

OLD ENGLISH *ĒO* IN MIDDLE KENTISH PLACE-NAMES¹

1. MIDDLE KENTISH AND PLACE-NAME STUDIES

The Middle English period is characterised by its great dialectal diversity and has as one of its most peculiar varieties the dialect of Kent, Kentish, also called south-eastern variety. Those who have traditionally searched for the regional features reflected in anchor texts from Kent have regarded this variety as a Middle English dialect in which sound changes have an unconventional behaviour.

Complementary to these traditional textual analyses is the onomastic approach developed within the field of medieval dialectology during the 20th century. Following this approach, names are regarded as true informants of phonological change, and place-names, in particular, as “the material which has so far proved most profitable for the investigation of OE and ME dialects” (Kristensson 1967: XII). The inherent condition of place-names as accurate locators of dialectal variants and their importance in providing sometimes the only evidence of specific sound developments has produced works such as Serjeantson (1922, 1924, 1927a, 1927b), Ekwall (1931), Smith (1956), and Ek (1972, 1975).

This onomastic approach to medieval dialectology received a further boost in the 1950s when Kristensson decided to embark on a survey of the Middle English dialects. So far, this project has given place to four volumes Kristensson (1967, 1987, 1995, 2001). This research project, still in progress, aims to investigate the dialects of Middle English through the formal study of place-names and surnames from c. 1290-1350 and has as its primary source the Lay Subsidy Rolls, the official documents that more faithfully seem to reflect the local uses. The last volume published by Kristensson (2001) has an obvious interest for those concerned with Kentish

¹ This paper is part of a research project titled “Diccionario nuclear sintáctico de base semántica del léxico del inglés antiguo”, funded by the Gobierno Autónomo de Canarias (No. PI 1999/136).

matters since it deals with vowels (except diphthongs) in the Southern counties (the dialect of Kent included).

The main intention behind this research paper is to participate of this onomastic perspective and contribute to Kristensson's investigation by doing a formal analysis of OE *ēo* (a diphthong that has traditionally been regarded as dialectally relevant in Middle Kentish) in medieval place-names of Kent. This analysis, for both the first (or unique), and the second constituent of a Kentish compound noun,¹ will be done by checking our early Middle English material against the data assembled for late Middle English, that is name-forms from the 12th and 14th cc. respectively.

With this time-span in mind, we cannot limit ourselves to take the above mentioned Subsidy Rolls as our single primary source, mainly because these Rolls date back only to the second half of the 12th c., this being a period when they had not even been regularly and consistently established. On the other hand, there are authors who consider other documents to be equally valid to these as medieval dialectal sources. Arngart, for example, claims that the Assize Rolls have "a nearly equal right with the Subsidy Rolls of being described as local documents" (1949: 26-27).

Kentish registers from, among others, these two sources (the Subsidy Rolls and the Assize Rolls) also comprise Wallenberg's *The Place-Names of Kent* (1934) —henceforth *PNK*—, which is regarded up to now as the most important compilation to carry out research on the medieval place-names of Kent.² We will consequently take as a main source for the data gathering of this piece of research Wallenberg's *PNK*³, where the author, after scrutinising the most relevant English documents, shows the reader the written name-records of every single farm, village, parish and hundred of medieval Kent. These records, besides their corresponding source

¹ The intention behind this lies in checking whether the position of this OE sound in a stressed or in an unstressed syllable affects its ME development. Ek (1972: 66) claims that this fact does not affect the ME development of this OE variable.

² Ek (1975) also uses, as a basis for his Kentish data, Wallenberg's *Place Names of Kent*.

³ Apart from other secondary sources: Anderson (1934-1939), Cameron (1961), Reany (1964), Copley (1968) and Ekwall (1980).

references, include an etymological definition that served as a basis for the data gathering.

The authors of *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (McIntosh et al. 1986) —henceforth *LALME*— following an evidently geographical perspective but still adopting a new methodology (that of applying systematically a strict questionnaire of linguistic items to a heterogeneous selection of texts), get to draw a more approximate picture of the dialectal variation of late medieval English (c. 1350–1450). Although the intention behind the authors of this *Atlas* may have been different, the scarcity of medieval sources also allows us to profit from the formal diversity captured in the 14 Kentish Linguistic Profiles generated thanks to the fit-technique. *LALME* therefore will also constitute a potential frame, among others, with which to compare our 14th c. data.

2. GENERAL DISTRIBUTION¹

We centre upon the study of the evolution of OE *ēo* firstly because in Kentish “the long diphthongs underwent a separate development” (Hogg 1992: §5.210), and secondly because “it is only the long OE diphthong that is of interest. OE *eo* did not undergo any particularly Kentish development” (Ek 1972: 8).

The origin of OE *ēo* is the Germanic diphthong **ēu*. This diphthong seems to have passed into primitive Old English preserving the second element *-u*, although it does appear as *ēo* already in early texts. During the Middle English period, we will see however how the historical evolution of *ēo*, at least in the dialect of Kent, is intimately connected with the development of another Germanic diphthong, **īu*. This long diphthong, in a first stage of Old English, also preserves the second element *-u*, but will soon develop into *īo* (Luick 1914/1941: §191; Campbell 1959: §297; Jordan-Crook 1974: §§84-85; Hogg 1992: §5.160).

¹ Variables and variants will be generally represented in italics. We only use “<>” or “[]” when spellings or sounds, respectively, are meant explicitly. In order to conform to this convention, some illustrative quotations had to be slightly modified, that is, adapting the original format to this one.

The degree of interrelation between both diphthongs is such that Wyld (1921), Campbell (1959), Hogg (1992) or Ek (1972), among others, consider that, in Kentish, both of them (either long or short) are confused and, as regards the long one, *īo* seems to be more common than *ēo*. In Kentish documents from, according to Campbell (1959: §297) and Hogg (1992: §§ 5.155-5.162), the 9th c. and, according to Ek (1972: 13), the 7th c., we notice a marked tendency to raise the point of articulation of the first element of the diphthongs *ēo* and *eo* (although this tendency seems to be less evident in the second one). Besides, we can infer from the *Kentish Glosses (KG)* that the diphthongs *ēo* and *īo* coalesced into one long diphthong *īo* (or *īa*),¹ while short *eo* and *io* coalesced, on the other hand, into *eo* in West Saxon, Mercian and Kentish (Hogg 1992: §§5.155-5.160). These conclusions, based on the *KG*, are confirmed by the Middle English developments observed, for example, by Jordan-Crook (1974: §§84-85), or Luick (1914/1941: §§260-261) (for the latter, the change *ēo* > *īo* is first registered in Kent in the 7th c. and finally generalised in the 10th c.).

Leaving Kent aside, it seems to be the case that already at the end of Old English the diphthong *ēo* is monophthongised to *ē* in Essex and Suffolk. This smoothing process that, at the end of the 12th c. and the beginning of the 13th c., will affect the Southwest, the Central and West Midlands, the territory of London and its adjacent counties (except Kent), changes *ēo* into a rounded [ö:]. This [ö:] is generally unrounded during the 13th c., except in the Southwest and the West Midlands, and progressively changes to an *ē*, represented with either the typical spellings of the time, that is <e, ee, ei, ey>², or the Anglo-Norman spelling convention <ie>. As far as the West Midlands and the South-western counties are concerned, the process of unrounding does not take place until much later (14th - 15th cc.), and therefore it is here where it will keep on being spelt with the original <eo>³

¹ “It will be observed that the first element of *eo* tends to be raised in Kt., producing *īo*, or, with unrounding of the second element, *īa*” (Campbell 1959: §280 (n. 3)).

² “*ē* is often written <ei, ey>, esp. in the South [...] This spelling is probably nothing but a graphic symbol for *ē*” (Thuresson 1950: 251; see also Kristensson 1967: 172.)” (Ek 1972: 95).

³ This distribution coincides with that offered by Jordan-Crook in the dialectal map adapted from Moore, Meech, and Whitehall (1935), in which we single out that “line F represents the eastern and northern limit for OE *ēo* retained as a front round vowel /ø:/ spelled <eo, o, oe, u, ue>” (1974: § 84 (Remark 5)).

for a longer time. While preserving its roundness this sound may gradually raise to [y] and be represented with the Anglo-Norman spelling conventions <o, u, ue, ui, uy, oe, eu> (Wyld 1921: 129-34; 1927: §168-69; Mossé 1952: §30; Campbell 1959: §329 (2); Ek 1972: 12-13; and Jordan-Crook 1974: §84-85).

In South-eastern texts, particularly in Kentish, the old diphthong *ēo* is frequently spelt <ie, io, ye>. These digraphs are however inconsistent (Wyld 1927: §169) because we can occasionally find in Kentish spellings such as <ia, ee, oe, eo, e, i, y> (Wyld 1921: 12; Campbell 1959: §297; Jordan-Crook 1974: §85; Hogg 1992: §5.160). Campbell (1959: §329 (2)) and Jordan-Crook (1974: §85 (2)) have argued that <ie, ye>, typically Kentish digraphs, could represent a diphthongal pronunciation (with a rising diphthong) and suggest that in Kentish the monophthongisation process of OE *ēo* may not have existed. For Wyld (1927: §169) and Brook (1965: 70-71) this is extremely improbable since <ie> (and maybe also <ye> in Kentish) is an Anglo-Norman representation frequently used in Middle English as an expression for [e:].

For Ek (1972: 108 and 119-120), however, the traditional development *ie* evidenced in Kentish texts and place-names is not due to the Anglo-Norman orthographic influence but it merely represents a variant of a diphthongal development that might have been smoothed to *i* in a subsequent stage. He bases this inference on the following solid premises: (i.) the diphthongal character that forms with *ye* show; (ii.) the presence of forms with *ie* before 1350, when the Anglo-Norman convention was used only occasionally; (iii.) the possible ambiguity that could have been created with the *e*-development of OE *y* in this south-eastern side of the country; (iv.) the absence of forms with *ie* or *ye* in counties like Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire or Huntingdonshire (Ek 1972: 108 and 119-120).

3. DISTRIBUTION OF OE *ĒO* IN TWELFTH-CENTURY KENT

3.1. FIRST ELEMENT

20 Kentish localities from the 12th c. have a first or unique element that derives from OE *ēo*. These Middle Kentish developments alternate fundamentally between variants with *e* and alternatives with *i*.

As regards the *e*-variant only *Beckenham* and *Greatness* present in the 12th c. an exclusive *e*-development (see table 1). Other four localities present a predominant *e*-development alternating with diverse minor variants (see *Bensted*, *Greet*, *Chelsfield* and *Leaveland* in table 1). In five of them the development is mixed, either <e/i> (see *Ridley*, *Newchurch* and *Tudeley* in Table 1), <e/ea> (see *Grain* in table 1 below), or <e/io> (see *Lewisham* in table 1). Finally, in other four localities, *Newenden* (*Selbrittenen Hd.*), *Newington* (*Milton Hd.*), *Newnham* and *Preston* (see Table 1: 12th c. *Kentish place-name forms with e in the first or unique element*), the *e*-variant appears as a non-predominant development.

With respect to the *i*-variant *Ifield*, *Twinney Creek*, and *Newington* (*Folkestone Hd.*) (see Table 2: 12th c. *Kentish place-name forms with i in the first or unique element*) present exclusive developments. In *Newington* (*Milton Hd.*), *Newnham* and *Newenden* (*Selbrittenen Hd.*) <i> is the predominant development (see Table 2). As we saw earlier on, in *Ridley*, *Newchurch* and *Tudeley* the development is a mixed <e/i> (see table 2). Finally, in *Chelsfield* and *Leaveland* (see Table 2) <i> is in a non-predominant distribution.

We also have a relative high percentage of digraphs in the first element of these 12th c. place-names. These traditionally Kentish forms are <ea> in *Bensted* and *Grain* (see both of them in Table 1); <eo> in *Lydden* (*Folkestone Hd.*) (*Hleodaena c. 1100 Dom Mon*); <ie> in *Greet*, *Leaveland* (see both of them in table 1), *Lewsome* (*de Lieurechestune 1176 Facs*) and *Lydden* (*Folkestone Hd.*) (*Lieden 1176 BM Facs*); and <io> in *Leaveland* (see table 1). In agreement with Ek, we can only admit those place-name forms with <ie> as standing for a real diphthongal pronunciation.¹

Ek (1972) distinguishes in his analysis, as so do Jordan-Crook (1974: §109), among: (i.) a diphthong *ēo* + *w*; (ii.) a diphthong *ēo* unaccompanied by *w*; and (iii.) a diphthong *ēo* before consonantal groups with a homorganic

¹ See above Ek's considerations in this respect (Ek 1972: 108 and 119-120).

voiced consonant causing lengthening. The first category applies to OE *nēowe* and *ēow* that appear as first constituents of our place-name forms in the 12th c. The rest of our constituents belong to the second category, whereas there are no candidates for the third one.

OE *nēowe* and *ēow* are in this sense worth being analysed in detail because in both of them we have to consider the possible particular evolution of the diphthong *ēo* when in the vicinity of *w*. Ek reminds us that Jordan (1974: §109) and Luick (1914/1941: §399) claim that, as a consequence of the vocalisation of the semivowel, *ēo* + *w* will give place to a diphthong [eu] that will in turn become [iu], but “Luick also says that in spite of a development [eu] > [iu] the writing <ew> was still kept in most cases” (Ek 1972: 113). It is precisely this argument that Ek uses to highlight as special those forms with <i> in their orthography.

We registered five localities with the lexical term *nēowe* as first constituent in twelfth-century Kent. In all of them, except *Newchurch*, where we have a mixed development <e/i>, the variant, exclusive in the case of *Newington (Folkestone Hd.)*, and predominant in the case of *Newington (Milton Hd.)*, *Newenden (Selbrittenenden Hd.)* and *Newnham*, is <i> (see Table 2). We also registered one case with OE *ēow* in *Ifield* (see Table 2) where the *i*-development is exclusive. Maybe these *i*-reflexes from the 12th c. are equally special to those analysed by Ek (1972) because in them *ēo* + *w* > *īw* is the rule.

Discarding the place-name forms compounded in their first element by a first constituent in which *ēo* is combined with *w*,¹ what clearly predominates in our 12th c. material is the *e*-development, even though some *i*- and *ie*-forms are still around as possible witnesses of their original diphthongal nature.²

3.2. SECOND ELEMENT

¹ This change also happens on one occasion in which *w* precedes the diphthong in question (cf. *Twineneia*, *Tuinenea*, *Tuinega*, *Tuinga* for the locality of *Twinney Creek*).

² See section 2 for an explanation to the formal diversity of Old English *ēo* in Kentish.

Only one Kentish locality, *Tollingtrough Green*, was registered for the 12th c. with a second element that derives from an Old English term with *ēo*, that is, OE *trēow* ‘tree’, a lexical element that corresponds with Ek’s first category. This locality is in the North-western quarter of Kent and its behaviour is the predominant mixed development <e/o> that alternates with a rare <ui> (*Tolte(n)trui* c. 1100 *Dom Mon*; *Toltintro* 1178-9 *P*; *Totingetre* 1187-8 *P*).¹

4. DISTRIBUTION OF OE *ĒO* IN FOURTEENTH-CENTURY KENT

4.1. FIRST ELEMENT

34 Kentish localities with OE *ēo* in the first element were registered for the 14th c. Out of them, 27 present an *e*-development: 22 exclusively; only *Tudeley* and *New Hythe* in a predominant way; and finally *†Redemeregge*, *Deerton St.* and *Lymbridge Green* with a non-predominant distribution (see Table 3: 14th c. Kentish place-name forms with *e* in the first or unique element).

The abundant realisations with <e> (a variant that is even present in name-forms going back to OE *nēowe*) contrast with the behaviour observed in the first (or unique) constituent of other seven 14th c. localities showing an *i*-reflex. Five of these localities have an exclusive <i> and only in *Lymbridge Green* and *New Hythe* is this development predominant or rare (see Table 4: 14th c. Kentish place-name forms with *i* in the first or unique element).

The presence of digraphs is as follows: <ay> and <ey> in *Deerton St.* (see table 3); and <ye> in *Tudeley* (see table 3) and *Lydden* (*Folkestone Hd.*) (*Lyedene* 1304 *Ass*; *Lyeden*’ 1313 *Ass.*). In my opinion again, we can only admit forms with <ye> as standing for a real diphthongal pronunciation.²

¹ We do not really know whether to attribute the variants *ui* and *o* for *Tollingtrough Green*, as Ek (1972: 95) and Jordan-Crook (1974: §109 (2)) do, to a “shifting of stress in OE”, or to the fact that, according to Reany, they may be an evidence of a possible rounding of *ēo* in Kent (1925: 343ff.). In any case, the same criterion we use here must also be applied to the *o*- and *u*-reflexes of *†Redemeregge* (see Table 3).

² See above Ek’s considerations in this respect (Ek 1972: 108 and 119-120).

With respect to OE *nēowe*, we have 11 Kentish localities of the 14th c. compounded in their first (or unique) element by this Anglo-Saxon lexical constituent. As opposed to what happened in our place-name forms of the 12th c., and obviously coinciding with Luick's opinion,¹ the most frequent development in them is *e*. The only exceptions are *Nizel's Heath* and *New Hythe* with an exclusive and a rare *i*-development respectively (see Table 4).

The preponderance of the *e*-variant is therefore much more significant in the 14th c. than in the 12th c., even though we keep on having examples in this century where a certain number of *i*-forms show their definite reluctance to disappear, and some very sporadic digraphs (in particular the presumably diphthongal <ye>) are still present.

4.2. SECOND ELEMENT

We only registered one Kentish locality, *Ebbsfleet*, for the 14th c. with a second constituent deriving from an Old English lexical element with *ēo* (OE *flēot* 'fleet'). Its behaviour is that of an exclusive digraph <eo> (*Hyppesfleet* 1308 *Th*) for which we can not assure a diphthongal pronunciation.

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Generally, there exists a clear difference between the registers corresponding to early Middle English and those of the 14th c. when comparing our Kentish place-names with OE *ēo* in the first element. In agreement with Ek's statement about the *i*-forms being much more expected in the early material (1972: 114), we find that the frequency of *e* and *i* is similar for the 12th c., whereas for the 14th c., although some localities with *i* are still documented, the predominant development is *e*.

Besides, whereas in the 12th c. we register some varied alternatives (mainly digraphs) with a certain regularity, the end of the Middle English period is characterised only by their very sporadic presence. On the other

¹See Ek's quotation on Luick cited above, where despite the development [eu] > [iu], Luick considers that <ew> was still kept in most cases (Ek 1972: 113).

hand, the scarcity of registers (only one locality per century was registered) for the second constituent does not allow us to establish conclusive comparisons. This fact should not however underestimate the validity of our analysis since “the position in stressed or unstressed syllable of the word or word-element, containing the OE $\bar{e}o$ does not affect the development of this sound.” (Ek 1972: 66).

Likewise, with respect to the behaviour of OE $\bar{e}o + w$ in our place-name forms, we observe here a similar tendency to the one observed in the general analysis, that is, a much more abundant presence of the *i*-development in the 12th c than in the 14th c. material.

Ek concludes his South-Eastern analysis claiming that in Kent “ $\bar{e}o$ [...] became $\bar{i}o$ [...]”. This stage seems to have been reached at the latest in late OE. In very early ME the $\bar{i}o$ developed into $\bar{i}e$.” (1972: 122). His general table (1972: 94) seems to contradict, however, this conclusion since of all the forms recorded in it only 15.7 % present an *i*-development. This inconsistency is stressed when we centre upon the registers corresponding to the period 1300-1500 where the percentage of *i*-forms only reaches 7%.

Our results do coincide with Ek’s table, and therefore also contradict in part his own conclusion, since in our analysis the predominance the *e*-variants predominate over the *i*-variants. The only coincidence here lies in the fact that the *i*-variant appears with a higher frequency in the 12th c. than in the 14th c., a fact that is directly connected with the peculiar development observed for the place-name forms compounded by OE *nēowe*.

The material *LALME* offers for OE $\bar{e}o$ is practically non-existent since, of all the items recorded in the corresponding Kentish Linguistic Profiles, only one, the Anglo-Saxon feminine pronoun *hēo* corresponding to ModE *she*, contains in its etymology the diphthong in question. This pronominal item has traditionally been regarded as a controversial element among English historical linguists because of the lack of unanimity on ascertaining its true etymology.¹ This fact does not make of OE *hēo* precisely the most adequate term with which to contrast the results provided by our analysis of $\bar{e}o$.

¹ The hypotheses that at present try to explain the modern development of an initial palatal make reference to the nature of the original diphthong and to the peculiar developments that this could have undergone in the Northern territories,

However, this paper is part of a dissertation in which other OE variables were analysed and their behaviour correspondingly contrasted with the formal diversity shown by those items of *LALME* that originally contained such a variable¹. Consequently, it is coherent to analyse here also the evidence, although scanty in this case, for OE *ēo* in *LALME*'s items, that is, in SHE (< OE *hēo*).

Forms with an *i*-variant (i.e., <i, y, ye>)² in this *Atlas* (pre)dominate in LPs 5890, 5900, 5940, 5960, 6050 and 9380, that is, those located in the Northern and North-Eastern areas of the county. The LPs in which *e* (i.e., <e, ee>) is exclusive are 5881, 5970, 5980, 5990 and 9470, that is, those that gather around the Central and Western areas of the county.³ We have to pay heed to the fact that these registers correspond to a late Middle English stage and, yet, we still observe in them, with all the reservations its etymological origin may produce, a certain abundance of forms with *i* (<i, y, ye>). It is therefore evident that the results provided by this *Atlas* do not precisely coincide with those obtained here.

6. CONCLUSION

The most outstanding fact that we can draw as a conclusion to this paper is that, as opposed to what we could expect, we do not seem to have among our place-name forms the digraphs and/or diphthongs <ie, io, ye> with the necessary frequency as to consider such realisations as characteristic of Middle English Kent. In other words, they are very infrequent in our sources and in this sense we can say that our corpus-data does not endorse the traditional view.

In fact, had it not been for the frequency, specially in the 12th c., of place-name constituents with OE *ēo* + *w* (for which Jordan-Crook and Ek already

¹ This is, in fact, my PhD dissertation, titled *Dialectología y Toponimia del Kéntico Bajomedieval* (Universidad de La Laguna, 1999; unpublished).

² We interpret this digraph according to Ek (1972: 95).

³ It is worth noticing the coincidence between forms with *e* and the palatal character of the previous consonant (i.e., *sche*, *schee*, *she*), and those in which the *i*-reflex combines with a previous aspirated *h* (i.e., *hi*, *hy*, *hie*). It is only occasionally that the form *he* appears (LPs 5900 and 5960).

claim a special *i*-development), the predominance of a ‘regular’ *e*-variant would have been much more significant, relegating to a second place those digraphs/diphthongs that have traditionally been regarded as typically Kentish.

María Auxiliadora Martín
University of La Laguna

TABLE 1: 12TH C. KENTISH PLACE-NAME FORMSWITH *E* IN THE FIRST OR UNIQUE ELEMENT

OE <i>*bēoga</i> ‘bent; Submissive’	BECKENHAM	<i>Becceham</i> c. 1100 Text Roff.
OE <i>bēonet</i> ‘long and thick grass’	BENSTED	<i>Bedenestede</i> c. 1100 Dom Mon; <i>Beantesteda</i> c. 1100 Text Roff; <i>de Bentested</i> ’ 1199 FineR.
OE <i>*grēon</i> ‘grain’	GRAIN	<i>Grean</i> c. 1100 Text Roff; Gren 1189 Reg Roff
OE <i>grēot</i> ‘sand, gravel’	GREATNESS	Gretenersce c. 1100 Text Roff (Arch C 44, 53)
	GREET	<i>de Grete</i> 1327, 1334, 1346, 1347,1348 Subs; <i>Griete</i> 1304 Ass.
OE <i>hrēod</i> ‘reed’	RIDLEY	Redlege 11 DM; <i>Riddelee</i> 1198 FF.
OE <i>nēowe</i> ‘new’	NEWCHURCH	<i>Niwancirc</i> 11 DM, Newechirche 1198 FF.
	NEWENDEN (SELBRITTENDEN HD.)	<i>Niuuende</i> , <i>Niwendenne</i> , <i>Niuuendene</i> c. 1100 Dom Mon; Newendenna 1157 StAug; <i>Niwendeñ</i> 1165-6 P; <i>Niwedeñ</i> 1166-7 P.
	NEWINGTON (MILTON HD.)	<i>Niwantun(e)</i> , <i>Niuuentune</i> c. 1100 DomMon; Newton 1172-3 P; <i>Niweton</i> ’ 1175-6 P.
	NEWNHAM	Newenham 1177 Reg Roff; <i>Niwenham</i> 1182-4 ib
OE <i>prēosta</i> ‘priests’	PRESTON	Prestetune c. 1100 Dom Mon; <i>P’stune</i> , <i>P’st</i> ’ 1154-89 Subs.
OE <i>*þeof</i> ‘thief’	TUDELEY	<i>Tiuedele</i> c. 1100 Dom Mon; Theudelei c. 1100 Text Roff.
OE <i>Cēol</i> Pers. N.	CHELSFIELD	<i>Cilesfeld</i> c. 1100 Text Roff; <i>de Chelesfeld</i> 1176-7 P; Chelesfeld

OE Lēofa Pers. N.	LEAVELAND	<i>1185-1214 Reg Roff; 1198 FF; Chelefeld' 1194 Cur</i>
		<i>Liofeland, Lieveland(e) c. 1100 Dom Mon; Levelande c. 1175 ArchC 4, 211; Leveland c. 1180 <i>ib.</i>, 215; <i>de Liveland'</i> 1199 Cur.</i>
OE *Lēowsa / Lēofsa Pers. N.	LEWISHAM	<i>Liofesham 11 DM; Leueseham c. 1100 TextiRoff</i>

TABLE 2: 12TH C. KENTISH PLACE-NAME FORMS WITH / IN THE FIRST OR UNIQUE ELEMENT

OE <i>betwēonum</i> 'between'	TWINNEY CREEK	Twineneia 1166-7 P; Tuinenea 1190 P; Tuinega 1191, 1192 P; Tuinga 1194 P.
OE <i>ēow</i> 'yew-tree'	IFIELD	Iuelda c. 1100 Text Roff; Yfeld 1174-84, 1177 Reg Roff.
OE <i>hrēod</i> 'reed'	RIDLEY	Redlege 11 DM; Riddelee 1198 FF.
OE <i>nēowe</i> 'new'	NEWCHURCH	Niwancirc 11 DM, Newechirche 1198 FF.
	NEWENDEN (SELBRITTENDEN HD.)	Niuuende, Niwendenne, Niuuendene c. 1100 Dom Mon; Newendenna 1157 StAug; Niwendeñ 1165-6 P; Niwedeñ 1166-7 P.
	NEWINGTON (FOLKESTONE HD.)	Niwan tune c. 1100 Dom Mon.
	NEWINGTON (MILTON HD.)	Niwantun(e), Niuuentune c. 1100 DomMon; Newton 1172-3 P; Niweton' 1175-6 P.
	NEWNHAM	Newenham 1177 Reg Roff; Niwenham 1182-4 ib.
OE *þēof 'thief'	TUDELEY	Tiuedele c. 1100 Dom Mon; Theudelei c. 1100 Text Roff.
OE <i>Cēol</i> Pers. N.	CHELSFIELD	Cilesfeld c. 1100 Text Roff; de Chelesfeld 1176-7 P; Chelesfeld 1185-1214 Reg Roff; 1198 FF; Chelesfeld' 1194 Cur
OE <i>Lēofa</i> Pers. N.	LEAVELAND	Liofeland, Lieveland(e) c. 1100 Dom Mon; Levelande c. 1175 ArchC 4, 211; Leveland c. 1180 ib., 215; de Liveland' 1199 Cur.

TABLE 3: 14TH C. KENTISH PLACE-NAME FORMS WITH *E* IN THE FIRST OR UNIQUE ELEMENT

OE <i>bēonet</i> ‘long and thick grass’	BENSTED			<i>Bentestede</i> 1312 FF; <i>Bentsted</i> 1316 Ipm, etc.
	BENTHAM HILL			de <i>Benthame</i> 1327 Subs; de <i>Benthamme</i> 1332, 1338 Subs; de <i>Benehamme</i> 1334 Subs; <i>Bentham</i> (p.) 1348 Subs.
	BENCHILL FM			Cf. Phps. Will. de <i>Benteleye</i> 1301 FF.
IA <i>brēosa</i> ‘horsefly’	BRISHING COURT	WD.,	B.	<i>Bresyng</i> 1346 FA; <i>Bresyng</i> 1362 Cl; <i>Bressing</i> 1368 Cl; <i>Bressinge</i> Ipm.
	BRISSENDEN			<i>Bresindenn</i> ’ 1346 Subs; <i>Bresynden</i> 1327, 1334 Subs; <i>Bresynden</i> ’ 1338, 1347 Subs; de <i>Bresyndenn</i> ’ 1346 Subs; de <i>Bresindene</i> 1348 Subs.
OE <i>dēop</i> ‘deep’	DEPTFORD			<i>Depford</i> ’ 1351 FF; <i>Depford</i> ’ 1313 FF; <i>Deppford</i> ’ 1314 FF; <i>Depford</i> 1334 Fine; <i>Depeforde</i> 1344 FF.
	DIBDEN			de <i>Depedene</i> 1310 FF; 1332 Subs; de <i>Depeden</i> ’ 1315 FF; de <i>Depedene</i> 1327 Subs; <i>Depedenn</i> ’ 1334 Subs; de <i>Depedenne</i> 1338 Subs; <i>Depinden</i> ’, <i>Depe(n)den</i> ’ (p.) 1348 Subs.
OE <i>dēor</i> ‘deer’	DARGETS WD.			De <i>Dergate</i> (s. <i>Horsted</i> 116 E 2) 1313 Ass.
	DARGATE			De <i>Dergate</i> 1348 Subs.
	DEERTON ST.			de <i>Dertone</i> 1334 Subs; de <i>Deyr-</i> , <i>Drayton</i> ’ 1338 Subs; de <i>Dy(e)r-</i> , <i>Draytone</i> 1346 Subs; de <i>Dyerr-</i> , <i>Drayton</i> ’ 1347 Subs; de <i>Dertone</i> , <i>Drayton</i> ’ 1348 Subs.
OE <i>hl̥eo</i> ‘shelter’	LYDDEN			<i>Ledene</i> 13 StAug.

	(RINGSLOW HD.)	
OE <i>hrēod</i> ‘reed’	†REDEMEREKGE	<i>Redmeregge</i> 1301 Subs; <i>Rodmeregge</i> 1323 FF; 1396 Pat; 1398 Ipm; <i>Rodmeresregg’</i> 1332 Subs; <i>Rude-merigge</i> , <i>Rodemerigge</i> 1343 Cl; <i>Rodmerugg</i> 1344 Cl; Redmeregge 1369 Cl; <i>Rodemerigge</i> 1374 FF; Red-marerugg 1376 Pat; <i>Rodmerugge</i> 1379 Cl.
OE <i>nēowe</i> ‘new’	NEWBURY	<i>Neuburgh</i> 1342 Ipm; <i>Newburgh’</i> 1348 Subs; <i>Newebourgh</i> 1349 Ipm; <i>Newburgh</i> 1357, 1395 BM I.
	NEWCOURT WD.	<i>Newecourt</i> 1327 Subs; 1343-4 Ass; 1343-4 Ass; <i>de Neweco(u)rt</i> 1332, 1334, 1338 Subs; <i>Newecourt</i> 1346 FA.
	NEWENDEN	<i>Neuyn-</i> , <i>Newyndenn’</i> 1313 Ass; <i>de Newyndenne</i> 1332 Subs; <i>de</i> <i>Newyndñ</i> 1334 Subs, etc.
	NEW HYTHE	<i>Niweheth</i> 1316 Cl; <i>Newehethe</i> 1320 FF; <i>Neuheth</i> 1323 Cl; <i>Newehethe</i> 1325 Inq.
	NEWLAND (CALEHILL HD.)	<i>de la Newland</i> 1313-4 Seld 24, 195; <i>ate Newelonde</i> 1327 Subs, etc.
	NEWLAND (PORT OF NEW ROMNEY)	<i>Newelandeswall</i> 1351 Pat.
	NEWLANDS	<i>Atte Newelonde</i> 1327, 1332, 1334, 1347 Subs.
	NEWNHAM FM.	<i>de Newenham</i> 1332 Subs.
	NEWSOLE FM.	<i>de Newesole</i> 1304 Ass; 1327, 1332, 1334 Subs, etc.
	NEWSTREET FM.	<i>Neustrete</i> 1327 Subs; <i>de</i> <i>Newestrete</i> 1347 Subs.
OE <i>prēosta</i> ‘priests’	PRESTON FM., HILL	Preston’ 1377 FF; Preston 1325 Cl; 1330 Ipm; <i>de Prestone</i> 1332 Subs; <i>de Preston’</i> 1334 Subs; Preston 1346 FA; 1372 Cl.
	PRESTON FM.	<i>de Preston’</i> 1348.

	PRIESTWOOD,	<i>de Prestwode 1327, 1332, 1338</i>
	P. GREEN	<i>Subs.</i>
OE *þēof ‘thief	TUDELEY	<i>Teudele 1316, 1320 FF; 1324-5</i> <i>BM I; 1324 Cl; 1327 Ipm;</i> <i>Thewdele 1313 Ass; Tewedale</i> <i>1316 FA; Teu-, Tyedele, Tyendale</i> <i>1353 FF, etc.</i>
OE <i>Lēofmær</i> Pers. N.	LYMBRIDGE GREEN	<i>de Lymeryng’ 1316-28 Ass; 1327</i> <i>Subs; de Lemeryng’ 1334 Subs.</i>

TABLE 4: 14TH C. KENTISH PLACE-NAME FORMS WITH *l* IN THE FIRST OR UNIQUE ELEMENT

OE <i>hlēo</i> ‘shelter’	LYDDEN VALLEY	<i>Lhydene</i> 1313 Ass.
OE <i>nēowe</i> ‘new’	NEW HYTHE	<i>Niweheth</i> 1316 CI; <i>Neweheth</i> 1320 FF; <i>Neuheth</i> 1323 CI; <i>Neweheth</i> 1325 Inq.
	NIZEL’S HEATH	<i>Nigheselle</i> 1327 Subs; <i>Nys(h)ell’</i> 1332 Subs; <i>Nyselle</i> 1346 Subs; <i>Ny-</i> , <i>Niselle</i> 1347 Subs; <i>Niselle</i> (p.) 1348 Subs; <i>Nisell’</i> 1380 FF.
OE <i>Hēopwell</i> Pers. N.	EBBSFLEET	<i>Hyppesfleot</i> 1308 Th.
OE <i>Lēofwynn</i> Pers. N.	LYDDENDANE FM.	<i>de Lyuenedane</i> 1327 Subs; <i>de Lyuyndan’</i> 1347, 1348 Subs.
OE <i>Lēofa/Lēofwine</i> Pers. N.	†LYMBOROUGH BOTTOM	<i>de Lymb’gh’</i> 1327, 1332, 1346 Subs; <i>de Lymbergh’</i> 1332 Subs; <i>Limberghe</i> 1334 Subs, etc.
OE <i>Lēofmær</i> Pers. N.	LYMBRIDGE GREEN	<i>de Lymeryng’</i> 1316-28 Ass; 1327 Subs; <i>de Lemeryng’</i> 1334 Subs.

WORKS CITED

- Arngart, Olof S. (Anderson) 1934-39: *The English Hundred-Names*. Vols. 1-3. Gleerup, Lund.
- Arngart, Olof S. (Anderson) 1949: Middle English Dialects. *Studier i Modern Sprakvetenskap* 17: 17- 29.
- Brook, George Leslie 1965 (1958): *English Dialects*. Andre Deutsch, London.
- Cameron, Kenneth 1961: *English Place-Names*. Batsford, London.
- Campbell, Alistair 1959: *Old English Grammar*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Copley, G. J. 1968: *English Place-Names and their Origins*. David & Charles, Devon.
- Ek, Karl-Gustav 1972: *The Development of OE y and ēo in South-Eastern Middle English*. Gleerup, Lund.
- Ek, Karl-Gustav 1975: *The Development of OE æ (i-mutated a) before Nasal and OE ē in South-Eastern Middle English*. Gleerup, Lund.
- Ekwall, Eilert 1931: *Studies on English Place- and Personal Names*. Gleerup, Lund.
- Ekwall, Eilert 1980: *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hogg, Richard M. 1992: *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. I: *Phonology*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Jordan, Richard 1974: *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*. [translated and revised by Eugene J. Crook]. Mouton, The Hague.
- Kristensson, Gillis 1967: *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: The Six Northern Counties and Lincolnshire*. Gleerup, Lund.
- Kristensson, Gillis 1987: *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: The West Midland Counties*. Gleerup, Lund.
- Kristensson, Gillis 1995: *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: The East Midland Counties*. Wallin & Dalholm Boktr AB, Lund.

- Kristensson, Gillis 2001: *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350. The Southern Counties. I. Vowels (except Diphthongs)*. Lund University Press, Lund.
- Luick, Karl 1914/1941: *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*. Tauchnitz, Stuttgart.
- McIntosh, Angus, Michael L. Samuels, Michael Benskin, Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson 1986: *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen University Press, Aberdeen.
- Moore, Samuel, Sanford B. Meech and Harold Whitehall 1935: *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and dialect Boundaries. Language and Literature*. University of Michigan Publications, Ann Arbor.
- Mossé, Fernand 1952: *A Handbook of Middle English*. [tr. J.A. Walker]. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Reany, Percy H. 1925: On Certain Phonological Features of the Dialect of London in the Twelfth Century. *Englische Studien* 59: 321-45.
- Reany, Percy H. 1964. *The Origin of English Place-Names*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1922: The Dialectal Distribution of Certain Phonological Features in Middle English. *English Studies* 4: 93-109, 191-98.
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1924: *Distributions of Dialect Characters in Middle English*. Amsterdam [No indication of publisher]
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1927a: The Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English. *Review of English Studies* 3: 54-67, 186-203, 319-31.
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1927b: The Development of Old English *ēag*, *ēah* in Middle English. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 26: 198-225 and 350-400.
- Smith, A. H. 1956: *English Place-Name Elements*. 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thuresson, Bertil. 1950: *Middle English Occupational Terms*. Lund University Press, Lund.

Wallenberg, J. K. 1934: *The Place-Names of Kent*. Appelbergs Boktryckerei Aktiebolag, Uppsala.

Wyld, Henry C. 1921: South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects in Middle English. *Essays and Studies* 6: 112-145.

Wyld, Henry C. 1927: *A Short History of English* (3rd edn.). John Murray, London.

* † *