MAP 7

West Riding of Yorkshire: Wapentakes

Distribution of <u>Shay</u> Place-Names

SHAW/SHAY: THE PHONOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Margaret Gelling

Shay in the north-country names discussed by Mary Higham derives ultimately from Old English sceaga. On the basis of modern landscape conditions the material which she has assembled might be considered to be evidence for a different place-name element which had no connotation of woodland. But the evidence of early spellings for names containing sceaga which is set out in *PNYorks.* (*WR*) demonstrates that the OE word frequently developed to *shay* in that county.

In the *Notes on Phonology and Dialect* in *PNYorks.* (*WR*) (VII, 78), A. H. Smith cited names in which *shaw* and *shay* interchange. In all the examples cited there, the Shaw- or -shaw form prevailed. He did not adduce examples of modern Shay names, probably because of the lack of early documentation. Interchange is also found in these, however, as in:

The Shay (III, 273) – *Shaw Clough and Hill* 1850;
Shay Green (ibid. 265) – *Shaw Green* 1853;
Shay Syke (ibid. 108) – *Shaw Sike* 1588, 1636.

It might be claimed – as Mrs Higham suggests for The Shaws and The Shays in Loppington, Shropshire – that there is no true connection between minor names Shaw and Shay, they just sometimes occur in proximity to each other; but this is not convincing. Shaw(s) is not a common name in Shropshire: there are fewer than a dozen examples on the 6″ O.S. maps, and it is not likely to be coincidence that the single instance of the Shays lies beside an instance of The Shaws. In two of the West Riding instances cited above, Shay Green and Shay Syke, there can be no doubt that the earlier *Shaw* forms refer to the same piece of land. Shawbury in Shropshire has spellings such as *Shabery* from the 12th to the 18th century, and in the 1930s some older residents are said to have used the pronunciation appropriate to this form.

A. H. Smith (*Notes on Phonology*) explained the development of Shay from sceaga as due to failure to diphthongize $\check{a}ga$ to aw, and subsequent vowel-lengthening in an open syllable which resulted in ME $-\bar{a}ge-$. The raising of ME $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{e}$ in north-country toponyms is well-evidenced in such names as Cadeby, Laycock, Pateley Bridge. 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.

This is probably sound, though Smith weakened his case by adducing unsatisfactory parallels. One of these is Haigh, from OE haga, in which influence may be suspected from OE gehæg, also meaning 'enclosure'. Others, such as Ainleys and Aughton, do not have an open syllable. Laverton (sometimes *Layrton*) is surely exhibiting a different phenomenon, a development of an element containing -f- which is found elsewhere, e.g. in the local pronunciation [deintre] of Daventry, Northants. Hainworth, from OE *Hagenan worth*, seems the most satisfactory of the parallels which Smith adduces from West Riding names for the Shaw/Shay dichotomy. From another part of Yorkshire he might have cited Raywell in Cottingham (East Riding), which is *Ragwelle* 1282, from ragu 'moss'.

Occasional development of ME -ay-, -ai- from OE -aga- or -age is probably not confined to north-country names. Brayfield, Bucks, from OE *Bragenfeld* looks like the same phenomenon; the spellings show alternative developments to ME *Brainfeud* and *Braunfeld*. But the alternative form of OE bragen is brægen (modern *brain*), and there may have been another, unrecorded, OE form of the place-name, *Brægenfeld*, which would invalidate the comparison. The development only calls for special explanation if it occurs in an element which has the back vowel a. Chailey, Sussex, which is *Cheagele, Chaglegh* 1087 X 1100, *Chageleye* 1255, might be considered relevant, and Faintree, Shropshire, if the

usual derivation from *fāgan treowe be accepted. Facit in Lancs. ('variegated hill-side') shows this development of fāg; it is recorded as *Fagheside* in the thirteenth century, which leaves no doubt about the etymology.

The development of sceaga to *shay* poses a difficult problem, not adequately dealt with as yet in place-name literature. But there can be no serious doubt that *shay* is from sceaga. It appears in minor names in areas where sceaga is particularly common, and interchange between the two forms is very well-evidenced. The specialized use of the *shay* form which is established in Mrs Higham's paper perhaps derives from awareness that *shaw* sometimes occurred in regions where there had been no trace of woodland for a very long time. Since the word *shaw* retained its connotation of woodland, the alternative form *shay* might have been adopted for use in the situations described in the paper.

There may be other instances in minor place-names of the use of an alternative modern form to mark the distinction between areas where the known ME or modern meaning of the term was appropriate, and those where the conditions which gave rise to the name have vanished utterly from the landscape. The occurrence of a term originally denoting woodland in areas which have long been treeless may be paralleled by the use in place-names of OE wald, modern *wold*.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

CARLTON, RESTON, AND SAINT MICHAEL: A RECONSIDERATION

A. E. B. Owen

A castle mound, a couple of farms and an overgrown churchyard are almost all that is visible today of Castle Carlton, a mere speck on the map of north-east Lincolnshire five miles south-east of Louth. Even two centuries ago the antiquary Richard Gough found there 'only nine wretched cottages of mud and straw', but declared that 'this poor village was once a populous market town'.[1] My own researches over a number of years have confirmed that Castle Carlton was more than just another of Lincolnshire's deserted medieval villages. It seems to have arisen near the end of the twelfth century, under the ægis of Hugh Bardolf the judge, as a 'new town' foundation beside an existing castle mound on the borders of Great Carlton and South Reston. The present article has its origins in an attempt to discover when, and by whom, the actual castle might have been built before Castle Carlton parish, a mere 471 acres, was (as seems probable) formed from the extremities of these two neighbours. What follows is therefore concerned with them rather than with Castle Carlton itself.[2]

At the time of the Lindsey survey (LS) of 1115 x 1118, Asgautr (Ansgot) of Burwell held, *inter alia*, four carucates in *Carletune* as tenant-in-chief, besides six bovates in *Carletuna* and *Sumercotis* as under-tenant of Robert de Haia.[3] In their edition of the Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey, Foster and Longley identify the former holding as 'Castle Carlton and Great Carlton', the *Carletuna* of the latter merely as 'Great Carlton'. They identify the LS holding of Alan of Percy, two carucates in *Ristuna* and *Carletuna*, as 'Reston and Little Carlton' in the body of their text, calling the former place more precisely 'Reston, North' in the index. The corresponding, somewhat larger, DB holding of William of Percy, three carucates in *Ristone et Carletone* (GDB, fo. 354r; Lincs. 22/29), they identify similarly as 'North Reston and Little Carlton'.[4] What is apparently lacking from the two surveys is, in LS, any mention of South Reston, and, most notably, any mention in DB of either South Reston or Great Carlton.

Initially I accepted the latter as just another unexplained Domesday lapse which might, or might not, have implications for the status of the two places in 1086. As my research progressed, however, and in the face of Fellows-Jensen's positive statement 'not named in DB' in respect of Great Carlton,[5] it seemed essential to check whether its 'missing' four carucates might be subsumed under the entry for some other holding. A tedious comparison of the DB and the LS entries for every place in Loutheske wapentake left me none the wiser, merely