; 1114 × 1119); Reri de Walnehmer, Fulco f. Reri, 119 (witnesses; 1121 × 1148); Symon f. Reri, 147 (tenant in Hessett ante 1156 × 1180; cf. KS, 11 n. 3), Willelm(m) (dat.) f. Rery de Hessee, KS, 99 (granite; 1182 × 1188), Reri (gen.) f. Æghe, 4 (Hessett), and Reri (gen.:) Brichthe, 4 (Hessett).

This name, well-attested though it is, has so far no established etymology. Cf. ‘Ad Bradefele tenet Rerius’ (FDB, 18), where LDB (14/59, also 79) has Roricus, a recognized reflex of CG Hrodiricus (Marynissen, 218; Morlet I, 138a, also 1914; cf. Forssner, 219). (Of the metronymys, Æghe, with an abbreviation-mark over the first element, represents OE æcgilfgu [see above] and Brichthe, OE Beorhtgifu [PNBD, 194].

Ricardus Vlifter f., FDB, 43 (Hunstredele, 60 acres).

CG/OFR Richard(ard) (TV, 34; Morlet I, 188–189a; Faourux, 532), sparsely attested in pre-Conquest England (Forssner, 213–14; PNBD, 149), was borne by two of the abbey’s 1086 u-t (LDB, 14/54, 151; cf. FDB, 10, 24). (The patronym represents OE Wulfegifu.)

Robertus, FDB, 26 (Barton, 19 acres); Robert, 28, Item Robert, 30 × (Rougham, 3, 1, 60 acres); Robert, 31 (Hessett, 25 acres); Lechum Boberto, 30 (Hessett, 40 acres jointly); Robert et Elicr, 35 (Rushbrooke, 16 acres jointly); Robert et Vistan, 39 (Walsham, 3 acres jointly); Robert, 44 (Littlechurch, 10 acres).

CG Hrothbirt and its OFR reflex (TV, 77; Morlet I, 138a; Faourux, 533–5) had been known in England as a moneyer’s name since the mid-10th cent. (F&B, 204; Smart, ‘107–1107’, 236, and Index, 64; Forssner, 216–17); all DB instances TRE refer, however, to Robert son of Wymarc (PNBD, 349–50). For Robert Blund as u-t of the abbey, see LDB, 14/92 (cf. FDB, 21–2).

Rusel, FDB, 43 (Huntfeldle, 1 acre).

An ORR name based on the adj. ro(u)sel, diminutive of ro(u)s ‘red-haired;’ seemingly unknown in pre-Conquest England, but attested by 1086 (LDB Essex, B3 [Colchester]; cf. PNWD, 215, referring to a tenant in Winchester ante 1110).
Salomon, FDB, 28 (Rougham, 7½ acres); 43 (Littlechurch, 6 acres); Salomon, 119, and Salamon clericus, 121 (witnesses; 1121 × 1148); Salomonis (gen.) clerici; de Rucham, 131, and Salomonis (gen.), 132 (uncle of Herbert son of Robert, kinsman of Abbot Ording of Bury; 1148 × 1156; cf. KS, 18 n. 2).

The Biblical name (Morlet II, 101b; Fauroux, 538), found only once in DB TRE (PNDB, 351; cf. ELPN, 94).

Æblmer et Sebode, FDB, 39 (Walsham, 1 acre jointly).
CG Sighbodo > Seibodo (Schlaug I, 148, II, 151; Morlet I, 197b), found in England in the early 11th cent. as the moneyer’s name Siboda (Forssner, 225; Smart, ‘973–1016’, 270, and Index, 67; see further ELPN, 61).

Tedricus Paue f., FDB, 43 (Cosford, 5 acres); cf. perhaps, as above, Odric Tederi, 26 (Barton, 3 acres).
Although a native OE *Tedric is possible (ELPN, 66, cf. 2; Seltén II, 160), the widespread CG *Theodric may seem more likely here (Schlaug I, 85, II, 163; TV, 116; Morlet I, 66b–70a; Fauroux, 549; cf. Forssner, 231–3, Smart, Index, 71, PNDB, 383–4, and PNWD, 174).
(For the patronymic Paue, see n. 27 above.)

Godwine Thede f., FDB, 25 (Barton, 10 acres).
The patronym probably represents an OE short-form *Þêode (NoB XXXIII, 90; also F&B, 204 n. 1; an OE *Þêode fem, is formally possible, but see n. 34 above; for the well-attested CG *Theodun/Thiedo and corresponding fem. forms, see Schlaug I, 187, II, 164, Marynissen, 93–4, TV, 139, and Morlet I, 71a). 

Titebud, FDB, 35 (Rushbrooke, 1 acre).
CG *Teodobodo/Teutbodus (Morlet I, 67b, showing also variants in Ti(o) for other Teod- compounds; cf. Theuturus; TV, 78).

Ulbern, FDB, 38 (Honington, 1 acre).
Because four of the eleven Honington names are Scand. and, because, as a moneyer’s name, Wulfern/Ulfborn seems peculiar to Lincoln, the rare ODan Ulfþorn (SPLY, 324–5, followed by Smart, Index, 74) seems the likeliest etymon (for the better-attested CG Wulfbern, see Schlaug I, 166, and cf. EENS, 54).

Walter, FDB, 37 (Treston, 1 acre).
CG Waldhere (Schlaug I, 153, II, 168; Morlet I, 213ab; Fauroux, 556–7), little known in pre-Conquest England (Forssner, 243–4; PNDB, 409; PNWD, 167), was borne by a 1086 u-t of the abbey (LDB, 14/23, 87; cf. FDB, 20).

Warin, FDB, 31 (Hessett, 2 acres).
CG/Warín/Warin (Marynissen, 234–5; TV, 26; Morlet I, 219b; Fauroux, 505), found in England as a mid-10th-cent. moneyer’s name (Smart, Index, 76) but not in DB TRE (cf. Forssner, 246–7, and PNWD, 176), was borne by a 1086 u-t of the abbey (LDB, 14/15, 66; cf. FDB, 19).

Willelmus cum fratre suo Ælfrine, FDB, 38 (Langham, 4½ acres jointly); Willelmus f. Ailbald, 109 &c. (witness; 1112–1148 × 1153; and grantee; 1135 × 1148).
CG Wilheilm (Schlaug I, 162–4, II, 179; TV, 80; Morlet I, 2258; Fauroux, 558–60), little known in pre-Conquest England (PNDB, 415), soon spread rapidly (Forssner, 255–7; PNWD, 177; cf. above 8–9 and nn. 9–11). (For the patronym < OE Ælfrǣlæld, see Seltén II, 25–6.)