Nomina XIII


PN Cambs., 316.

PN Essex, 576.


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.

For these examples see PN Warks., 323; PN Cambs., 316; PN Notts., 278; PN Derbys., 721; and PN Herts., 251.

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*. There can, as she says, be no doubt that *shay* derives from OE *seeage* 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. [aːə]) to diphthongize to *-aw* (i.e. [æv]), and that instead it lengthened to *-æge* (i.e. presumably [aːɡə]) in the open syllable, whence late ME *-æg(e)*—spelt *-æi(g(e)*, *-æy*.

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 *-æge to become *-aye*.'

is also unsatisfactory, since on the one hand it describes no more than the normal development of ME [aː] (*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 *-æge*.

In fact, *aw/ay* variation is a very well attested phenomenon in English. On the one hand, the usual development of ME [au] 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 [ɛː] by about 1600, although diphthongal pronunciations continued to be recognized as late as 1685. By the time of this monophthongization ME [aː] was generally represented by a high front vowel [ɛː] and there was no possibility of the new monophthong becoming associated with ME [aː].

On the other hand, in some varieties of English there was a monophthongization of ME [au] so early that it did become associated with ME [aː] and consequently developed as a front vowel accompanying ME [aː] through successive raisings to [ɛː], [ɛː], [ɛː] and eventually diphthongizing to [ei]. 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. Thus, in some varieties of (non-standard) English the same development seems to have occurred at a later period and to
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have invaded the standard language in the course of the seventeenth century. 

In short, there were two different monophthongizations of ME [au], one in which it became [ɔː] and one in which it became [aː]. 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 [ref] (ME Rauf) and half penny pronounced ha'penny, and, when it occurred late, in words like dance, calm, half, salve and Ralph pronounced [raːf]. The results of the former are seen in words like claw, draw, staunch, haunch, etc., and generally. 

Dobson cites two examples which are particularly pertinent to the shaw/shay question: the condemnation of la for law in Merriott's Grammaticall Miscellaneous 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 ë which could occur in any position'. 

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

1. before labialization: shage [ʃaː]
2. after early-13th-c. labialization of [y] > [ʌ] > [w]: shawe
3. with loss of -e: shaw
4. with IME monophthongization: shë [ʃaː]

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 hage, late ME hâg, but labialization did not. OE gehaeg is irrelevant therefore, and the ai spellings are normal northern graphies for ME [aː].

(2) Aughton (ibid., I, 159) is an uncertain case. In this name OE ãc-ænt > ME Aghton, in which a is short and gh represents a spirantized guttural pronunciation of OE [k], before which the expected vocalic off-glide [ɨ] subsequently developed. The spellings Aigh-, Ayghton 1399, 1658 might represent late ME [aː] for [au], but they might equally well represent the survival of forms without the off-glide and with retention of original OE [aː], or just possibly be evidence of the development of a palatal spirant before which the vocalic off-glide would be [ɬ].

(3) Slaithwaite (ibid., II, 307) is also a problem. It is uncertain whether the specific is OE slâh 'sloe' or ON slag 'blow'. Early spellings seem to point to slâh with loss of [-h]: Sladweit 12th c., Slathwaið/-twayne 1191–1286, beside forms which retain -h, Slathuat 1213–1227, Slagwaite 1306, Slathhwayt 1307, -thwayne(e) 1373, 1402. From the latter develop forms with a u off-glide: Slaghwäyt 1360, -thwayne 1593, Slawhit 1665, Slawit 1750 and the modern local pronunciation [slawwit], and also forms with late ME [aː] < [au]: Slaghwæyty 1558, Slaghwæyte 1627, Slaghwait 1641. The problem forms are Slagwwayne 1277 and Slakwayth 1410, -with, -thwaitte 1540, which seem to suggest the specific slag. This is unnecessary, however. ME medial h represented a peripheral phoneme (? [x] or [ɣ]) liable to sound substitution in many contexts; this was usually by a phoneme of allied phonetic character, viz. the spirants [f] or [s], but substitution by the palatal or guttural stop consonants [k] and [g] is also on record.

(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 ragu is recorded beside ragu and also occurs in the compound raghâr '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 braen and brægen, which would give ME braun, brain respectively.

(6) Chailey (PN Sussex, 296) is also cited: Cheagele, Chaglegh 1087–1100, Chagg(e)le(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 Chail(e)y/-ligh spellings which occur 1588–1693 remain, therefore, unexplained.

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

(8) Little Heater (PN Yorks.WR, II, 170), -hawter 1462, might
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be another example of ME à/au variation, but the suggested derivation from OE hagú-born 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 awen- (Aundeley 12th c., Aunlay 13th c., Awndeley 16th c.) and with IME [a:] < [au] (An(ne)ley 14th c., Ainley 1817); the sporadic d would seem to be intrusive between [n] and [l], as in spindle < OE spīn(e)le.16

(10) Hainworth (ibid., VI, 4) is rightly added as a satisfactory parallel to shawishay. The form Hageneworde 1086 'Hagen'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, ai for [a:]

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


(13) Laverton (ibid., V, 211) 'tun 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 Laver-spellings from 1086 onwards, but they are ambiguous as between au and aw and the first certain example of the vocalization of [v] is Lawrent 1606. Nevertheless, vocalization must have occurred as early as the thirteenth century, and the resultant ME [au] then been monophthongized to [a:], as represented by the spellings Layrton 1457, 1535, Laret 1488–1585, Laernt 1598, Lairent 1641, and the modern pronunciation [lɛːtən].

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

(15) Finally, Facit (Lancs.) < OE fāh + side 'dappled hillside',
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Fagheside 13th c., is a good example and provides a ME [a:] variant beside the identical au names Fawsid (Durham), Fauside 1335–1336, and Fawcett (PN Westm., I, 137), Faksid 1247, 1282, Faksid 1256, Fauside 1282, Fau-/Fawcett(i) 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:] < [au] (17th-c. Fa- spellings).
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The Place-Name Survey of Wales

FOLLOWING the acceptance of the recommendation that the Place-Name Survey of Wales / Arolwg Enwaith-Lleod 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.
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