Old MacDonald had a *fyrm, eo, eo, y*:
Two Marginal Developments of ⟨eo⟩
in Old and Middle English

Alaric Hall
Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies,
University of Glasgow

It is widely accepted that the Old English diphthong /e(:)o/ generally monophthongized, around the eleventh century, to the central rounded /ø(:)/.[1] In much of England, /ø(:)/ soon unrounded to /e(:)/, but in the dialects of the south-west and west Midlands, which had a greater predilection for rounded vowels, the /ø(:)/ reflex of /e(:)o/ was retained. Since the development /e(:)o/ > /ø(:)/ took place after /ø(:)/ < i-mutation had been unrounded, it had no effect on the phonemic system of Old English: the change led to no collapse or creation of phonemic distinctions. Accordingly, ⟨eo⟩ remained as useful a graph for /ø(:)/ as for /e(:)o/, and it was used to represent that sound into the fourteenth century (as in the thirteenth

---

[1] Cf. R. M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English, Vol. 1: Phonology* (Oxford, 1992), §§5.210–11; R. Lass, 'Phonology and Morphology', *The Cambridge History of the English Language Vol. 2: 1066–1476*, ed. N. Blake (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 23–155, at 42–3. The Old English 'long' diphthongs were of course of the length usual in diphthongs, that is, in systematic terms, the same length as a long vowel. As Hogg emphasizes, these would best be thought of as 'normal' diphthongs and signified by /eo/, and short diphthongs distinguished by a breve. For convenience however, I follow the common convention of marking normal diphthongs long (/e:o/) and leaving short ones unmarked. For the other languages cited, where there was no distinction of length between diphthongs, all are left unmarked, despite the fact that, for example, Old Welsh /au/ would correspond in length to Old English /æ:ɑ/.

century AB language). The dating of the monophthongization of /e(:)o/, therefore, relies on the appearance, largely in the eleventh century, of <e> spellings, attesting to a phonemic shift caused by unrounding. Thus, although the eleventh century is usually given as the time of the monophthongization, it could in fact date from any time after the loss of /ø(:)/ < i-mutation.[2]

Monophthongisation could, however, be affected by phonological context, or proceed differently for more obscure reasons. Thus in late West Saxon, /eo/ regularly became /u/ between /w/ and /r/.[3] Another variant development is suggested by some less well observed south-western and west Midland Middle English forms, which show the spelling <u>, widely used in Middle English to represent /y(:)/, for etymological /e(:)o/. Mary S. Serjeantson found them in quantity in Hampshire, Dorset, Devon, Somerset, Wiltshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire and Herefordshire, with a scattering of forms in adjacent counties and Lancashire – a distribution more or less identical with the area in which rounded vowels survived into the fourteenth century – and suggested that /e(:)o/ 'seems to have been rounded and monophthongized to [ø], and perhaps subsequently raised to [y]'.[4] Unfortunately, Serjeantson, while listing all instances of <u> for etymological /e(:)o/ in various texts for each county, did not analyse these data further: the phonological significance of <u> in a given text, which cannot be assumed for Middle English without considering a text's whole graphemic system, the possibility of patterns in phonological contexts for <u> forms, and relative proportions of different spellings for identical etymons therefore went largely unconsidered.

---

[2] Cf. Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.214.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, §§5.183–5.

[4] M. S. Serjeantson, 'The Dialectal Distribution of Certain Phonological Features in Middle English: Section II', *ES* 4 (1922), 191–8, at 194–8.

This shortcoming was exacerbated by the fact that earlier commentators had tended to see <u> for late West Saxon <eo> to represent a wholesale sound change, particularly Wyld, who claimed that 'in the extreme S.W. and perhaps further Nth' [ø(:)] < /e(:)o/ was 'gradually raised' to [y(:)] and was 'thus levelled with Fr. [y] and with the same sound, when it survived, from O.E.' Wyld cited Laȝamon's rhyme *neode* 'need', rhyming with *hude* 'hide', and the *South English Legendary*'s *duyre* 'dear', rhyming with *huyre* 'hire', without considering the more obvious explanation of i-mutation variants in <y> < <ie> in late West Saxon.[5] Luick justly opposed Wyld's interpretation, as have, implicitly, almost all commentators since.[6] Unsurprisingly, then, <u> reflexes of conventional <eo> have since rarely been differentiated from spellings such as <eo, oe, eu, ue, uy>, as indeed they were not by Wyld, being taken together with them to imply /ø(:)/.[7]

A more detailed consideration of the evidence, however, suggests that Serjeantson's <u> forms did indeed represent /y(:)/, rather than

[5] H. C. Wyld, *A Short History of English*, 3rd ed. (London, 1927), §168c; cf. H. Sweet, *A History of English Sounds from the Earliest Period: with Full Word-Lists* (Oxford, 1888), §§657, 682.

[6] K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1914–40), §357, Anm. 3.

[7] S. Moore, S. B. Meech and H. Whitehall, 'Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries', *Essays and Studies in Eng. and Comparative Lit.* 13 (1935), 1–60, at 12–13; J. Fisiak, *A Short Grammar of Middle English Part One: Graphemics, Phonemics and Morphemics* (London, 1968), pp. 18, 20; K. Ek, *The Development of OE y and eo in South-Eastern Middle English*, Lund Studies in Eng. 42 (Lund, 1972), 12; R. Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. E. J. Crook (The Hague, 1974), §§65–6, 84–5; G. Kristensson, 'OE *eo* in the West Midlands in Late Middle English', *Historical and Editorial Studies in Medieval and Early Modern English for Johan Gerritsen*, ed. M. Arn, H. Wirtjes, and H. Janssen (Groningen, 1985), pp. 97–111, at 108–9; but n.b. A. J. Bliss, 'The OE Long Diphthongs *ĒO* and *ĒA*', *Eng. and Germanic Studies* 3 (1949–50), 82–7, at 84–5; Lass, 'Phonology', p. 55.

chance scribal variation for /ø(:)/, though this need not be true of the other spellings mentioned. That this should be so is suggested by the consistent use of ⟨u⟩ for etymological /y(:), u/ in stressed vowels in, for example, AB language, where the graph contrasts with ⟨ou⟩ for /u:/ and ⟨eo⟩ for /ø(:)/.[8] Indeed, in view of Gillis Kristensson's statement regarding place-name evidence for the reflexes of OE /e(:)o/, that 'in the whole area examined the reflex of OE /y(:)/ remained, spelt ⟨u⟩', his assumption that ⟨u⟩ should represent /ø(:)/ when derived from /e(:)o/ is rather counter-intuitive.[9] Particularly in view of the critical heritage, however, the a priori likelihood that our evidence attests to a development of /e(:)o/ > /y(:)/ requires further consideration, by two sorts of approaches. (1) We may seek circumstantial evidence for such a development in consistent phonological contexts, the plausibility of these being bolstered if they provoke similar processes elsewhere in linguistic change, ideally in the dialect(s) in question. (2) We may seek objective correlatives, that is correlating evidence of differing sorts for the change. The most important is that of correlating evidence from differing orthographic systems, most obviously pre-Conquest orthography showing ⟨y⟩ for etymological /e(:)o/. The chance occurrence of such spellings in similar contexts to the Middle English ⟨u⟩ spellings would be extremely unlikely: a correlation should reflect a genuine phonological phenomenon.

We may begin to pursue these forms of evidence by considering two manuscripts of the *South English Legendary*, London, BL Harley 2277 and Hand A of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 145, both from the first quarter of the fourteenth century, located in the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* to Berkshire and Somerset

---

[8] Cf. S. R. T. O. d'Ardenne, *Þe Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Iuliene*, EETS 248 (Oxford, 1961), pp. 173–5.
[9] Kristensson, 'OE *eo*', p. 109.

respectively; the original Legendary must have been produced in this area.[10] These texts use much the same orthography as AB language, with the only relevant difference being occasional ⟨uy⟩ for /y:/. We may be fully confident of the phonological value of the graph ⟨u⟩ when used of stressed long vowels here, and reasonably confident when it is used of short vowels. As in Serjeantson's material, a small number of instances show the variant form ⟨u⟩ for reflexes of conventional ⟨eo⟩, and in view of the otherwise consistent orthographic system, these must represent /y(:)/ reflexes. Given the infrequency of the relevant forms, and the absence of an electronic text, for this initial survey, relevant forms were sought in the glossary to Harley 2277 and Corpus 145 by Charlotte d'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, which while not being complete, aims to record 'primarily the more unusual words and the more unusual meanings of common words… But occasionally familiar words … are included when the variety of their forms is of interest'.[11] The glossary, then, should have noted most irregular ⟨u⟩ forms. It is unfortunate, however, that comparison of this edition with, for example, Wright's text from the life of St Michael shows that the EETS text, while purporting to be edited from Corpus 145 and Harley 2277, was in fact based on Corpus 145, with variants from Harley 2277 being recorded only when they affected word order and lexeme: spelling variants are not

---

[10] *LALME*, III, 11–12 (LP 6810) and III, 441 (LP 5130), respectively. For Corpus 145 Hand B, see III, 158 (LP 5560, Hants.); cf. M. Laing, *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 95–6, 21–2.

[11] C. d'Evelyn and A. J. Mill, *The South English Legendary: Edited from Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS. 145 and British Museum MS. Harley 2277 with Variants from Bodley MS. Ashmole 43 and British Museum MS. Cotton Julius D. IX*, 3 vols., EETS 235, 236, 244 (London, 1956–9) III, 40.

noted.[12] Wright's text, for example, shows *urthe* to have been standard for Corpus 145 *eorþe*, with an instance of *durk* for *derk* besides. Fuller consideration of Harley 2277 would doubtless be rewarding in this connection, therefore; but for now, the material of Corpus 145 adverted to in the EETS edition's glossary will suffice (see Table 1).

Reference[13]	Etymon	Attested form
II, 504, l. 360; II, 472, l. 263; II, 511, l. 598	eorþ	urth-, vrth-
II, 504, l. 357; II, 538, l. 170	deorc	durc, durk
II, 496, l. 116	liornian	lurny
I, 259, l. 365; II, 692, l. 70	sīoþ; sīon < sīon	sucþ; suk
II, 471, l. 236; II, 578, l. 193	fīorða	furde
I, 132, l. 114	dīor	dure
I, 67, l. 144	dīope	dupe
cf. *LALME* III, 12; III, 441	hēold (but cf. eWS hīold) < healdan	huld

Table 1: Middle English instances of ⟨u⟩ *for conventional* ⟨eo⟩

Serjeantson's suggestion, then, that our Middle English evidence sometimes indicates /y(ː)/ as a reflex of /e(ː)o/ is independently witnessed by a literary text. Moreover, the ⟨u⟩ forms occur in clear phonological contexts: they derive from /eor/ and /i(ː)o/. Strikingly, we seem also to find a back-spelling, with ⟨eo⟩ for conventional ⟨u⟩, in line 175 of the life of St Blaise, where we have *heorne* < *hyrne*; the form is confirmed by its rhyme in line 176, *turne* < Old English *tyrne* (subjunctive of *turnian*). There must, then, have been some confusion between the sounds represented by ⟨eo⟩ and ⟨u⟩. Harley 2277

and Corpus 145, then, meet desiderata (1) and (2) above. But they still leave uncertainty, particularly with regard to the short vowels, where ⟨u⟩ might represent /y/ or /u/. It is necessary, therefore, to seek further evidence.

Old English material offers a number of forms with the spelling ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩, listed in the appendix; in pre-Conquest orthography, ⟨y⟩ consistently represented the high front rounded vowel /y(ː)/.[14] The basis of my dataset was established by searching the *Dictionary of Old English* online corpus for word-roots showing ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩.[15] The roots were drawn from two corpora. The first was A. H. Smith's *English Place-Name Elements*, since the Old English charter bounds were deemed a particularly useful source, given the comparatively great possibility of localizing and dating the material extracted therefrom.[16] The second source was Duncan Macrae-Gibson's list of word-roots occurring in the Old English poetic corpus.[17] This digital list of roots was selected principally

---

[14] Hogg, *Phonology*, p. 15; Hogg also argues (§§5.164, 5.170–5) that in late West Saxon, ⟨y⟩ represented a lax [Y(ː)] (/y(ː)/), but also a lax and unrounded [ɪ(ː)], for which argument cf. P. Gradon, 'Studies in Late West-Saxon Labialization and Delabialization', in *English and Medieval Studies Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. N. Davis and C. L. Wrenn (London, 1962), pp. 63–76. If so, however, we must nonetheless consider [ɪ(ː)] to have collapsed phonemically and perhaps phonetically with /y(ː)/ by the twelfth century, if not by the late West Saxon period, since after the Norman Conquest, ⟨u⟩ was used for late West Saxon ⟨y⟩ in stressed syllables regardless of whether they originated in early West Saxon ⟨ie⟩ (which Hogg reads as [ɪ(ː)]) or ⟨y⟩. Cf. Corpus 145 *hūre < hȳran < hīeran; hurd < hyrd < hierd.*

[15] http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/, accessed 5 November 2001; cf. R. L. Venezky, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English* (Newark, DE, 1980–3).

[16] A. H. Smith, *English Place-Name Elements*, 2 vols., EPNS 25 (Cambridge, 1956).

[17] ftp://ftp.csd.abdn.ac.uk/pub/dmg/ASPR.roots/, accessed 5 Nov. 2001; cf. J. F. Madden and F. P. Magoun, *A Grouped Frequency Word-List of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (Harvard, 1966).

because ⟨eo⟩ roots could be found in it swiftly, and although its inclusion of poetic vocabulary was a drawback, it provided a generous selection of common words, enabling the effective searching of the whole online corpus. Positive results were collated with printed editions, with no discrepancies being discovered.

Where the substitution of ⟨y⟩ for ⟨eo⟩ produced the same form as a different word (e.g. *eorþ* 'earth' ~ *yrð-* 'ploughing'), the search was first narrowed to include only the charter corpus, and abandoned altogether if the number of instances was still too great for each to be checked. Forms were also discovered, naturally, by chance encounter in other contexts, and included accordingly. The list, then, cannot claim completeness, particularly since the Dictionary of Old English *Corpus of Old English* does not contain numismatic evidence, and unfortunately, the search method does not reveal back-spellings; but the search should represent a substantial proportion of the material showing ⟨y⟩ for ⟨eo⟩. Texts are referred to in the appendix by manuscript and, where applicable, Sawyer number.[18] Charters' dates and locations are derived from *The Electronic Sawyer*; cartularies' from Davis; and those of other texts, unless otherwise stated, from Ker.[19] Etymons are extrapolated from Holthausen and Bosworth–Toller.[20]

Forms which could be explained by other processes (e.g. *syfon* for *seofon*) were of course omitted from the list.[21] Particularly worthy of note among these excluded forms is *byrg* for *beorg*, since von Feilitzen, followed by Campbell, noted *Intebyrgan* (Inkberrow, Worcestershire) in

---

[18] P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (London, 1968), collated with http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/sdk13/chartwww/eSawyer.99/eSawyer2.html.

[19] *Ibid.*; G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain* (London, 1958); N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957).

[20] F. Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1934); B–T.

[21] Cf. A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §299d; OED s.v. *birch*.

a similar context.[22] This form can be explained by well-attested confusion between *beorg* 'hill, mound', *burg* (dative singular and nominative and accusative plural *byrig*) '(fortified) dwelling', and perhaps *beorg* 'defence'.[23] Confusion between words so similar in sound and sense is unsurprising and need not reflect a sound change (compare Modern English confusion between *bought* and *brought*). Thus we see clearly analogical confusion in S771: 'Ðanon on lythlan eorþbeorg of þære byrig'. The sound change proposed might of course have promoted analogy, but *byrg* for *beorg* cannot demonstrate the change itself. Likewise, the forms *byrht* and *byrn* for *beorht* and *beorn* in personal names were dealt with separately (see below, pp. 82–3).

Before analysis of the collected forms can proceed, the evidence requires some discussion. S1547 (Exeter DC, 2530) is particularly noteworthy, since here we can be unusually confident that the document and its language are precisely localizable. The manuscript is one of the two surviving unattached single sheet Old English boundary clauses (the other is S255, MS 2, reportedly to be S1548B in Susan Kelly's revised edition).[24] Such documents seem most likely to have been those on which boundary clauses were originally recorded *in situ* in order to communicate the details of the bounds to the scriptorium where a single-sheet charter would be drawn up.[25] Here, then, *dyra* is probably a first-hand witness to Devonshire dialect, a point particularly significant in this instance, since in more northerly areas, a form *dyr* might be ascribed to influence from Old Norse **diur* (compare Old Icelandic *dýr*). Since S1547 corresponds to no surviving

---

[22] O. von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Names of Domesday Book*, Nomina Germanica 3 (Uppsala, 1937), pp. 61–2; cf. Campbell, *Grammar*, §304, n. 1.

[23] See *Exodus*, ed. P. J. Lucas, (London, 1977), p. 87, for examples.

[24] K. A. Lowe, 'The Development of the Anglo-Saxon Boundary Clause', *Nomina* 21 (1998), 63–100, at 65.

[25] Cf. *ibid.* p. 65.

charter, however, we cannot date it precisely.

For the rest, however, we must consider difficulties with sources, principally concern regarding the evidential value of the twelfth-century manuscripts of Old English texts which provide so many of the forms listed – the cartularies of Winchester and Worcester (generally known as the *Codex Wintoniensis* [CW] and *Hemming's Cartulary* [HC]), and the Winteney version of the Old English *Benedictine Rule* [WR]. CW seems to date from the episcopate of Henry of Blois (1130–50),[26] while the material in HC may be dated paleographically to s. xi[1] and s. xi[2], and WR to s. xii[1]. CW, and early medieval charters generally, seem to have been copied *literatim*, with little deliberate altering of forms, although copyists of other sorts of texts may have felt freer when copying.[27] But in each of our manuscripts, post-Conquest copyists have evidently altered some spellings (e.g. HC s. xi[2] *rudmerlega*, CW *urlæ*, WR *ysun*), and as well as possibly providing linguistic evidence in itself, this affects our understanding of spellings which may be accurate copies of Old English forms (e.g. HC s. xi[1] *rydemæreleage*, CW *yrle*, WR *HEARDHYRTNESSE*). Could a form like *yrle* be a post-Conquest alteration from an examplar's regular form *eorle? This would suggest /e(:)o/ > /i(:)/, not /y(:)/. However, this development would be even more surprising than /e(:)o/ > /y(:)/; such

---

[26] Cf. A. R. Rumble, 'The Purposes of the Codex Wintoniensis', *Proc. of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies IV, 1981*, ed. R. A. Brown (Woodbridge, 1982), pp. 153–66, at 157, and *passim.*

[27] K. Lowe, ' "As Fre as Thowt"?: Some Medieval Copies and Translations of Old English Wills', *Eng. Manuscript Studies 1100–1700* 4 (1993), 1–23; M. Laing, 'Anchor Texts and Literary Manuscripts in Early Middle English', *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays Celebrating the Publication of 'A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English'*, ed. Felicity Riddy (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 27–52, at 37–42; cf. P. R. Kitson, 'The Nature of Old English Dialect Distributions, Mainly as Exhibited through Charter Boundaries', *Medieval Dialectology*, ed. J. Fisiak (Berlin, 1995), pp. 43–135, at 48–50.

evidence as we have for such a change would in any case be most easily explained as unrounding of /y(:)/ < /e(:)o/.[28] Moreover, the reading would sit ill with the appearance of post-Conquest ⟨u⟩ forms in the same contexts, in the same manuscripts. As in the *South English Legendary* material, these forms are problematic, and in early Middle English might represent /u:/ as well as /u, y(:)/. Meanwhile, if the ⟨u⟩ form derives from the exemplar, it would certainly suggest an Old English development of /e(:)o/ > /u(:)/. A close study of the WR leaves no doubt that ⟨u⟩ could represent /y(:)/ (e.g. 25.22–3 *hura uldran*),[29] but there are no instances of ⟨ou⟩ for /u(:)/ to suggest that an updating scribe would not have used ⟨u⟩ for /u(:)/ also. There are also some instances of ⟨u⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩ in Old English (though a search of the *Old English Corpus* based on Macrae-Gibson's list for examples of ⟨u⟩ for ⟨eo⟩ has produced far fewer examples than of ⟨y⟩ for ⟨eo⟩).[30] However, it is clearly most efficient to argue that ⟨y, u⟩ for conventional Old English ⟨eo⟩ are different periods' spellings of /y(:)/ – otherwise we would have to argue the development of /e(:)o/ to two of /i(:), y(:), u(:)/, rather than only to

---

[28] Cf. von Feilitzen, *Pre-Conquest Names*, §34.

[29] Cf. M. Gretsch, 'Die Winteney-Version der Benediktinerregel', *Anglia* 96 (1978), 310–48, at 343.

[30] Cf. Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.07–9, and note also *laruw* (Bede 5 B9.6.7, 9.410.19), *sufon* (ByrM 1 (Baker/Lapidge) B20.20.1, 1.2.123; ChrodR 1, B10.4.1, 83.3; Mt (WSCp) B8.4.3.1, 22.28, PsGlC (Wildhagen) C7.1, 11.7, 78.12; S1547, B15.8.589), *þwurh* (PsGlC (Wildhagen) C7.1, 77.8), *hura* (RegCGl (Kornexl) C27, 11.179), *eahtuþan* (RegCGl (Kornexl) C27, 32.731), *cwuwa* (*leg. cnuwa*, BenRGl C4, 50.85.17), *þud* (HomS 15 (Belf 6) B3.2.15, 130), *þwurh* (GD 1 (H) B9.5.8.2, 10.76.9), *betwun-* (ChrodR 1 B10.4.1, 54.21, 80.10; LS 21 (AssumptTristr) B3.3.21, 77; Nic (D) B8.5.3.2, 17). Citations according to A. diP. Healey, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English: the List of Texts and Index of Editions* (Toronto, 1980). Note that PsGlC (Wildhagen) C7.1 and S1547, B15.8.589 also record ⟨y⟩ forms – respectively, *cnywv* (*leg. cnyw*) and *dyra snæd*.

/y(:)/. The spelling ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩, then, may be taken with confidence to represent pre-Conquest orthography, ⟨u⟩ to represent post-Conquest.

The presence of ⟨u⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩ in a post-Conquest manuscript is still not wholly straightforward. Though most obviously representing the intrusion of post-Conquest phonology via post-Conquest orthography into the copying, the spelling might conceivably be a transliteration of a form in pre-Conquest orthography (*⟨y⟩) by a scribe who understood the phonological values of the former spelling system, and altered a form so as to preserve its phonological value in the new spelling system. The former prospect seems more likely, and is the safer assumption. Thus the second, post-Conquest, example from HC suggests ⟨u⟩ forms to show linguistic as well as orthographic updating. Here we have two apparently independent copies of the the same boundary clause,[31] the earlier giving *rydemæreleage*, the latter *rudmerlege*. Although the ⟨u⟩ of *rud-* could be an updated transliteration of the ⟨y⟩ in *ryd-*, if that form is original, the rest of the word shows linguistic as well as orthographic updating. Since Redmarley was local to the scribes of HC we may assume that the later scribe knew the name, and accordingly wrote down the form of the name which he was accustomed to use. This situation is less clear for forms such as CW's *dupan*, which preserves the Old English inflection, but it is safest to assume it.

The time and place for which 'exemplar forms' are evidence can be assumed reasonably comfortably for charters, since the form is likeliest either to derive from the area of the charter's bounds or from the area of the principal house of the charter's beneficiary. Kitson has argued that locally written boundary clauses were usually copied

---

[31] N. R. Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 49–75, at 51, 68.

literatim into single-sheet charters, and thence into cartularies, with original dialect forms intact,[32] and with due caution we may ascribe ⟨y⟩ forms to the area of the charter's bounds in the case of genuine charters (otherwise, once more with caution, to the area of the principal house of the beneficiary). The provenance of the exemplar of WR is harder to judge, but Gretsch found that WR's closest textual affiliations were to London, BL Cotton Titus A. iv, whose likeliest provenance is Winchester.[33] We may cautiously assume, therefore, that WR's exemplar was likewise a Hampshire text, though its date is unknown.

Problems of origin and transmission also beset the form *Byferes stane* (Beverstone in Gloucestershire, very close to Malmesbury) in the E-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but these can be resolved sufficiently for present purposes. It is not known where the E-recension of the Chronicle was being kept in 1051, but it is believed at least to represent a contemporary and independent record at this time, so if the form is original, it is precisely dated.[34] The fact that the annal locates events at *Byferes stan* without referring to a wider geographical context (recension D, by contrast, places events at *Gleawcester* instead)[35] implies that the annalist, and whatever audience he may have been writing for, knew Gloucestershire well. E seems to have been known in Worcester and Malmesbury in the thirteenth century, and was often in contact with a text known to D, D almost

---

[32] Kitson, 'Dialect Distributions', pp. 48–50.

[33] 'Die Winteney-Version', pp. 323–8; cf. M. Gretsch, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Übersetzung,* Texte und Unterschungen zur Englischen Philologie 2 (Munich, 1973), 37.

[34] *The Peterborough Chronicle (the Bodleian Manuscript Laud Misc. 636)*, ed. D. Whitelock, EEMF 4 (Copenhagen, 1954), 31–2.

[35] *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols., (Oxford, 1892–9) I, 175.

certainly being kept at Worcester.[36] We may localize the form of *Byferes stan* with confidence, therefore, to the area of the southern Welsh marches – if not, speculatively, to Gloucestershire, and accordingly its scholastic centre Malmesbury.

The two forms of apparent south-eastern provenance must also be noted. This provenance is interesting, but not problematic, since despite general and early unrounding of /y(:)/ in the south-east, a scattering of ⟨u⟩ reflexes of late West Saxon /y(:)/ is still apparent in the late medieval evidence for that region.[37] But each text is slightly complicated: London, BL Stowe Ch. 40, offering *Lyfwine*, is a forgery, though this does not invalidate it as linguistic evidence for the likely time of the text's composition, around the first quarter of the eleventh century; and since the beneficiary and bounds of the charter were in Kent, a Kentish provenance is fairly assured. Here, ⟨y⟩ might be an inverted spelling for /e:/ < /e:o/,[38] but as the Kentish form should have been *Līof-*, this seems unlikely. The glosses in Yale University MS 401, with *yroda*, are located on the basis of south-eastern dialect features.[39] These use ⟨yo⟩ for Kentish ⟨io⟩, so *yroda* might simply be a scribal error omitting the *o*.

Lastly, we must note some difficulties in determining the etonyms of place-names, and with the evidence of names in general. Place-names comprise the main part of the corpus of ⟨y⟩ forms, which is why the corroborating evidence of literary sources is particularly important. As Cecily Clark observed,

> semantic divorce from common vocabulary lays name-material
> especially open to phonological change, in so far as shifts and
> reductions may be unrestrained by analogies with related lexical items

---

[36] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. and trans. M. J. Swanton (London, 1996), p. xxv.
[37] Cf. *LALME*, I, dot maps 17, 19, 23 and 1059.
[38] Cf. Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.194.
[39] *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished*, ed. A.S. Napier (Oxford, 1900), p. xxxii.

and may at times be warped by random associations with unrelated but like-sounding ones. As a source of phonological evidence, name-material must therefore be treated with reserve.[40]

Fortunately, these difficulties should not generally impinge on the value of the charter evidence collected, since almost all the names there are transparent descriptive formations, even if some are also toponyms. *Dyra snæd* ('Wild animals' area'), for example, seems unlikely to have been affected phonologically in ways in which other lexical categories would not, though the less transparent *Wryng* < *wrīo-ing* might have been. On the other hand, it may be that names were less constrained by the orthographic conventions of the *Schriftsprache* than other words. Occasionally the etymology of a place-name is un-clear – thus, although *rydmædwan* is included in the appendix, the first element might be < *rȳd* 'clearing'. Smith considered the element more likely to derive from *hrēod* 'reed', however, perhaps because the place was by water.[41] But on the whole, etymons are clear and pose few difficulties. From these analyses, we may tentatively produce a list of pre-Conquest instances of ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩ (see Table 2).

The distributions in Table 2 match those of Harley 2277/ Corpus 145. Five etymons have short vowels, and four of these show ⟨y⟩ before /-r/ (*yrl*, *hyrt*, *gedyrf*, *deorc*). Naturally enough, these also precede /-rC/, but it is hard to see any significance in this fact given the varied character of the second consonants. Of the eight long vowels, three

---

[40] C. Clark, 'Onomastics', *The Cambridge History of the English Language Vol. 1: the Beginnings to 1066*, ed. R. M. Hogg (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 452–89, at 485–6; cf. C. Clark, 'Onomastics', *The Cambridge History of the English Language Vol. 2*, ed. Blake, pp. 542–606, at 592–5; K. Cameron, *English Place-Names*, 2nd ed. (Trowbridge, 1996).

[41] Smith, *Place-Name Elements*, II, 82.

County	Etymon	Attested root
Worcestershire	hrīod	ryd (× 2)
Gloucestershire	biofor	byfer
	cnīow	cnyw
Wiltshire	dīor	dyr (× 2)
Somerset	wrīo	wryng
Devonshire	dīor	dyr
Hampshire	eorl	yrl
	heorte	hyrt
	gedeorf	gedyrf
	*crēowel	crywel
	drīorig	dryri
South-East	līof	lyf
	ēorod < eoh-rād	yrod
Unlocated	deorc	dyrc
	drīorig	dryri

Table 2: Pre-Conquest instances of ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩

County	Etymon	Attested form
Wiltshire	hrīod	hrud
Hampshire	eorl	urlæ
	heorte	hurt
	dīop	dup
	dīofol	dufel
	bīoþ	buþ
	līoht	luht
	prīost	prust
	gesēon	ysun

Table 3: Pre-Conquest instances of ⟨u⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩

show ⟨y⟩ before /-r/ (though never before /-rC/; *dyr*, *dryri*, *yrod*), though four follow /r-/ (*ryd*, *wryng*, *crywel* and *dryri*), but more striking here is that six out of eight etymons show /i:o/ rather than /e:o/. The ⟨u⟩ forms recorded in WR and CW once more repeat these distributions (see Table 3). Here, each of the short vowels precedes /r/, and all but one of the long vowels derive from /i:o/.

The possibilities for explaining these developments are manifold, but the trends in context and etymology presented here inevitably guide us towards two strands of interpretation. Whatever the case, we may note that the roundedness of a monophthong from /e:o/ can be explained without reference to external influence, due to the rounded second element of the diphthong, which alone was sufficient to produce the roundedness of /ø(:)/. In the Old English evidence, and the later material of Hampshire and Harley 2277/ Corpus 145, long diphthongs show /y:/ reflexes with no consistent synchronic phonological context; but they do derive almost invariably from what in early West Saxon would have been written as ⟨io⟩.[42] So striking a context cannot be ignored. The significance of ⟨io⟩ is not entirely clear: the Old English high diphthong must originally have been /i(:)u/, and it is possible that ⟨io⟩ represented that, which would conform with the principal of 'diphthong height harmony' present in /e(:)o, æ(:)ɑ/ (cf. Lass, 'There is no doubt that this [*sc.* ⟨io⟩] must be

---

[42] This seems also to be true of the west Midlands, north of the West Saxon dialect area, to judge from the ⟨u⟩ forms found by G. Kristensson, *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290–1350: the West Midland Counties*, Pub. of the New Soc. of Letters at Lund 78 (Lund, 1987), 112–18, 123–6, 151–7; distribution maps 11 and 13, pp. 244 and 245 (cf. Kristensson, 'OE *eo*'). These show eight different words, most of which, etymologically, had long diphthongs: *de Gruthurst* < *grīot*, *Stur* < *stīor* (Worcestershire); *de Durhurst* < *dīor*, *Prust* < *prīost* (Gloucestershire); *Bruwest'* < *brīowan*, *Prust* (Oxfordshire); *(de) Crulefeld*, *de Cruleye* < **crēowel* (Warwickshire). All show etymological /i:o/ except the *Crul-* forms.

/iu/').[43] On the other hand, ⟨io⟩ may represent /i(:)o/, with a lowered second element, which would be consistent with the spelling (cf. Hogg, 'it is certainly the case that the second element of all these diphthongs [*sc.* /e(:)o, i(:)o/] had already lowered lowered [sic] to /o/').[44] Fortunately, either form would plausibly yield /y(:)/ upon monophthongization, so we need not decide between these alternative certainties; Bliss's reading [ɪ:o], whatever its phonemic status, would also be an important possibility.[45] For convenience, I read /i(:)o/.

After /i(:)o/ and /e(:)o/ merged, the late West Saxon *Schriftsprache* of course used the digraph ⟨eo⟩ rather than ⟨io⟩. This suggests that the phonetic process behind the merger was the falling of /i(:)o/, at least in the dialect on which the *Schriftsprache* was based, although the preference for ⟨eo⟩ might simply reflect the greater frequency of /e(:)o/ in the language,[46] leading to the promotion of the more common digraph. However, /i(:)o/ > /e(:)o/ is also suggested by the fact that the reflex of the diphthong in Middle English was almost always of mid articulation.[47] It is evident, however, that the late West Saxon *Schriftsprache* was not representative of the whole of the south-west, nor even, despite the common coinage 'Winchester usage', based on Winchester's dialect.[48] Accordingly, Veronica Smart, while ruling out the form ⟨LIOF-⟩ for conventional *leof* as representative of many moneyers' dialects due to centralized die production, nonetheless found that 'Cnut's first type workshops in Chichester,

---

[43] R. Lass, *Old English: a Historical Linguistic Companion* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 50–1 for diphthong height harmony; p. 68 for quotation.

[44] Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.155.

[45] Bliss, 'Long Diphthongs'.

[46] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 84.

[47] Cf. Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.155; d'Ardenne 192–3.

[48] Kitson, 'Dialect Distributions', p. 45 and nn. 19–21, with refs.

Lewes and Winchester also produced a few dies with this variant [*sc.* ⟨LIOF-⟩], suggesting that as far west as Winchester *Liof* represented an acceptable spelling of this element' in the first half of the eleventh century.[49]

The ⟨LIOF-⟩ spellings might be taken to reflect influence from the differing process of diphthongal merging in the south-east, where /e:o, i:o/ became ⟨io⟩ and /eo, io/ became ⟨eo⟩. This evidence in part led Bliss to argue that /e:o/ rose to [ɪ:o], and subsequently coalesced with /i:o/.[50] The argument certainly helped him to explain the Middle English development of Old English /e:ow/ > Middle English /iu/, rather than to /eu/ or /ɛu/, but in view of the data presented above, it cannot be accepted straightforwardly for the south-west. Only *yroda* and *crywelæ* seem to derive from /e:o/; and *yroda*, if it does show /y:/, would plausibly show the Kentish raising of /e:o/. The origins of **crēowel* are unclear, and its value seems uncertain. On the basis of Old Frisian *crawil*, proto-Old English **cræwil* should have become **crewel* by i-mutation, and *creowel* by the vocalization of /-w-/, with the lengthening of /e/ seen in **cnew > cnēo(w)*.[51] However, a high vowel origin, and etymological long vowel, is hinted at by Old English *crūw*, 'a bend'. There is not space here to pursue this problem fully; we may simply note for present purposes that there is little sign of confusion between /e:o/ and /i:o/ derivations in the ⟨y, u⟩ forms. This surely implies that the ⟨y, u⟩ forms here show the monophthongization of /i:o/ to /y:/, just as /e:o/ monophthongized to /ø:/, a necessary corollary being that at

---

[49] V. Smart, 'Die-Cutting and Diatopic Variation: the Variant ⟨LIOF-⟩ on Late Anglo-Saxon Coins', *Evidence for Old English: Material and Theoretical Bases for Reconstruction*, ed. F. Colman, Edinburgh Studies in the Eng. Language 2 (Edinburgh, 1992), 169–77, at 176.

[50] Bliss, 'Long Diphthongs', pp. 82–4.

[51] Cf. Hogg, *Phonology*, §3.19; *contra* Smith, *Place-Name Elements*, I, 112.

the time of monophthongization, /i:o/ and /e:o/ were still distinct.

According to standard accounts of Old English, /i:o/ and /e:o/ were merging in the south west at the time of the earliest West Saxon texts, around the end of the ninth century. However, if this were the case in the types of speech producing /y:/ reflexes, we would expect to see ⟨y⟩ for /i:o/ much earlier than we do. Instead, we must accept the implications of Smart's numismatic record, that /i:o/ was a variant in some dialects or registers of south-western speech into the eleventh century, and hypothesize moreover that these instances of /i:o/ were not due to a process like that in the south-east, of the wholesale raising of long mid diphthongs, but to conservative phonology. It would cause no great difficulty to scribes to transcribe the two phonemes /i:o, e:o/ with one graph ⟨eo⟩ (much as they transcribed the two phonemes /e:o, eo/ with one graph), but to write ⟨eo⟩ for /y:/ when that sound was normally represented by a different graph would be very counter-intuitive. Thus ⟨io⟩ disappeared from the written record even in dialects where /i:o/ survived, while a reflex /y:/ produced by the monophthongization of /i:o/ sporadically appeared.

The other context for ⟨y⟩ forms is of course /eor/; these forms rarely derive from /io/ (infrequency of /io/ in Old English may account for its dearth in the dataset: but note Corpus 145 *lurny*). The shortness of the vowel corresponds with the fact that in Old English (and generally) short vowels were more prone to being affected by their contexts than were long vowels (as in i-mutation and breaking); but the context itself is problematic. As Hogg wrote when arguing that ⟨y⟩ represented the lax [ɪ(:)] in words like *ryht*, 'It is difficult to suppose that a preceding /r/ could have had the effect of rounding which we may assume for preceding /w/, for where /r/ has any phonological effect in OE it is usually one of retraction and/or

lowering'.[52] Such a tendency may be observed in, for example, modern Spanish, where the openness of the trill /r/ tends to cause lowering of adjacent vowels.[53] Hogg's statement might be questioned, insofar as /r/ does not seem particularly associated with lowering; indeed, the context /weor/ regularly developed to /wur/ in West Saxon, where /r/ is a necessary component in raising. Likewise, breaking in the context /-rC/ (amongst others) originally involved the introduction of the high rounded /u/. In any case, even if the paradox implied by Hogg's claim is real, it is of a sort well known in Old English phonology. It is reminiscent, for example, of the disjunction between breaking and Anglian smoothing. In Anglian smoothing, /r, l/ + velar caused monophthongization where at an earlier period the very same context caused breaking. This difficulty is probably to be explained by changes in the quality of velars, but it is interesting that /r/ is involved. The quality of /r/ may have changed also after the time of breaking; a close palatal /r/, for example, is perfectly conceivable, and can be heard in some dialects of Edinburgh. The late West Saxon development of *sel-* > *syl-* (thus *sylf*, *syllan*, *syllīc* < *seldlīc*) is also relevant. Campbell assumed that this was a change related to palatal diphthongization (*self* > *sielf* > *sylf*),[54] and this is reasonable enough; but even if we read ⟨y⟩ here, with Hogg, as [I(:)],[55] we must still reckon with a raising of /e/ in a context otherwise associated with breaking (/-lC/), the product of which Middle English orthography seems to show to have merged with /y/ (cf. n. 2 above).

Relevant also are the early and frequent forms *byrht*/ *bryht* and *byrn*/ *bryn* for etymological *beorht* and *beorn* in personal names, first appearing at the start of the tenth century. 'In the course of the 10th c.

---

[52] Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.170.

[53] Cf. T. Navarro Tomás, *Manual de la Pronunciación Española* (Madrid, 1918), §53.

[54] Campbell, *Grammar*, §325.

[55] Hogg, *Phonology*, §§5.164–5, 170.

this variant gains ground rapidly and tends to supersede *Beorht-*'.[56] Accordingly, these words were excluded as a special case from the general search for ⟨y⟩ for conventional ⟨eo⟩. The spellings might in theory be ascribed to palatal umlaut of metathesized *breoht* (*breoht* > **brieht* > *bryht*), or palatal umlaut acting through the /r/ of *beorht*, but this prospect has never been favoured. Campbell went so far to avoid it as to suppose a 'special development' of *beor-* to *byr-* in names.[57] In view of the evidence discussed, it seems more likely that these forms represent the earliest evidence for the proposed change /eor/ > /yr/. As noted above, it is not surprising to find an innovation attested earliest and most fully among personal names. Perhaps the change began in the context /beor/, or /Leor/, progressing in time, if sporadically, to /eor/ (cf. *dyrce*, *c.* 1000).

These explanations suggest two distinct sound changes, though their forces may at times have overlapped. Thus, *byferes*, with a short vowel, lacks an /-r/ context, but does derive from /io/; given the rarity of /io/ in Old English, it might be taken as sufficient evidence for the maintenance of /io/ as well as /i:o/ in some forms of speech, likewise monophthongizing to /y/. Conversely, one might also perceive a tendency for /y:/ to appear in the context of /r/: of the thirteen relevant lexemes in Tables 2 and 3, seven show /r/ contexts; all of the six west Midland forms in note 4 do so. None of those are breaking contexts, which implies that the bias towards /r/ forms is due to something other than the causal relationship of /-rC/ with diphthongization. This perhaps suggests that /i:o/ was less likely to fall to /e:o/ in the context of /r/, though one would not wish to press the idea. We may guess that the change /beor-/ > /byr-/ was underway before /i:o/ > /y:/. This is suggested by the late ninth

[56] von Feilitzen, *Pre-Conquest Names*, p. 62.

[57] Campbell, *Grammar*, §304, n.1; cf. von Feilitzen, *Pre-Conquest Names*, p. 62.

century occurrence of /byr-/ forms in personal names (where, for example, we see no instance of *Lyf-* for *Liof-*), whereas /i:o/ > /y:/ is first securely attested in 960 (S684). Unfortunately, only one Old English text, WR, attests to both changes at once; here, the forms *hyrt* and *gedyrfe* attest to /eor/ > /yr/, and *dryri* to /i:o/ > /y:/ before the end of Old English orthography, but no more can be said of them.

Serjeantson was right, then, to interpret Middle English ⟨u⟩ spellings as /y(:)/ reflexes of conventional Old English ⟨eo⟩, though her idea that it might represent a raising of /ø(:)/ seems unlikely: we may perceive instead the two developments /eor/ > /yr/ and /i:o/ > /y:/. Perhaps a stage /ø/ was present in /eor/ > /yr/, but that development seems to have begun some time before we would expect to find /eo/ > /ø/, by the end of the ninth century. It seems clear that /i:o/ survived much longer in the south west than the literary record would suggest, and was being monophthongized to /y:/, if only sporadically, by the mid-tenth century. The patchy occurrence of these forms in the textual record cannot be attributed to variation across space: the material of the Vespasian Psalter and its descendants in AB language show no hint of them, but HC shows /i:o/ > /y:/ in the same area in the eleventh, if not the tenth, century. We must reckon, surely, on register of speech suppressed in the textual record by a more prestigious variety, more innovative in respect of the loss of high diphthongs, but less so regarding /eor/ > /yr/; in Hampshire, this alternative register seems to have been sufficiently acceptable to receive reasonably extensive representation in the textual record. The reflexes of both these developments remained in Middle English until the loss of rounded vowels themselves.[58]

This much having been established, further research might examine other issues and material which have not been addressed

---

[58] Cf. Serjeantson, 'Dialectal Distribution', p. 194.

here. The corpus of Old English coin inscriptions might shed further light on the sound changes, and those developments might equally elucidate some linguistic issues in the coin corpus. At the other end of the development's attested history, further examination of the Middle English evidence would also be productive. We might determine more precisely than did Serjeantson the extent of each sound change, both in the lexicon and in space. For example, Serjeantson found *-true*, *Hurt-* and *Dup(e)-* in Lancashire, but no ⟨u⟩ forms to the south in Cheshire or north Shropshire, a gap in the distribution map which *LALME* dot map 738 (*urth*, *vrth*) partly rectifies, as do the forms *burne* and *rurde* in London, BL Cotton Nero A. x, whose language is from Cheshire.[59] Meanwhile, *Hurthull*, recorded in Derbyshire in 1272, suggests more easterly extremes for the developments.[60] However, these additional forms suggest only /eor/ > /yr/ this far north, despite the late attestation of the distinction between ⟨io⟩ and ⟨eo⟩ in Northumbria,[61] and the extent to which the two developments for which I argue overlapped in space, and how far they may have been related to each other, or to other developments with similar Old and Middle English distributions, such as ⟨ie⟩ > ⟨y⟩, would be worth pursuing.[62]

---

[59] *LALME*, III, 37 (LP 26).

[60] K. Cameron, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, 3 vols., EPNS 27 (Cambridge, 1959), I, 108.

[61] Hogg, *Phonology*, §5.159.

[62] I owe thanks to several for their helpful comments and other assistances regarding this paper: those who asked questions and made comments at the conference; Simon Horobin, Katie Lowe, Paul Bibire, Jon Coe, Meg Laing and Beth Fox.

Appendix

Manuscript and reference	Date
Marquess of Bath, Longleat, 39. S371.	MS s. xiv Charter 904 (suspect)
Exeter, D.C., 2522. S684.	MS s. x^{med} Charter 960
BL Harley 436. S766.	MS s. xiv Charter 968
Harley Glossary, BL Harley 3376.[A]	s. x/xi
BL Cotton Tib. A. xiii. S55.	MS s. xi^1 Charter 757
BL Cotton Tib. A. xiii, fo. 83. S1338. fo. 159. S1338.	MS s. xi^1 Charter 978 MS s. xi^2 Charter 978
Exeter, D.C., 2530. S1547.	?s. xi^1
Aldhelm Fragments, Yale University, MS 401.[B]	MS s. x^2 Glosses s. xi
BL Stowe Ch. 40. S981.	MS ?s. xi^1 Charter undated (suspect)
Oxford, Bodleian, Laud Misc. 636.[C]	MS s. xii^1 Annal 1048 (*recte* 1051)
Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.1.23.[D]	s. xi^{med}
BL Cotton Ch. viii. 11. S540	MS s. xi? Charter 948 (probably forged)

Place	*Attested form, etymon, and MnE reflex or equivalent*
MS Glastonbury, Somerset. Bounds Somerset.	**wryng** < wrīo, 'twisting'
Bounds Cornwall.	**hryd worwig** < hrīod, 'reed'
Beneficiaries Wilton Abbey, Wilts. Bounds Wilts.	**Dyre broc** < dīor, 'deer'
'Probably from the west of England'.[E]	**dyrce** < deorc, 'dark'
Bounds Warwicks.	**rydmædwan** < hrīod, 'reed'
MS and bounds Worcester. MS and bounds Worcester.	**Rydemæreleage** < hrīod-, 'reed' **Rudmerlega** **<** hrīod-, 'reed'
Bounds Devon.	**dyra snæd** < dīor, 'deer'
South Eastern (dialect).	**yroda** < ēored, 'troop'
Beneficiary Christ Church, Canterbury. Bounds Kent.	**Lyfwine** < līof-, 'love'
MS Peterborough; annal refers to Beverstone, Gloucs.	**Byferes stane** < biofor, 'beaver'
'Perhaps from Winchcombe' (Gloucs.).[F]	**cnywv** [*leg.* cnyw] < cnīow, 'knee'
Beneficiary church of SS Peter and Paul, Winchester. Bounds Wilts.	**dyre broc** < dīor, 'deer'

Manuscript and Reference	Date
BL Add. 15350 (Codex Wintoniensis). S229, 275, 393, 540 (5 boundary clauses/ charters on consecutive folios). S378.	MS ?1130 × 1150 All spurious or dubious claiming to be s. vii to 948. Charter 909 (suspect)
S585.	Charter 956
S820.	Charter 973 × 974
S970.	Charter 1033
S1009.	Charter 1045
BL Cotton Claudius D. iii (Winteney Benedictine Rule). 27.2, 69.7; 3.6, 7.2, 7.5, 17.34, 25.5; 5.21, 23.23, 41.20, 77.15, 131.34. 79.14	s. xii[1].[G]
19.29	
7.5	
13.14, 21.1	
9.12	
127.7	
5.12	
Brussels, 8558–63, f. 80[r].[H]	MS ?s. viii Gloss unknown

Place	*Attested form, etymon, and MnE reflex or equivalent*
MS Winchester Bounds Wilts.	**dyre broc** < dīor, 'deer'
Bounds Hants.	**ullan crywelæ** < *crēowel, 'fork in road or river'
Bounds Wilts.	**hrud wylle** < hrīod, 'reed'
Bounds Hants.	**dupan furh** < dīop, 'deep'
Bounds Hants.	**Godwine urlæ** < eorl, 'earl'
Bounds Hants.	**Godwine yrle** < eorl, 'earl'
Winteney, Hants. Exemplar closely related to BL Cotton Titus A. iv, possibly from Winchester.[1]	**(-)hyrt(-); (-)hurt(-);(-)hert(-)** < heorte, 'heart' **gedyrfe** < gedeorf, 'labour' **dryri** < drīorig, 'dreary' **dufel** < dīofol, 'devil' **buþ** < bīoþ, 'are' **leafluht** < līoht, 'light, not heavy' **mæsseprustes** < Lat. presbyter; cf. early West Saxon -prīost, 'priest'[J] **ysun** < gesēon 'see'
Unknown	**dryrinese** < drīorig 'dreary'

Notes to Appendix

[A] *The Harley Latin–Old English Glossary: Edited from British Museum Harley 3376*, ed. R. T. Oliphant (The Hague, 1966), p. 153.

[B] Napier, p. 175.

[C] Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, I, 174.

[D] *Der Cambridger Psalter*, ed. K. Wildhagen, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 7 (Darmstadt, 1910), p. 285.

[E] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 313.

[F] *Ibid.* p. 12.

[G] *Ibid.* p. xix.

[H] O. B. Schlutter, 'Anglo-Saxonica', *Anglia* 32 (1909), 503–15, at 513.

[I] Gretsch, 'Winteney-Version', pp. 323–8.

[J] Cf. H. Sweet, *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, 2 vols., EETS 45 (London, 1871–2) I, 7; Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, I, 34.