

- ⁴⁵ H. E. Hallam, *Settlement and Society: A Study of the Early Agrarian History of South Lincolnshire* (Cambridge, 1965), 179.
- ⁴⁶ *PN Cambs.*, 316.
- ⁴⁷ *PN Essex*, 576.
- ⁴⁸ W.G. Waller, 'Essex field-names', *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* V (1894-96), 144-81; VI (1896-98), 60-85, 258-77; VII (1898-99), 65-92, 285-327; VIII (1900-02), 76-103, 199-222, 295-323; IX (1903-05), 68-100, 156-79.
- ⁴⁹ *PN Berks.*, II, 332, cf. *ibid.*, III, 858, s.v. *clapper*. See also *PN Surrey*, 397, where the Blechingley field-name is associated with a clapper bridge.
- ⁵⁰ For these examples see *PN Warks.*, 323; *PN Cambs.*, 316; *PN Notts.*, 278; *PN Derbys.*, 721; and *PN Herts.*, 251.

Shaw/Shay Revisited

Victor Watts

IN a note appended to Mary Higham's article on *shay* names in the previous issue of this journal, Dr Margaret Gelling discussed the phonological problem of the relationship of *shaw* to *shay*.¹ There can, as she says, be no doubt that *shay* derives from OE *sceaga* as a doublet of the more usual *shaw*. The explanation of the development of *shay* to which she refers is that of A.H. Smith in *The Place-Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire*: he suggested that the various spellings *-ay-*, *-aigh-* might be due to occasional failure of OE *-aga-* (i.e. [aya]) to diphthongize to *-aw-* (i.e. [av]), and that instead it lengthened to *-āge* (i.e. presumably [a:gə]) in the open syllable, whence late ME *-ā(g)-* spelt *-ai(g)-*, *-ay-*.²

Dr Gelling is rightly uneasy about this account, but her own suggestion that

'In the case of Shay it has to be presumed (though Smith does not say this) that there was late diphthongization of the new raised vowel which caused *-age* to become *-aye*'³

is also unsatisfactory, since on the one hand it describes no more than the normal development of ME [a:] (*viz.* raising and eventual diphthongization to [ei]) and on the other does not explain the loss of the consonantal element, presumably [g], of the hypothetical late ME *-āge*.

In fact, *aw/ay* variation is a very well attested phenomenon in English.⁴ On the one hand, the usual development of ME [av] in words like *claw*, *draw*, *slaughter*, *hawk* and *haunt* seems to have involved assimilation of the two elements of the diphthong to produce the monophthong [ɔ:] by about 1600, although diphthongal pronunciations continued to be recognized as late as 1685.⁵ By the time of this monophthongization ME [a:] was generally represented by a high front vowel [ɛ:] and there was no possibility of the new monophthong becoming associated with ME [a:].⁶

On the other hand, in some varieties of English there was a monophthongization of ME [av] so early that it did become associated with ME [a:] and consequently developed as a front vowel accompanying ME [a:] through successive raisings to [æ:], [ɛ:], [e:] and eventually diphthongizing to [ei].⁷ In the history of English phonology it is important to think not of once and for all historical sound-changes but rather of tendencies or repeated or recurrent operations.⁸ Thus, in some varieties of (non-standard) English the same development seems to have occurred at a later period and to

have invaded the standard language in the course of the seventeenth century.⁹

In short, there were two different monophthongizations of ME [av], one in which it became [ɔ:] and one in which it became [a:]. The results of the latter, a good example of a repeated or recurrent operation, are seen, when it occurred early, in words like *change* (ME *chaunge*), *strange* (ME *straunge*), *gauge*, *safe* (ME *sauf*), *Ralph* pronounced [reif] (ME *Rauf*) and *halfpenny* pronounced *ha'penny*, and, when it occurred late, in words like *dance*, *calm*, *half*, *salve* and *Ralph* pronounced [ra:f]. The results of the former are seen in words like *claw*, *draw*, *staunch*, *haunch*, etc., and generally.¹⁰

Dobson cites two examples which are particularly pertinent to the *shaw/shay* question: the condemnation of *la* for *law* in Merriott's *Grammaticall Miscellanies* of 1660 and the 'phonetic' spelling *layer* for *lawyer* in Cocker's *Accomplished School-Master* of 1696; and after a full discussion of the evidence he concludes 'that we have to do here with a late ME change of *au* to *ā* which could occur in any position'.¹¹

In the light of this, we can see that the expected developments of OE *sceaga* in Middle English are:

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| (1) before labialization | <i>shage</i> [ʃayə] |
| (2) after early-13th-c. labialization of [y] > [y ^w] > [w] | <i>shawe</i> |
| (3) with loss of -e | <i>shaw</i> |
| (4) with IME monophthongization | <i>shā</i> [ʃa:] |

Both (3) and (4) survived into Modern English, the former in the Standard English word *shaw*, the latter, spelt *shay*, as its dialect equivalent.

The problem with the material collected by A.H. Smith in his phonological notes and cited by Dr Gelling is its disparate nature. Thus:

(1) *Haigh* (PN Yorks.WR, I, 309), *Haige* 1614, is irrelevant to the *shaw/shay* question. It is rather to be compared with other Yorkshire spellings like *Hague*, *Hague Wood*, *Applehaigh*, etc. Here OE *haga* became ME *hage*; then open-syllable lengthening did indeed take place to give *hāge*, late ME *hāg*, but labialization did not. OE *gehæg* is irrelevant therefore, and the *ai* spellings are normal northern graphies for ME [a:].

(2) *Aughton* (*ibid.*, I, 159) is an uncertain case. In this name OE *āc-tūn* > ME *Aghton*, in which *a* is short and *gh* represents a spirantized guttural pronunciation of OE [k], before which the expected vocalic off-glide [ʷ] subsequently developed.¹² The spellings *Aigh-*, *Ayghton* 1399, 1658 might represent late ME [a:]

for [av], but they might equally well represent the survival of forms without the off-glide and with retention of original OE [a:], or just possibly be evidence of the development of a palatal spirant before which the vocalic off-glide would be [i].¹³

(3) *Slaithwaite* (*ibid.*, II, 307) is also a problem. It is uncertain whether the specific is OE *slāh* 'sloe' or ON *slag* 'blow'. Early spellings seem to point to *slāh* with loss of [-h]: *Sladweit* 12th c., *Slathwait/-thweyt* 1191-1286, beside forms which retain -h, *Slaththwait* 1213-1227, *Slaghwaite* 1306, *Slaghthayt* 1307, *-thwayt(e)* 1373, 1402. From the latter develop forms with a *u* off-glide: *Slaughwayt* 1360, *-thwayte* 1593, *Slaughtit* 1665, *Slawitt* 1750 and the modern local pronunciation [slaywit], and also forms with late ME [a:] < [av]: *Slayghwayte* 1558, *Slaythwayte* 1627, *Slaighwait* 1641. The problem forms are *Sclagtwayt* 1277 and *Slakwayth* 1410, *-with*, *-thwaite* 1540, which seem to suggest the specific *slag*. This is unnecessary, however. ME medial *h* represented a peripheral phoneme (? [χ] or [y]) liable to sound substitution in many contexts; this was usually by a phoneme of allied phonetic character, viz. the spirants [f] or [θ], but substitution by the palatal or guttural stop consonants [k] and [g] is also on record.¹⁴

(4) *Raywell* (PN Yorks.ER, 207), *Ragwelle* 1282 'well or spring overgrown with lichen' is cited by Dr Gelling as an additional parallel to *shaw/shay*. But caution is needed here, as OE *rægu* is recorded beside *ragu* and also occurs in the compound *ræghār* 'grey with lichen'.

(5) *Brayfield* (PN Bucks., 3), to which might be added the associated names *Brafield* (PN Nthants., 144) and *Bransford* (PN Worcs., 189), is rightly ruled out on account of the alternative OE forms *bragen* and *brægen*, which would give ME *braun*, *brain* respectively.

(6) *Chailey* (PN Sussex, 296) is also cited: *Cheagele*, *Chaglegh* 1087-1100, *Chag(g)ele(ye)* 1255-1442. But this name has no recorded *au* spellings and, indeed, they could not be expected from an OE *ceage* with geminate consonants. The *Chayl(e)y/-ligh* spellings which occur 1588-1693 remain, therefore, unexplained.

(7) *Faintree* (Salop) is also a problem: *Faventrei* 1086, *Fa(g)entre* 1212, *Fayntre* 1274. If the derivation from OE *fāgan-trēo* is correct, we should expect ME forms of the type **faun-tre*. GDB *Faventrei* might be evidence of labialization, but this would be unusually early (Jordan dates the change from 1200).¹⁵ More evidence is required.

(8) *Little Heater* (PN Yorks.WR, II, 170), *-hawter* 1462, might

be another example of ME *ā/au* variation, but the suggested derivation from OE *hagu-þorn* is not certain and the name is best left aside.

This leaves eight genuine examples of the *shaw/shay* variation, although these are not invariably recognized as such by either Smith or Dr Gelling:

(9) The case of *Ainleys* (*PN Yorks.WR*, III, 43) is complicated by uncertainty about its etymology. Nevertheless, the forms are consistent with a development from OE *āgan*, gen. sing. of *āga* 'owner' (*Aghenlay* 1198), to forms with labialization to *āwen-* (*Aundeleya* 12th c., *Aunlay* 13th c., *Awndeley* 16th c.) and with IME [a:] < [av] (*An(ne)ley* 14th c., *Ainley* 1817); the sporadic *d* would seem to be intrusive between [n] and [l], as in *spindle* < OE *spin(e)le*.¹⁶

(10) *Hainworth* (*ibid.*, VI, 4) is rightly adduced as a satisfactory parallel to *shaw/shay*. The form *Hageneuorde* 1086 'Hagena's enclosure' undergoes labialization to give *Haunewrd* 13th c. and, with subsequent monophthongization to IME [a:], *Heyne-*, *Hayn-*, *Hain(e)worth(e)* 1467 showing typical northern spellings *ey*, *ay*, *ai* for [a:].

(11) *Crawshaw* (*ibid.*, IV, 214) < OE *crāwe* + *sceaga* has a spelling *Crayshaw* which shows the reflex of ME [a:] < [av] in the specific.

(12) *Sawley* (*ibid.*, V, 187) < OE *salh* + *lēah*: *Sallai(a)/-lei(a)*, etc., 1086–1527, *Sawley* 1504, 1549, 1685 and *Saylley*; and *Sawley* (*ibid.*, VI, 182): *Sallai(a)*, etc., 1147–1523, *Sawlay/-ley* 1546–1680, *Sayley* 1610–1678, fit the pattern exactly. with ME [av] here arising from vocalization of [l] in OE *salh* 'willow'.¹⁷

(13) *Laverton* (*ibid.*, V, 211) 'tūn on the river Laver' is dismissed by Dr Gelling and associated with the pl.-n. *Daventry* (see 14 below), but both fit the pattern well. The former has *Laur-* spellings from 1086 onwards, but they are ambiguous as between *au* and *aw* and the first certain example of the vocalization of [v] is *Lawreton* 1606. Nevertheless, vocalization must have occurred as early as the thirteenth century, and the resultant ME [av] then been monophthongized to [a:], as represented by the spellings *Layrton* 1457, 1535, *Lareton* 1488–1585, *Laerton* 1598, *Laireton* 1641, and the modern pronunciation [lɛətən].

(14) *Daventry* (*PN Nthants*, 18-19) < OE *Dafan* + *trēo* 'Dafa's tree' is *Daventre(i)* 1086–1537, *Dauntre* 1205, 1227. Spellings indicating IME [a:] occur in 1564 (*Deyntre*) and with some frequency in the seventeenth century.

(15) Finally, *Facit* (*Lancs.*) < OE *fāh* + *side* 'dappled hillside',

Fagheseide 13th c., is a good example and provides a IME [a:] variant beside the identical *au* names *Fawside* (*Durham*), *Fauside* 1335-1336, and *Fawcett* (*PN Westm.*, I, 137), *Faxside* 1247, 1282, *Fakside* 1256, *Fausyde* 1282, *Fau-/Fawcet(t)* 1535-1777, *Facet*, *Fasid* 1620, 1621. The latter, in fact, illustrates the full range of possibilities: substitution of stop [k] for spirant [x], labialization (*Fau-*, *Faw-* spellings), and IME [a:] < [av] (17th-c. *Fa-* spellings).

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

NOTES

- 1 'Shaw/Shay: the phonological problem', *ante* XII, 103-4.
- 2 *PN Yorks.WR*, VII, 78.
- 3 'Shaw/Shay', 103.
- 4 The standard authorities for this phenomenon are: E.J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1968), II, §§104, 234-9; E. Ekwall, *A History of Modern English Sounds and Morphology* (Oxford, 1975), §§36-41, 44-5; R. Jordan, *Handbuch der mitttelenglischen Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1934), §§122, 127, 129, 240, 267, 286; K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1914-1940; repr. Oxford/Stuttgart, 1964), §§402-3, 427-8, 503, 519-22; A.A. Prins, *A History of English Phonemes*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1974), §§3.36, 3.40, 3.57, 4.38.
- 5 Dobson, §235; Ekwall, §36; Prins, §4.38. Luick, §519, has a different explanation, on which see n.8 below.
- 6 Dobson, §98; Ekwall, §29, Luick, §492; Prins, §4.9.
- 7 Dobson, §104; Ekwall, §§22, 38, 44; Jordan, §§240, 286n.; Luick §427.1, 2 and n.1.
- 8 C. Jones, *A History of English Phonology* (London, 1989), §1.2.
- 9 Dobson, §238; Ekwall, §§42, 44; Prins, §§4.13.4-6. Luick (§§ 519, 557) held a different view, not generally accepted, of the development of ME [av], viz. loss of the *u*-element leaving a back-vowel monophthong [ɑ:] which remains in many dialects. Then, in the later eighteenth century. this [ɑ:] > [ɔ:]. The advantage of Luick's theory would be that of explaining all developments of [av], whether early or late, in the same way, viz. as monophthongization to [ɑ:]. At the same time the proposed late-eighteenth-century change [ɑ:] > [ɔ:] would exactly parallel the change of OE [ɑ:] > ME [ɔ:] and thus be another instance of a recurrent operation.
- 10 Dobson, §§234ff.; Ekwall, §§35-7; Prins, §§4.38, 4.13.3-6.
- 11 §104, p.605.
- 12 Jordan, §118, 129.
- 13 Jordan, §96; Luick, §403.
- 14 J. Vachek, 'On peripheral phonemes of modern English', *Brno Studies in*

English IV (1964) [= Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis: Facultas Philosophica XCIII], 7-100, esp. 9-21, 'Chapter Two: The elimination of the Modern English /h/-phoneme'; Luick §§512-3, 768-9. A good example of substitution by [k] is in ModE *hough* pronounced [hɒk], a new singular formation from ME *hox*, *hoxen* < OE *hōhsinu*, cf. Luick, §769 n.3.

15 §186.

16 Jordan, §202.

17 Jordan, §267; Luick §§502-3; Prins, §4.13.3.

The Place-Name Survey of Wales

FOLLOWING the acceptance of the recommendation that the **Place-Name Survey of Wales / Arolwg Enwau-Lleoedd Cymru** be inaugurated under its auspices, as noted *ante* XI (1987), 210, the Board of Celtic Studies of the University of Wales appointed Professor Gwynedd O. Pierce as its Director and Professor Bedwyr Lewis Jones as Associate Director. The Survey will operate through a steering committee which reports annually to the Board. Members of the committee as at present constituted are: Dr Margaret Gelling (Chair), Professor D. Ellis Evans, Professor Geraint Gruffydd, Dr Prys Morgan, the Director and the Associate Director. The committee was given powers of co-optation and, in order to encourage and to benefit from the activities of county societies actively involved in place-name projects, it has invited Mr G.G. Evans (Montgomeryshire), Miss M. Benson-Evans and Mr Terry James (Carmarthenshire), and Dr Hywel Wyn Owen (Clwyd) to join the committee. All formal correspondence is handled by Mr G.W. Evans, Assistant Registrar, University of Wales Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff CF1 3NS, Tel: (0222) 382656.

The main initial objective of the Survey Committee is now being actively pursued, namely, the computerization of the place-name material contained in the Melville Richards Archive at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, so that it can form the foundation of a Welsh national database into which further information can be fed. This will improve accessibility to *bona fide* scholars and serve as an additional safeguard to the security of the Archive. The purchase of a suitable microcomputer is being funded by the Board and a pilot-study initiated to establish the form and nature of the method of inputting the Archive material.

In the meantime, Dr Hywel Owen's study of the place-names of the lordships of Hawarden and Hope, Clwyd, is being supported with a view to publication in 1991, as is also the Director's revision of R.J. Thomas's unpublished work on the commote of Meisgyn, Mid Glamorgan, for publication at a later date.

The Survey is advising on the collection of place-name material in various localities and has issued a Welsh/English *Brief Guide to the Collection and Recording of Place-Name Forms* prepared by the Director. This is now being discussed further with a view to some modification to meet the needs of an increasing number of word-processor users.

GOP