*Some Welshmen in Domesday Book and Beyond:
Aspects of Anglo-Welsh Relations
in the Eleventh Century*

DAVID E. THORNTON

WHEREAS the importance for the study of eleventh-century English history of William the Conqueror's great land survey known, since the twelfth century, as 'Domesday Book' hardly needs stating, its value as a source for the history of Wales during the same period is perhaps less self-evident.¹ True, Welsh historians from Sir John Lloyd onwards have drawn on the survey for their historical reconstructions, but most of these studies have tended to 'sample' Domesday Book in order to supplement information drawn from their other – main – primary sources. While there are notable exceptions to this rule, a thorough analysis of Wales and Welshmen in Domesday Book *per se* remains to be undertaken.² My purpose in the present paper is to make a contribution towards redressing this historiographical deficiency,³ by offering a prosopographical analysis of the Welsh individuals who occur in Domesday Book and especially those who occur before the Norman Conquest – that is, *tempore regis Edwardi*, or TRE as it is usually indicated in the text itself. The starting point is the data presented in Table 12.1 below: that is, a total of seventy-nine entries

¹ In this paper I shall cite Domesday Book from Farley's edition, which employs the folios of the original manuscripts: *Domesday Book seu Liber Censualis Willelmi Primi Regis Angliae*, ed. Abraham Farley, 2 vols. (London, 1783), hereafter DB. Farley's text is most readily available in the so-called 'Phillimore' edition and translation, which also uses a more specific means of locating entries: *Domesday Book. A Survey of the Counties of England*, gen. ed. John Morris, 35 vols. in 40 (Chichester, 1975–86). Pending a full scholarly response by historians to David Roffe's reassessment of the position and date of Domesday Book in his *Domesday: The Inquest and the Book* (Oxford, 2000), I shall follow here the more traditional interpretation of the relationship between William I and Great and Little Domesday Books.

² A volume of articles on Welsh history and Domesday Book by various specialists in the field is currently under proposal: *Domesday Book and Wales: Anglo-Saxons, Anglo-Normans and the Welsh in the Eleventh Century*, ed. David E. Thornton (forthcoming). For a cartographic depiction of Wales according to Domesday Book, see Illus. 12.1 below.

³ A companion piece, provisionally entitled 'More Welshmen in Domesday Book and Beyond: The Welsh and the Norman Conquest', is expected to appear in *Domesday Book and Wales*, ed. Thornton.

from Domesday Book (both TRE and for 1086) which may be considered in some way to refer to Welshmen. The criteria for compiling this list are onomastic and geographical, though as might be expected neither is straightforward and both require some preliminary comment.

There are three main categories of Welsh personal names in Domesday Book.⁴ Firstly come those which, judging from the Domesday form, would appear to be linguistically or etymologically Brittonic: these are explained more clearly in Table 12.2 below. Obviously, the Welsh were not the only 'Britons' to occur in Domesday Book, so it is necessary to weed out any occurrences of Cornish or Breton personal names – though one would expect the former to be limited mostly to the West Country and the latter to occur mostly in 1086. Secondly, Table 12.2 lists a number of strange or 'corrupt' onomastic forms which, given their geographical location, may represent Welsh names. In addition to commonly attested forms such as *Grifin* for Gruffudd and *Mariadoc* for Maredudd, there are other names which require some degree of correction, such as *Elmui* for Old Welsh (OW) *Elinui* where a Domesday scribe has apparently confused his minims, or *Saisi* for OW *Saissil*, now Seisyll.⁵ More difficult forms include *Costelin* and *Taldus*, both names of TRE tenants in Archenfield where genuine Welsh names are attested,⁶ or the Gloucester Domesday name *Ouus*, which is usually taken to represent a form of Welsh *Owain*, though it could perhaps be a corruption of *Nouis*, now Nowy.⁷ Similar problems of interpretation arise for the forms *Genut*, *Genust* and *Gethne*, which probably all refer to the same TRE tenant in Shropshire.⁸ Such erroneous and strange forms should be understood in the context of the development of the Domesday manuscripts themselves. Scholars no longer regard the main scribe of Greater Domesday Book, which concerns us here, as an Anglo-Norman who 'Normanized' Old English names but rather as a native Englishman whose aim was to Latinize the orthography of personal and place-names, while also occasionally 'correcting' some extreme instances of 'Normanized' name forms.⁹ Before him, however, was a less clearly

⁴ For the study of Domesday anthroponomy, Olof von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book* (Uppsala, 1937) remains a useful, if dated, starting point. See also, K. S. B. Keats-Rohan and David E. Thornton, *Domesday Names. An Index of Latin Personal and Place Names in Domesday Book* (Woodbridge, 1997), and K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, *Domesday People. A Prosopography of Persons occurring in English Documents, 1066–1166. 1: Domesday Book* (Woodbridge, 1999).

⁵ For *Elmui* see Wendy Davies, *The Llandaff Charters* (Aberystwyth, 1979), p. 162; A. G. Williams, 'Norman Lordship in South-East Wales during the Reign of William I', *Welsh History Review* 16 (1992–3), 445–66, at p. 450. For *Saisi* von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 351; note also the form *Aisil*.

⁶ On which, see below, p. 163.

⁷ Williams, 'Norman Lordship in South-East Wales', p. 463.

⁸ von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, pp. 259–60.

⁹ Alexander R. Rumble, 'The Palaeography of the Domesday Manuscripts', in *Domesday Book. A Reassessment*, ed. Peter Sawyer (London, 1985), pp. 28–49, at pp. 45–9; *idem*, 'The Domesday Manuscripts: Scribes and Scriptoria', in *Domesday Studies. Papers Read at the Novocentenary Conference of the Royal Historical Society and the Institute of British Geographers, Winchester, 1986*, ed. J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 79–99, at p. 84; Cecily Clark, 'Domesday Book – A Great Red-Herring: Thoughts on Some Late Eleventh-

Table 12.1: Welshmen in Domesday Book

<i>DB Form</i>	<i>ID</i>	<i>Farley</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>
Aisil (?)		259c	Salop	1066	Brockton (Wrockwardine)
Aisil (?)		257a	Salop	1066	Brockton (Wrockwardine)
Aluric Mapesone		176c	Worcs	1066	Droitwich (Clent)
Beluard de Caruen (?)		162b	Glouc	1086	W:
Berdic jocularis regis	Berddig Gwent	162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Blein	Bleddyn ap Cynfyn	181a	Heref	1066+	(narrative: Archenfield)
Bleio (prepositus)		162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Cadiand (<i>Cadian</i>)	Cadien Ddu	181a	Heref	1066	Kilpeck (Archenfield)
Caraduech regem	Caradog ap Gruffudd	162a	Glouc	1086-	W: (narrative)
Chenesis (?)		162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Costelin (?)	(Custennin ap Cadien)	181a	Heref	1066	Birch (Archenfield)
Eduinus	(Edwin of Tegeingl)	268d	Chesh	1066–86	W: Coleshill (Atiscross)
Eduinus (?)	(Edwin of Tegeingl)	268d	Chesh	1066	W: Castretone (Atiscross)
Eduinus (?)	(Edwin of Tegeingl)	268d	Chesh	1066	W: Aston (Atiscross)
Eduinus (?)	(Edwin of Tegeingl) (?)	267a	Chesh	1066	W: Hope (Exestan)
Eli		264c	Chesh	1066–86	Crewe Hall (Broxton)
Elmui (prepositus)	Elynwy ab Idnerth	162a	Glouc	1086	W:
filius Wasuuc	Gwasfwyth, son of	162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Genust (?)		258c	Salop	1066	Holdgate (Patton)
Genut (?)		258c	Salop	1066	Uffington (Wrockwardine)
Gethne (?)		258c	Salop	1066	Bosle (Alnothstree)
Godric Mapesone		181a	Heref	1086	Goodrich (Archenfield)
Grifin		246d	Staff	1066	Biddulph (Pirehill)
Grifin		267b	Chesh	1066	Newton (Northwich)
Grifin	(Gruffudd ap Maredudd)	184d	Heref	1086	Kings Pyon (Stretford N)
Grifin	(Gruffudd ap Maredudd) ¹	180c	Heref	1086	<i>Le Oake</i> ² (Leominster)
Grifin	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	179b	Heref	1086	(list)

Grifin		266b	Chesh	1066	Weston (Bucklow West)
Grifin (filius Mariadoc regis)	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187a	Heref	1086	Kenchester (Staple)
Grifin [puer]	(Gruffudd ap Maredudd) ¹	180c	Heref	1086	<i>Le Oake</i> (Leominster)
Grifin filii Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	(heading)
Grifin puer	(Gruffudd ap Maredudd) ¹	180c	Heref	1086	<i>Le Oake</i> (Leominster)
Grifin regis	(Gruffudd ap Llywelyn)	162a	Glouc	1066+	W:
Grifin rex	Gruffudd ap Llywelyn	181a	Heref	1066–	(narrative: Archenfield)
Grifin, Aldgid uxor	Gruffudd ap Llywelyn	238d	Warw	1066	Binley (Stoneleigh)
Grifin, rex	(Gruffudd ap Llywelyn)	269b	Chesh	1086–	W: Bistre (Atiscross)
Grifini	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	183d	Heref	1086	Lye (Hazeltree)
Grifino, regi; Grifin	Gruffudd ap Llywelyn	263a	Chesh	1066–	W: land beyond river Dee
Grifinus	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187a	Heref	1086	Kenchester (Staple)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	<i>Mateurdin</i> (Elsdon)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	Bunshill (Staple)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	Mansell Lacy (Staple)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	Mansell Lacy (Staple)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	Stoke Bliss (Plegelgate)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	Lye (Hazeltree)
Grifinus filius Mariadoc	Gruffudd ap Maredudd	187c	Heref	1086	<i>Curdeslege</i> (Elsdon)
Idhel (prepositus)	Ithel ap Tewdws	162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Iwardus (?)		259d	Salop	1086	Newetone (Merset)
Madoc	(Madog ab Bleddyn)	259d	Salop	1086	<i>Halston</i> and <i>Burtone</i> (Merset)
Madoc		187c	Heref	1086	Ashperton (Radlow)
Madoch		170d	Glouc	1066–86	Rudford (Botloe)
Madoch		179b	Heref	1086	(list)
Marcud	Marchudd ap Cynan	269a	Chesh	1086	W: Axton and Gellilyfdy (Atiscross)
Mariadoc regi	Maredudd ab Owain	187a	Heref	1066+	Kenchester (Staple)
Mariadoc regi	Maredudd ab Owain	187c	Heref	1066+	<i>Mateurdin</i> (Elsdon)
Mariadoc regi	Maredudd ab Owain	187c	Heref	1066+	Lye (Hazeltree)
Mereuin (?) teinus com' Odonis		184c	Heref	1066	Mathon (Worcs)
Mereuuin (?)		181a	Heref	1066	Baysham (Archenfield)

Morganau		167c	Glouc	1066	English Bicknor (Westbury)
Noui (<i>Nouis</i>)		181a	Heref	1066–86	<i>Penebecdoc</i> (Archenfield)
Ouen (<i>Owein</i>)	Owain ab Edwin	187c	Heref	1066	Lye (Hazeltree)
Ouin		265c	Chesh	1066	Basford (Nantwich)
Ouine (?)		276b	Derby	1066	Bradwell (High Peak)
Ouinus		265d	Chesh	1066	Austerton (Nantwich)
Ouinus (?)		105b	Essex	1086	Colchester
Ouus prepositus regis		162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Rees	Rhys Sais	267c	Chesh	1066	W: Erbistock (Exestan)
Reuer (?)		186c	Heref	1066	Litley (Cutsthorpe)
Reuer (?)		186b	Heref	1066	Bullinghope (Dinedor)
Riset de Wales	Rhys ap Tewdwr	179b	Heref	1086	W: (payment)
Ruillio (?)		183d	Heref	1066	Birley (Stretford)
Saisi		186d	Heref	1066	Lyde (Cutsthorpe)
Saissil		186d	Heref	1066	Staunton on Arrow (Staple)
Taldus (?)	(Tewdws ap Marchci)	181a	Heref	1066	Goodrich (Archenfield)
Tuder quidam Walensis	Tudur ap Rhys Sais	253c	Salop	1086	W: (one district of Welsh land)
Wasuic prepositus	Gwasfwyth	162a	Glouc	1086	W:
Werestan (?) ³		181a	Heref	1086	(Harewood): Archenfield
Wonni (?)		184a	Heref	1066	Maund (Thornlaw)

¹ This identification is strengthened by the fact that a later, marginal note in the 'Herefordshire Domesday' names the holder of this manor as William de Blez, who was also to hold some of Gruffudd ap Maredudd's other lands.

² Coplestone-Crow has identified *Alac* with 'Le Oake' in Knoakes Court: *Herefordshire Place-Names*, p. 125.

³ This is evidently OE Wærstān, but is included here because of its Archenfield location and because the name was borrowed into Welsh as *Gwerystan*.

understood process of oral and written transmission by the agency of men of various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, which has resulted in an extant text containing up to forty different types of mistakes when representing onomastic data.¹⁰ Much of the discussion of these issues has inevitably focussed on the fate of English and Continental names at the hands of the main Domesday scribe and his predecessors; for present purposes it should be stated that the fate of the rarer and less familiar Celtic names in Domesday Book was no doubt even more problematic.

Thirdly, it is also necessary to mention a number of uncertain or ambiguous personal names: these include, on the one hand, linguistically English names which had been borrowed by the Welsh before or by the eleventh century; and, on the other hand, Domesday forms which may be understood to derive from either Welsh or English names. The most common English onomastic borrowing into Welsh in this period was probably Edwin (OE *Eadwine*), which is attested as early as the ninth century.¹¹ Other possible such 'loan names' to be found in Welsh sources include Welsh *Elystan* (from OE *Æthelstān*), *Gwerystan* (OE *Wærstān*), *Edryd* (OE *Eadred*) and *Uchdryd* (OE *Uthræd*),¹² though all of these occur less frequently in Welsh sources than Edwin. Such names may therefore be considered socio-linguistically Welsh, despite their Insular Germanic origin, and so it is not impossible that such apparently English forms in Domesday Book may in fact conceal a Welshman. Here it should be emphasized that the etymology of a personal name need not necessarily be indicative of the ethnicity or descent of its bearer.¹³ In addition there are a number of Domesday name forms which are open to either English or Welsh interpretation: for example, the form *Mereuwin* (in Archenfield) and maybe *Mereuin* (Worcs.) could reflect OE *Merewine* (like

Century Orthographies', in *England in the Eleventh Century. Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 2 (Stamford, 1992), pp. 317–31, repr. in *Words, Names, and History. Selected Writings of Cecily Clark*, ed. Peter Jackson (Cambridge and Rochester, NY, 1995), pp. 156–67, at p. 159.

¹⁰ J. McN. Dodgson, 'Domesday Book: Place-Names and Personal Names', in *Domesday Studies*, ed. Holt, pp. 121–37; and *idem*, 'Some Domesday Personal Names, Mainly Post-Conquest', *Nomina* 9 (1985), 41–51.

¹¹ David E. Thornton, 'Predatory Nomenclature and Dynastic Expansion in Early Medieval Wales', *Medieval Prosopography* 20 (1999), 1–22, at p. 13; David N. Dumville, 'The Historical Value of the *Historia Brittonum*', *Arthurian Literature* 6 (1986), 1–26, at p. 25.

¹² For example, see *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts*, ed. P. C. Bartum (Cardiff, 1966), pp. 185, 187, 193; C. A. Ralegh Radford and W. J. Hemp, 'The Cross-Slab at Llanrhaiadr-ym-Mochnant', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 106 (1957), 109–16.

¹³ For example, on the ethnic ambiguity of Scandinavian personal names in Anglo-Saxon England, see Cecily Clark, 'English Personal Names ca. 650–1300: Some Prosopographical Bearings', *Medieval Prosopography* 8/1 (1987), 31–60, at pp. 31–60; C. P. Lewis, 'Joining the Dots: A Methodology for Identifying the English in Domesday Book', in *Family Trees and the Roots of Politics. The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 69–87, at pp. 77–9; Dawn Hadley, '"Cockles amongst the Wheat": The Scandinavian Settlement of England', in *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. William O. Frazer and Andrew Tyrrell (London, 2000), pp. 111–35, at pp. 127–8.

similar forms in Cambs., Surrey and Yorks.)¹⁴ but, as they occur on the Welsh border, could equally reflect OW *Mermin*, later *Meruin*, now Merfyn. Similarly, the Derbyshire form *Ouuine* and Essex *Ouuinus* probably reflect the rare OE name *Ōwine*, not Welsh *Owain*, but what about similar forms in the Welsh March?

Clearly then, personal names alone are not always sufficient to determine Welshness in Domesday Book, and to some extent the geographical location of the relevant tenant must also be taken into account. The basic principle here is that someone who held land in Wales *may* have been Welsh himself. The main problem is how to define Wales: should we use the current administrative boundaries or attempt to define Wales according to the rather more fluid criteria of the eleventh century or even of Domesday Book itself.¹⁵ The latter approach would omit much of the present-day Welsh counties of Flintshire and Wrexham, which were parts of the Cheshire hundreds of Atiscross and Exestan in 1086. Gloucestershire Domesday includes an introductory section before the main list of tenants-in-chief which specifically refers to a series of manors and other lands in modern Monmouthshire as *in Wales sunt*. There is a far higher proportion of Welsh personal names among the tenants of these lands than among those in Atiscross and Exestan. In contrast, in the Domesday description of Archenfield, which was roughly equivalent to the old Welsh kingdom of Ergyng but possibly under English rule for as long as Atiscross and Exestan, and still part of Herefordshire today,¹⁶ there are a significant number of TRE tenants with etymologically Welsh names; and Domesday Book refers more than once to *Walenses* and contains a separate description of the *consuetudines* of the Welshmen in Archenfield. In the light of these brief comments, I shall attempt to be as inclusive as possible when defining Wales as a criterion for Welshness.

Accordingly, Table 12.1 lists Domesday tenants who may be defined as Welshmen because they bore a linguistically Welsh personal name and held land in Wales or on the English side of the Welsh border; or, who held land in Wales – maximally defined – but bore an English name known to have been borrowed by the Welsh; or, thirdly, who held land in Wales and bore a corrupt or ambiguous name form in Domesday Book which could be interpreted as Welsh. Obviously, this is a rather simplified pattern and assumes that Welsh and English were mutually exclusive groups, instead of accounting for the possibility of inter-marriage and mixed demography along either side of the shifting border: for instance, if an English name, like Edwin, could be borne by someone who considered himself

¹⁴ DB, I, ff. 35c, 194c, 322d. Note also instances in Warwickshire: *ibid.*, ff. 240b, 244a.

¹⁵ On the problem of defining Wales, and especially its eastern boundaries, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, see R. R. Davies, *Conquest, Coexistence, and Change: Wales 1063–1415* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 3–7; also more briefly, *idem*, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100–1400: II. Names, Boundaries and Regnal Solidarities', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series 5 (1995), 1–20, at pp. 17–18; and most recently, Huw Pryce, 'British or Welsh? National Identity in Twelfth-Century Wales', *EHR* 116 (2001), 775–801, at pp. 776–7.

¹⁶ Margaret Gelling, *The West Midlands in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester, 1992), pp. 114–18; Bruce Coplestone-Crow, *Herefordshire Place-Names*, BAR, BS 214 (Oxford, 1989), pp. 2–5.

12.1 Domesday Wales (based on H. C. Darby, 'Domesday: 1086–1836–1986', National Library of Wales Journal 25/1 (1987–8), 1–17, fig. 8 at p. 15

Welsh, it is not impossible – though less likely – for an Anglo-Saxon in the 'March' to bear a Welsh name.

Table 12.1 contains 79 so-called 'Welsh' entries, of which most (73) refer to property- or land-holding, and the remaining 6 may be loosely described as 'narrative'.¹⁷ As might be expected, the vast majority of these Welsh entries (74) occur in the Domesday accounts of the four English border-counties of Cheshire, Shropshire, Herefordshire and Gloucestershire, with one entry apiece for other

¹⁷ 'Narrative' here includes references such as that to the devastation caused by kings Grufudd ap Llywelyn and Bleddyn ap Cynfyn in Archenfield before 1066: DB, I, f. 181a.

Table 12.2: Welsh (and possible Welsh) Names in Domesday Book

<i>DB Form</i>	<i>OW Form(s)</i>	<i>Mod Welsh Form</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Aisil		Seisyll (?)	OE Æthelsige (?) ¹
Berdic	Berdic	Berddig	
Blein	Bledgint	Bleddyn	
Bleio	Bledgint (?)	Bleddyn (?)	
Cadiand	Catgen	Cadien	
Caraduech	Caratauc	Caradog	
Chenesis			OE Cynesige (?)
Costelin	Custennhinn	Custennin (?)	
Eli	Eli	Eli	but cf OE Eli (?)
Elmui	Elinui	Elynwy	
Genust			Cwnws (?)
Genut			Cwnws (?)
Gethne			
Grifin(us)	Gripuid, Grifud	Gruffudd	
Idhel	Iudhail	Ithel	
Iwardus			ON Ivarr (?); cf Staffs. DB <i>Iuuar</i>
Madoc	Matauc, Madoc	Madog	
Madoch	Matauc, Madoc	Madog	
Marcud	Marchiud	Marchudd	
Mariadoc	Margetiut, Margetud	Maredudd	
Mereuin	Meruin (?)	Merfyn (?)	OE Merewine (?)
Mereuain	Meruin (?)	Merfyn (?)	OE Merewine (?)
Morganau	Morcenou	Morgeneu	
Noui	Nougoy, Nougui	Nowy	
Ouen	Ouein	Owain	
Ouin	Ouein	Owain	
Ouaine		Owain (?)	OE Æwine (?)
Ouainus	Ouein	Owain	OE Æwine (?)
Ouus		Owain (?)	OW Noui, Nouis (?)
Rees	Ris	Rhys	
Reuer ²			
Riset ³	Ris	Rhys	
Ruillic ⁴	Riguallaun Riuguallaun	Rhiwallon (?)	
Saisi	Seissil, Seisill	Seisyll	
Saissil	Seissil, Seisill	Seisyll	
Taldus	Teudus	Tewdws	
Tuder	Teudebur, Teudur	Tudur, Tewdwr	
Wasuic	Guasfuith	Gwasfwyth	
Wonni			OE Wunnig (?)

¹ von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 142.

² von Feilitzen suggested that this name was based on Welsh *rhew*, 'frost, ice': *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 348. I assume some kind of error is at play here, though the name does occur twice in Domesday Book with the same form.

³ This strange form has been explained as containing the OF diminutive suffix *-et*: *Domesday Book: 17 Herefordshire*, ed. and trans. Thorn, n. A10. But cf. the form *Risen* in Orderic Vitalis.

⁴ von Feilitzen thought that this is an OW name: *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 350. My own derivation above assumes the miscopying of a form like **Riullio*.

Midlands counties: Warwickshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire. In addition I have also included one entry from Domesday Essex and one from Derbyshire, though both of these are onomastically 'ambiguous'. Of this total of 79 entries, 50% (=39) occur in the Herefordshire survey alone, but it should be emphasized that about half of these Herefordshire entries are accounted for as part of the holding of the 1086 Welsh tenant-in-chief Gruffudd ap Maredudd, and the description of Archenfield covers a significant part of the remainder. Next we have 13 'Welsh' entries in Cheshire, 14 in Gloucestershire and lastly, Shropshire, with 8 entries.

About half of the 79 Welsh entries (again, 39) refer to pre-Conquest individuals, though 4 of these still held land in 1086. However, maybe as many as 17 of these 39 pre-Conquest entries are what I have referred to above as ambiguous or uncertain, which accounts for almost 75% of all the uncertain entries in the whole table. In terms of individual counties, the Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Domesday surveys contain more 1086 than TRE entries, again, partly due to the holding of Gruffudd ap Maredudd and also the 'Monmouthshire section' in Gloucestershire. On the other hand, Cheshire and Shropshire name more pre-Conquest than 1086 tenants who may have been Welsh, though for Shropshire all the 1066 Welsh entries are 'ambiguous'. Lastly, it is worth pointing out that only 22 (that is, just over a quarter) of these so-called Welsh entries in Domesday Book refer to landholding or narrative activity in what is *now* Wales, mostly Flintshire in Cheshire, and Monmouthshire in Gloucestershire, with the remainder relating to England. To this could be added the nine 'Welsh' entries relating to Archenfield.

Of course, these 79 Welsh entries in Table 12.1 need not all refer to different men: for example, the tenant-in-chief Gruffudd ap Maredudd occurs 9 times with reference to his Herefordshire holding (no. 31) and may occur up to 7 more times in the same county.¹⁸ In fact, I would estimate that Table 12.1 perhaps accounts for about 40 or more different Welshmen. About half of these are attested uniquely in Domesday Book, but others may be found in other sources relating to eleventh-century Wales. I have indicated possible identifications in the second field of Table 12.1 called *ID*: here, identifications which are given in parentheses are less certain than those unbracketed. Accordingly, from the 79 entries I have made 32 fairly certain identifications plus an additional 13 less certain, currently totalling 45; these identifications account for 20 different individuals. The process of identification is initially an onomastic one. The Welshmen in Domesday Book, and especially the pre-Conquest ones, like their Anglo-Saxon counterparts are only recorded using a single forename. For the post-Conquest Welsh entries, we have a little more help, such as the 'bynames' *de Wales* and *Walensis*; 1 nickname (*puer*), 1 Welsh patronym in Latin (*filius Mariadoc*), plus 2 instances of the English patronym (or maybe surname?) *Mapesone*.¹⁹

In order to illustrate some of the general points outlined above and to indicate

¹⁸ See below, pp. 157–60.

¹⁹ The name *Mapesone* has been included as it probably contains the OW word *map*, later *ap*, meaning 'son'.

the value of Domesday Book as a source for Welsh history, the remainder of this paper will comprise three case studies, drawing where possible upon material 'beyond' the Domesday survey. The first case study is from the Cheshire lands held of Earl Hugh by Reginald Balliol: 'Isdem Rainaldus tenet ERPESTOCH. Rees tenuit sicut liber homo'.²⁰ The manor of *Erpestock* in Exestan hundred has been identified with Erbistock in the Welsh cantref of Maelor Gymraeg, later Bromfield (now the unitary authority of Wrexham). The form *Rees* suggests the modern Welsh personal name Rhys, OW *Ris*.²¹

This particular *Rees* has been identified by various scholars with Rhys Sais, that is, Rhys the Englishman.²² Rhys Sais ab Ednyfed occurs as ancestor of various Maelor families in later genealogies, which would place him in the right region, though he was also claimed as ancestor by Flintshire and Shropshire families.²³ Furthermore, the vernacular chronicles refer to the killing of Gwrgeneu ap Seisyll by 'the sons of Rhys Sais' in the year 1081; this date would certainly allow their father to have lived around 1066.²⁴ In addition the 'Second Extent of Bromfield and Yale' (1391) refers to the progeny of one *Rees* holding lands in various parts of Bromfield as 'coparceners' of the earl of Surrey, and some have accordingly identified their ancestor with our Domesday namesake.²⁵ This accumulation of onomastic, geographical and chronological material would mean that it is at least

²⁰ 'The same Reginald holds Erbistock. Rhys held it as a free man': DB, I, f. 267c.

²¹ von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 348.

²² A. N. Palmer and Edward Owen, *A History of the Ancient Tenures of Land in North Wales and the Marches* (Wrexham, 1885; rev. edn, Frome, 1910), p. 147; A. N. Palmer, 'Notes on the Early History of Bangor is y Coed', *Y Cymmrodor* 10 (1889), 12–28, at pp. 24–6; T. P. Ellis, *The First Extent of Bromfield and Yale, 1315*, Cymmrodorion Record Series 11 (London, 1924), p. 14; For a slightly more cautious approach, see P. C. Bartrum, 'Hen Lwythau Gwynedd a'r Mars', *National Library of Wales Journal* 12/3 (1962), 201–35, at p. 228; also, G. R. J. Jones, 'The Tribal System in Wales: A Re-assessment in the Light of Settlement Studies', *Welsh History Review* 1/2 (1961), 111–32, at p. 129. More recently, see Frederick Suppe, 'Roger of Powys, Henry II's Anglo-Welsh Middleman, and his Lineage', *Welsh History Review* 21/1 (2002), 1–23; and *idem*, 'Who Was Rhys Sais? Some Comments on Anglo-Welsh Relations before 1066', *Haskins Society Journal* 7 (1995), 63–73.

²³ P. C. Bartrum, 'Hen Lwythau Gwynedd a'r Mars', *National Library of Wales Journal* 12/3 (1962), 201–35: §§ 2(d), 12(a); Lewys Dwnn, *Heraldic Visitations of Wales and Part of the Marches*, ed. S. R. Meyrick, 2 vols. (Llandovery, 1846), I.324, II.295, 307, 313, 325, 327, 349, 357, 360, 362; 'Llyfr Silin yn Cynnwys Achau Amryw Deuluoedd yn Ngwynedd, Powys, etc.', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th series 5 (1888), 42–56, 105–21, 331–44, at p. 342, and 6 (1889), 148–63, 233–49, 327–42, at pp. 148–9, 151, 159, 241. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth 127, p. 108, Pen. 128, p. 69, Pen. 129, p. 44, Pen. 130, p. 98, Llanstephan 157, p. 25, and Llanwrin 1, p. 90; BL, Harley 4181, ff. 146–9, 156–60.

²⁴ *Brut y Tywysogyon or The Chronicle of the Princes. Peniarth MS. 20 Version*, trans. Thomas Jones (Cardiff, 1952), p. 17; *Brut y Tywysogyon or The Chronicle of the Princes. Red Book of Hergest Version*, ed. and trans. Jones (Cardiff, 1973), pp. 30–1; *Brenhinedd y Saesson or The Kings of the Saxons. BM Cotton MS. Cleopatra B.v and The Black Book of Basingwerk NLW MS. 7006*, ed. and trans. Jones (Cardiff, 1971), pp. 80–1.

²⁵ This Second Extent is as yet unpublished; the relevant passage is cited in R. R. Davies, *Lordship and Society in the March of Wales 1282–1400* (Oxford, 1978), p. 359, see also pp. 361–2. Compare also the comments on the lineage of Elidir ap Rhys, including the suggestion that it originated in Trefydd Bychain, by Ellis, *First Extent*, pp. 15, 58–60, 126–30; and G. R. J. Jones, 'Rural Settlement: Wales', *Advancement of Science* 15 (1959), 338–42.

not impossible that the Domesday *Rees* was the same man as Rhys Sais. What light the Welsh material casts on the single Domesday reference is rather more problematic, however.

Firstly, it should be stated that the reliability and authenticity of the Welsh annalistic and genealogical references to Rhys Sais are not wholly certain. The attribution of the killing of Gwrgeneu ap Seisyll to Rhys's sons only occurs in the three vernacular chronicles, and the event itself only occurs, without mention of Rhys's sons, in one of the two relevant Latin chronicles – that being the one most closely related to the three Welsh-language texts. Therefore, it is by no means clear whether this killing was recorded contemporaneously in the original annals kept at St David's, or whether it is one of many additions made at the end of the thirteenth century. More significantly, the earliest genealogies to mention Rhys Sais may derive from a tract of the fifteenth century but are preserved in later manuscripts. Of course, that in itself need not pose a big problem, but full analysis of the genealogical schemes relating to Rhys suggests that previous historians have been too ready to accept the relevant pedigrees at face value; in particular, the alleged descent of Roger de Powis (henchman of Henry II in Shropshire and the Welsh border) from Tudur son of Rhys Sais should probably be rejected.²⁶ The relevant pedigrees appear to have formed part of a wider genealogical scheme to link Roger and other Anglo-Normans of the March – notably *Gwilym Befyr*, that is William Peverell,²⁷ and *Ffwc ap Gwaring*, Fulk FitzWarin – to an 'appropriate' Welsh ancestor, and thereby to provide the later gentry families with an interesting and mixed ancestry. The Welsh and Anglo-Norman versions of Roger's genealogy have been set out separately as *Illus. 12.2*. All that this may really tell us is that by the late Middle Ages the figure of Rhys Sais was regarded as having been relatively significant along the Welsh-Shropshire border region in the eleventh century. Any conclusions regarding his descendants and, for that matter, his own ancestry as described in the surviving pedigrees should perhaps be treated as dubious, to say the least.

Where does this leave poor Rhys? In terms of his own genealogical origins, the genealogies – if they are to be trusted at all – do not connect him with any existing Welsh royal lineages but rather trace his descent from Tudur Trefor who is a purely genealogical figure, regarded as ancestor of at least one other Maelor family. The main point to emphasize is that in the Welsh material Rhys is the first member of his family to appear in the sources and was probably of relatively obscure (and possibly local) origins. That he achieved some significance is no doubt reflected in his later genealogical importance as an apical ancestor and in the late fourteenth-century reference to 'the progeny of Rhys' in Maelor

²⁶ For an alternative origin for Roger, see K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, *Domesday Descendants: A Prosopography of Persons occurring in English Documents 1066–1166. II: Pipe Rolls to Cartae Baronum* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 648–9, citing F. M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066–1166* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 281–2.

²⁷ The 'surname' given in the genealogical manuscripts may be a play on the Welsh word *pefyr* (lenited *befyr*), 'radiant, beautiful'.

12.2: Genealogies of Rhys Sais and Roger de Powis

A. According to the Welsh genealogical manuscripts

B. Reconstructed from Anglo-Norman Documents

Gymraeg.²⁸ His sons appear to have aspired to some sort of political influence – if the Welsh vernacular chronicles for 1081 are to be trusted – and one of them, Tudur ap Rhys, has indeed been identified with *Tuder quidam Walensis* named in Shropshire Domesday as holding *unum finem terrae Walensis*, for four pounds and five shillings (*solidi*), in 1086 from Roger of Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury.²⁹ Lastly, Rhys's nickname *Sais*, 'the Englishman', whether a contemporary usage or a later invention, clearly indicates some strong connection with England or things English. The sixteenth-century Welsh antiquary Humphrey Llwyd explained Rhys's nickname thus: 'for so they used to name all suche as had served in England and coulde speake the Englyshe tonge'.³⁰ The fact that Rhys Sais, if correctly identified with the Domesday *Rees*, occurs as a tenant in Domesday Book could be taken as confirmation of this English connection.

The second case study is based on the following entry in the Herefordshire lands of the Welsh tenant-in-chief *Grifin filius Mariadoc*, Gruffudd ap Maredudd:³¹

Isdem Grifinus tenet LEGE. Ouen et Elmer tenuerunt pro .ii. maneriis et wasti erant. ... Comes Willelmus dedit Mariadoc regi ... Rex Willelmus condonauit geldum regi Mariadoc et postea filio eius.

The *Lege* which *Ouen* and *Elmer* (OE *Ælfmær*) held as two manors has been identified as Lye in Hazeltree hundred. The form *Ouen* may suggest the name Owen, which is *Owain* in Modern Welsh,³² though it should be recalled that similar forms elsewhere in England have been regarded as reflecting the OE name *Ōwine*.³³

Gruffudd ap Maredudd held various lands in Herefordshire in addition to his own holding.³⁴ Domesday Book states that 'Earl William' (that is, William Fitz-Osbern, earl of Hereford, who died in 1071) had given the two Lye manors to 'king Maredudd' and that William the Conqueror had granted the tax to Maredudd and afterwards to his son Gruffudd. Now, Gruffudd and his father Maredudd

²⁸ The 'descendants' of Rhys are also attested as three *gwelyau* ('kinship/descent groups', lit. 'beds') – Gwely Ionas, Gwely Cuhelyn and Gwely Owain – in neighbouring Maelor Saesneg during the fifteenth century: see *36th Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records* (London, 1875), Appendix II, no. 1, p. 435; *37th Report* (1876), Appendix II, no. 1, pp. 335–9; *39th Report* (1878), Appendix II, no. 1, pp. 139–40. I am grateful to the late Prof. Rees Davies for directing my attention to these references. See also *The History of Flintshire, Vol. I. From the Earliest Times to the Act of Union*, ed. C. R. Williams (Denbigh, 1961), p. 98.

²⁹ DB, I, f. 253c.

³⁰ *Humphrey Llwyd. Cronica Walliae*, ed. Ieuan M. Williams (Cardiff, 2002), p. 123; note also Melville Richards, 'Gwyr, Gwragedd a Gwehelyth', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* (1965), 27–45, at p. 41; and Suppe, 'Who Was Rhys Sais?', pp. 64–5.

³¹ 'The same Gruffudd holds Lye. Owain and Ælfmær held it as two manors and they were waste. Earl William gave [them] to king Maredudd ... King William remitted the "geld" to king Maredudd and afterwards to his son': DB, I, f. 187c.

³² von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, pp. 342–3; Raymond Perry, *Anglo-Saxon Herefordshire 410 AD – 1086 AD* (Gloucester, 2002), p. 140.

³³ See above, p. 148 Table 12.1.

³⁴ DB, I, ff. 180c, 183d, 184d, 187a, c.

are relatively well-known as representatives of one branch of the ruling line of Deheubarth in south Wales.³⁵ Maredudd had ruled briefly during the period 1069–72, but in 1086 the kingdom was in the hands of Rhys ap Tewdwr who was a member of a (until that time) lesser dynastic segment. Gruffudd ap Maredudd made an unsuccessful attempt to oust Rhys in 1091 and was killed in battle. The kingdom was subsequently monopolized by the descendants of Rhys and we hear no more of Gruffudd's branch. The genealogy of Deheubarth for this period is reconstructed as Illus. 12.3 below, with those named in Domesday Book indicated in **bold**.

This dynastic segment is *not* described in the surviving Welsh genealogical sources, perhaps in part because they were politically unsuccessful in the long run, and in part because it may have been in the interests of their erstwhile rivals – the line of Rhys ap Tewdwr – to exclude them. Whatever the case, the diagram must be reconstructed from annalistic references. What is interesting is that *sub anno* 1069 the chronicles refer to Maredudd as 'Maredudd ab Owain ab Edwin', that is, listing three generations, instead of the far more usual two (forename plus patronym). As far as I am aware, this is the only notice of Maredudd's father, Owain son of Edwin, in a Welsh source. He may have been a younger brother of 'the sons of Edwin', Maredudd and Hywel, who had ruled Deheubarth in the 1030s and early 1040s. The occurrence of the personal name Owain here is obviously compelling, and it is tempting to identify this Owain ab Edwin, who probably flourished in the mid-eleventh century and was grandfather of Gruffudd ap Maredudd, with the TRE Domesday tenant *Ouen* who was a predecessor of Gruffudd in Lye.

The Herefordshire connections of this Welsh family can be traced further back and would support this hypothetical Domesday identification. A document from the reign of Cnut (S 1462) describes a legal dispute between an 'Edwin son of Einion' and his English mother regarding lands in Wellington and (unidentified) *Crydesleah* in Herefordshire.³⁶ The second place may be the same as the unidentified *Curdeslege*, which was one of Gruffudd ap Maredudd's Herefordshire lands. The coincidence of the place-names, and also of the 'Welsh' personal name Edwin in both cases, surely strengthens the case for this reconstruction. Lastly, it should be added that an Edwin ab Einion had launched an unsuccessful bid for the kingship of Deheubarth against his uncle Maredudd ab Owain in 992, significantly enough using Anglo-Saxon support.

Various considerations, therefore, combine to make it at least not impossible that the *Ouen* who held one of the manors of Lye in 1066 was Owain ab Edwin, grandfather of his tenurial successor Gruffudd ap Maredudd. The lack of addi-

³⁵ K. L. Maund, *Ireland, Wales, and England in the Eleventh Century* (Woodbridge, 1991), pp. 22–38.

³⁶ S 1462. I have touched upon this material elsewhere: David E. Thornton, 'Maredudd ab Owain (d. 999): The Most Famous King of the Welsh', *Welsh History Review* 18/4 (1997), 567–91, at pp. 584–5. See also H. R. Loyn, *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England 500–1087* (London, 1984), pp. 139–40; Coplestone-Crow, *Herefordshire Place-Names*, p. 45; and Perry, *Anglo-Saxon Herefordshire*, pp. 122–4. I am grateful to the late Patrick Wormald for discussing this document with me on more than one occasion.

12.3: The Family of Owain ab Edwin

(Individuals named in Domesday Book are in **bold**; kings of Deheubarth indicated by *k*)

tional information about the Domesday *Ouen* means it is obviously difficult to be completely certain about this identification, but the case is certainly compelling. What broader conclusions may we draw from this accumulation of data? Firstly, it should be noted again that for the family of Owain, we are entirely dependent upon chronicle sources, and this contrasts with the case of Rhys Sais, for whom the later genealogies are more forthcoming. This fact may stand in Owain's favour, though there are a few chronological problems in the reconstruction presented here. In addition it is worth pointing out that if the reconstruction holds, then the family's property connections with Herefordshire evidently ante-dated William FitzOsbern's three grants to king Maredudd mentioned in Domesday Book *circa* 1069–70. Indeed, our Owain provides the link in this chain between the situation after 1066 as recorded in Domesday Book and that described four or five decades earlier in S 1462. Owain is the only member of the family who is *not* mentioned in the Welsh annals in his own right, and indeed, the fact that the chroniclers felt it necessary to include three generations when naming his son is perhaps symptomatic of Owain's relative obscurity. This obscurity is perhaps understandable. There is clearly a gap between the reign of Owain's brother Hywel, who died in 1044, and that of his son Maredudd, beginning in 1069, during which

time South Wales including Deheubarth appears to have been dominated firstly by the dynasty of Rhydderch ab Iestyn, perhaps originating in neighbouring Morgannwg, and then, more significantly, by the powerful North Welsh king Gruffudd ap Llywelyn. During this period, we might postulate, Owain's own dynastic branch represented perhaps by Owain himself bided its time, possibly in England, just as Edwin ab Einion had done earlier and Gruffudd ap Maredudd was to do later on. On the other hand, the Welsh chronicles are notably silent about the kingdom of Deheubarth during the years between the death of Gruffudd ap Llywelyn in 1063 and the appearance of Maredudd ab Owain in 1069, which, of course, is precisely the time in which we know that Owain was alive, assuming he was indeed the TRE *Ouen* of Domesday Book.

We have here, therefore, a dynastic segment which played a not insignificant, yet clearly fluctuating, role in the politics of South Wales for a large part of the eleventh century. Furthermore, during times of political exclusion, members of the family appear to have found refuge across the border in Herefordshire, where they had claims to property, perhaps ultimately deriving from a marriage alliance with Anglo-Saxon landowners in the late tenth century. It is possible that when individual members of this family attempted to establish themselves in Deheubarth, they relied in part on English support.

The third and final case study will focus on the section in the Domesday survey for Herefordshire entitled *Hæ villæ vel terræ subscriptæ sitæ sunt in fine Arce-nefelde*, which occurs towards the end of the king's holding (variant readings in brackets have been supplied from the later 'Herefordshire Domesday Book'):³⁷

Willelmus filius Normanni tenet CHIPEETE. Cadiand [*Cadian*] tenuit TRE ... Isdem Willelmus tenet BAISSAN et Walterus de eo. Mereuuin [*Merewin*] tenuit de rege E. ... Rogerus de Laci tenet MAINAVRE. [*Birches*, marg. 'Heref DB'] Costelin tenuit TRE. Nunc filius eius tenet de Rogero ... Isdem Rogerus tenet PENEBCDOC [*Penebreddoc*, 'Heref. DB', *Penebredoc*, marg.] et Noui [*Nouis*] de eo. Isdem tenuit TRE ... Godric Mappesone tenet HVLLA. [*Castellum Gode-rich*, marg. 'Heref DB'] Taldus tenuit TRE ...

Here we find a nice series of Welsh, and some 'possibly Welsh', personal names: *Cadiand*, *Noui*, as well as the more problematic forms *Costelin*, *Mereuuin* and *Taldus*. All these men were TRE tenants, though *Noui* still held *Penebecdoc* in 1086,³⁸ and Costelin's anonymous son is also said to hold Birch from Roger de

³⁷ 'William FitzNorman holds Kilpeck. Cadien held it in the time of king Edward ... Roger de Lacy holds Birch. Custennin held it in the time of King Edward ... The same Roger holds *Penebecdoc* et Nowy [holds] from him. He [Nowy] also held in the time of king Edward ... Godric *Mappesone* holds Castle Goodrich [Howle Hill?]. Tewdws held it in the time of king Edward': DB, I, f. 181a; *Herefordshire Domesday, circa 1160–1170. Reproduced by Collotype from Facsimile Photographs of Balliol College MS. 350*, ed. Vivian Hunter Galbraith and James Tait, Pipe Roll Society new series 25 (London, 1950 for 1947–8), p. 19.

³⁸ The Domesday place-name *Penebecdoc* is unidentified, though may have been in Llanwarne parish: Richard Coates and Andrew Breeze, *Celtic Voices, English Places. Studies of the Celtic Impact on Place-Names in England* (Stamford, 2000), p. 310. Furthermore, Andrew Breeze has suggested to me that the various Domesday forms may reflect *Pen y*

Lacy in that year (*nunc*).³⁹ An interpretation of at least three of these five tenants is based upon an informative yet little studied document in the Book of Llandaff entitled *De terra Ercycg*.⁴⁰ This text begins with a list of churches in Ergyng (Archenfield) and then describes a series of consecrations of, and ordinations to, those churches by bishop Herewald for the period 1056–87. (For places in Archenfield mentioned in Domesday Book and *Liber Landavensis*, see Illus. 12.4 below.)

The first of the Domesday tenants in Archenfield is *Cadiand*, who is said to have held Kilpeck in the time of king Edward. The forms *Cadiand* and *Cadian* may reflect the Welsh name Cadien, which was usually *Catgen* in OW.⁴¹ Now, interestingly enough, the Llandaff document on Ergyng has the following entry for Kilpeck:⁴²

Tempore Uuillelmi, [Hergualdus episcopus] consecrauit Cilpedec et Morce-noui in presbiterum ordinauit, et mortuo illo filium suum Enniaun ordinauit, tempore Catgen Du et Ris filii Moridic.

The occurrence here of the relatively rare name Cadien in association with Kilpeck may be significant, and it is possible that this Cadien Ddu ('Cadien the Black') should be identified with his Domesday namesake.⁴³ The name *Catgen* occurs twice more in this document, for the consecration of the churches at 'Llanbedr' (now Peterstow) and Llanwarne:⁴⁴

Tempore Haraldi regis, [Hergualdus episcopus] consecrauit Lannpetir sub herede Cidrich filii Gunncu, et Catgen et filiis eius Gunna et Eutut, et filiis eius Merchiaun et Custennhin. ... Tempore Uuillelmi, [Hergualdus episcopus]

Beddeg ('Head of the Snare, Snare Head'), in which case it may have been near the modern farm of Poolspringle in Llanwarne (*springle* translating unattested Welsh **peddeg*, 'snare', from Latin *pedica*); see also Andrew Breeze, 'Kilpeck, near Hereford, and Latin *Pedica* "Snare"', *Nomina* 35 (2002), 151–2.

³⁹ For this section, the remaining TRE holders were King Edward himself and Earl Harold, who need not concern us directly here.

⁴⁰ *The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv reproduced from the Gwysaney Manuscript*, ed. J. Gwenogvryn Evans and John Rhys (Oxford, 1893), pp. 275–8. This interesting document has received little attention from historians; for some brief comments, see John Reuben Davies, *The Book of Llandaf and the Norman Church in Wales* (Woodbridge, 2003), esp. pp. 26, 84–5.

⁴¹ von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 213

⁴² 'In the time of [King] William, [Bishop Herewald] consecrated Kilpeck, and ordained Morgeneu as priest, and after his death he ordained his son Einion, in the time of Cadien Ddu and Rhys ap Moriddig': *The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv*, ed. Evans and Rhys, p. 276.

⁴³ *Domesday Book: 17, Herefordshire*, ed. and trans. Frank and Caroline Thorn (Chichester, 1983), n. 1.53.

⁴⁴ 'In the time of king Harold, [bishop Herewald] consecrated Peterstow under the heir [or possessor] Cydrich ap Gwnncu, and Cadien et his sons Gwnna and Eudud, and his sons Meirchion and Custennin. ... In the time of [King] William, [Bishop Herewald] consecrated Llanwarne, and ordained as priest *Audi* ab *Achess* and Gwlged ab Asser and afterwards Semion under the heirs Custennin ap Cadien, [and] Ieuan ab Ecgni ab Asser ab Assennan': *The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv*, ed. Evans and Rhys, pp. 276–7.

12.4 Domesday Archenfield: place-names in bold occur in Domesday Book [Penebecdoc unlocated]; names in (brackets) are identified in the 'Herefordshire Domesday' (Oxford, Balliol College, MS 350, ff. 11r-v); + indicates churches mentioned in Liber Landavensis, pp. 275-8

consecrauit Lannguern et in presbiterum ordinauit Audi filium Achess et Gulcet filium Asser et postea Semion sub heredibus Custennhinn filio Catgen, [et] Iouan filio Hecgni filii Asser filii Assennan.

It is not apparent whether these other Cadiens were the same as Cadien Ddu of Kilpeck, though it is certainly possible. Furthermore, the occurrence in both of these entries of the personal name Custennin, the Welsh form of Constantine, may be relevant here; the name of the Domesday tenant *Costelin* (who held Birch)⁴⁵ could well be a corrupt form of OW *Custennhinn*, but whether or not this was the same man as Custennin ap Cadien of the Eryng document is more difficult to determine.⁴⁶ This possible onomastic correction led me to examine the Eryng document further. There are three occurrences of the name Tewdws (OW *Teudus*), two of which at least must refer to the same layman, Tewdws ap Marchi (or *Marchci*).⁴⁷ The relevant churches include Llangarron and again perhaps Llanwarne, plus 'Llangustennin Garth Benni' (now Welsh Bicknor). Llangarron and Welsh Bicknor are very close to Goodrich, which was held TRE by *Taldus* according to the Herefordshire Domesday.⁴⁸ Once again, therefore, it is possible that *Taldus* is a corruption of the Welsh name Tewdws.⁴⁹ If so, then the Domesday tenant *may* have been Tewdws ap Marchi of the Book of Llandaff.

Further work needs to be done on this Eryng document in the Book of Llandaff. However, what we seem to have in this text is a rather nice depiction of a proprietary church in mid-eleventh-century Archenfield. Domesday Book adds another dimension in showing that, as well as being the *heredes* – which I take to mean 'possessors', not simply 'heirs' – of these churches, some of the laymen were landholders in their own right, which we might expect. A detailed study of both documents together would prove to be both interesting and fruitful.⁵⁰

A number of broad conclusions can be drawn about Welshmen in Domesday Book from the general comments made above and the three case studies. Firstly, it should be clear that there are two types of Welshmen in Domesday Book: those who can be identified in other documents, and those who cannot. As I have stated above, Table 12.1 contains 20 individuals who occur in *other* sources, and therefore as many as 25 others who do not. Furthermore, of the 20 identifications offered here, about a third occur *only* in the Book of Llandaff. Thus, Domesday

⁴⁵ John Freeman, 'Some Place-Names of Archenfield and the Golden Valley recorded in the Balliol Herefordshire Domesday', *Nomina* 10 (1986), 61–77, at p. 66.

⁴⁶ I wonder whether we have a case here of the Norman tendency to interchange/assimilate nasals (in *Custennin*) and liquids (in *Costelin*): Dodgson, 'Domesday Book', p. 125. Von Feilitzen, however, thought that *Costelin* was related to Continental Germanic *Costila*: *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 219.

⁴⁷ *The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv*, ed. Evans and Rhys, pp. 276–7.

⁴⁸ The Domesday place-name *Hulla* has alternatively been identified with Howle Hill and Huntsham Hill. For a discussion, see Coplestone-Crow, *Herefordshire Place-Names*, pp. 91–3.

⁴⁹ von Feilitzen was unsure what to make of this name-form: *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, p. 382. The offending letter is again 'l', as with *Costelin*.

⁵⁰ I intend to examine this material in more detail in a paper provisionally entitled 'Archenfield in Domesday Book and *Liber Landavensis*', in *Domesday Book and Wales*, ed. Thornton (forthcoming).

Book provides a unique record of a relatively significant number of Welshmen for the period 1066–86. This in itself should be reason enough to want to investigate these individuals further.

Many of the Welshmen who can be identified in sources other than Domesday Book were politically important – such as Gruffudd ap Llywelyn, Bleddyn ap Cynfyn, Rhys ap Tewdwr and others – or were regarded, at least retrospectively, as having been genealogically important – such as Rhys Sais, Rhys ap Tewdwr and also others like Edwin of Tegeingl and Marchudd ap Cynan in Table 12.1. In most of these cases, however, their own political and/or genealogical origins are obscure and in some instances simply fabricated in the later genealogies. In addition, many of these Welshmen had political, family or ‘onomastic’ links with England: for example, the dynasty of Bleddyn ap Cynfyn claimed descent in the later manuscripts from one Gwerystan ap Gwaithfoed; or, Edwin of Tegeingl named one of his sons Uchdryd, and Marchudd ap Cynan had a son called Edryd. As stressed above these personal names could represent borrowings, yet this pattern is worthy of note. Furthermore, Domesday Book adds to this, by providing evidence of tenurial ties between England and these Welshmen before and after 1066. Thus, the admittedly ‘Anglocentric’ Domesday Book may provide a key for determining, to some extent, the origins of certain players in the eleventh-century Welsh political scene. Historians of medieval Wales, for a time, regarded the first half of the eleventh century especially as a period of dynastic instability, characterized by frequent usurpation of royal power, though more recent scholarship has challenged this idea.⁵¹ Domesday Book reveals the extent of direct English territorial influence in parts of Wales, and I wonder if we can regard at least some of the alleged eleventh-century Welsh usurpers, whether they be total ‘unknowns’ or members of minor/disaffected dynastic branches, as owing their initial rise to prominence to their Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman overlords.

⁵¹ For example, see John Edward Lloyd, *A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest*, 2 vols. (3rd edn, London, 1939), I.346; Wendy Davies, *Wales in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester, 1982), p. 112; K. L. Maund, *Ireland, Wales, and England in the Eleventh Century*, pp. 7–10, 207–9.