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## THE ISOLATIVE TREATMENT IN LIVING NORTHMIDLAND DIALECTS OF OE $\check{e}$ LENGTHENED IN OPEN SYLLABLES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

By Harold orton

In EMEG ${ }^{1}, \S 78, \mathrm{~J}$. Wright states that in the North-Midland and Northern dialects ME $\bar{\varepsilon}$ from OE $e$ (conventionally written OE $\check{e}$ - below) that was lengthened in open syllables in disyllabic words differed in quality from the ME $\bar{\varepsilon}$ that arose both from OE $\bar{x}$, the $i$-mutation of $\operatorname{Pr} \operatorname{OE} \bar{a}$, and from OE $\bar{e} a$. He explains that the two sounds "are still kept apart in the modern dialects of this area, e $g$ in Yks., Lanc., Derb., Stf. the new $\bar{\varepsilon}[<\mathrm{OE} \tilde{e}-]$ has become $e i$, but the old $\bar{\varepsilon}$ has become iz or some such diphthong'. Perhaps justifiably so in an elementary grammar, he omits to refer us to the evidence, but doubtless he had in mind his EDG, ${ }^{2}$ and his Windhill Dialect, ${ }^{3}$ as well as, possibly, A. J. Ellis's EEP. ${ }^{4}$

Furthermore, K. Luick, Untersuchungen, ${ }^{5}$ § 202, a book based almost wholly on Ellis's monumental compilation mentioned above, also points out the differentiation of OE $\check{e}$ and ME $\bar{\varepsilon}$ in the living dialects of the North Midlands, but especially in South Yorkshire, for information about which he relies chiefly upon Wright's Windhill Dialect, published three or four years earlier. But nowhere, apart from this latter book, can the student without very great difficulty obtain a clear view of an adequate amount of convincing evidence. It is consequently the chief aim of this article to

[^0]bring together in one place all the available trustworthy information relevant to the treatment of OE $\check{e}$ - in the NorthMidland dialects. This includes facts relating not only to the development of ME $\bar{\varepsilon}$ (usually referred to below as ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ ), but also to that of ME $\stackrel{\bar{e}}{ }$ (usually here written ME $\bar{e}_{1}$ ). I have drawn not only upon Wright's Windhill Dialect, but also upon the monographs, both published and unpublished, that have been compiled by specialists subsequent to the appearance of Luick's Untersuchungen over fifty-five years ago. But I have not reproduced material from either Ellis or the EDG because I prefer to rely only upon direct, first-hand information collected by trained investigators. Among the latter I have ventured to include certain students of this Department who have recently written dissertations ${ }^{6}$ upon dialects in the area under survey.

The material I have assembled below concerns the independent treatment of the following ME sounds in modern North-Midland dialects :- (I) OE $\check{e}-$ ( (and Scand $\check{e}$-) lengthened in ME open syllables in disyllabic words, (2) OE $\bar{e} a$, (3) $\mathrm{OE} \bar{x}$ ( $i$-mut of $\bar{a}$ ), (4) OE $\bar{e}$ (i-mut of $\bar{o}$ ), (5) OE $\bar{e} 0$, (6) Angl $\bar{e}$ (Germ $\bar{x})$, (7) Angl $\bar{e}$ ( $i$-mut of $\bar{e} a$ ), (8) ME $\bar{a}<$ (a) OE $\check{x}-$-, $\breve{a}$-, (b) Scand $\breve{a}$-, (c) OFr $\breve{a}$-, all lengthened in open syllables in disyllabic words, and (9) ME ai < (a) OE æg, (b) OE eg, (c) Angl $\bar{e} g(=\mathrm{WS} \bar{x} g)$, (d) Scand $e i, e y$, (e) Angl $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}$ $+g$ ), (f) OFr ai and (g) OFr ei. I have attempted to bring together below all the words concerned, and have recorded the pronunciation of their stem vowels exactly as given by the dialectologists themselves. But I have also included the equivalent transcription in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association whenever the dialectologist himself has used some other phonetic system. Geographically, I have proceeded from West to East, and from North to South; and, further, have ignored forms with short [ $\varepsilon$ ] or [ $\downarrow$ ], because they have no bearing upon the problems involved. I have also

[^1]employed, without explanation, certain well-known conventional abbreviations. ${ }^{7}$

## I. Fleetwood (Lancs).

My information about the dialect of the fisherfolk at Fleetwood (present population about 25,000 ) derives from a dissertation compiled in 1949 by my colleague, Mr P. Wright, B.A., and entitled The Phonology of the Dialect of Fleetwood, Lancashive (197 pp). Fleetwood lies in Ellis's Northern North-Midland district, D 23. According to P. Wright (p 3), the fisherfolk's ancestors migrated, apparently in 1836, from three fishing villages situated on the south bank of the estuary of the Ribble, viz Marshside, Banks and Crossens, near Southport, some 20 miles down the Lancashire coast. This point is of linguistic importance since Fleetwood obviously lies geographically well to the north of the accepted boundary between the ME Midland and Northern dialects.
I. (a) $\mathrm{OE} \check{e}->\left[\varepsilon \_\right], \S$ I26 (3).
steal (' handle'), eat, meat, kneading, speak, steal, tread, weaner (' piglet'), meal (§ 119, i).
But [ id ] in even, break ( + rare [ $\mathrm{\imath}]$ ]), besom; and [ e :] in fever ${ }^{8}$, § $126(5, \mathrm{c})$.
(b) Scand $\check{e}->$ [12], § 126 (4).
leak.
2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a>[\imath \partial], \S \mathrm{I} 26(2)$.
bean, beam, beat, dead, deaf, death, great, heap, eastward, clee (' claw of pig's foot '), lead, leaf, leap (' basket '), seam, sheaf, steamer, threap (' argue '), team, cheap, head (+ [ $\varepsilon 1]$ ).
But [ii] in cleat (' metal plate'), reamy ('soft'; cf OE rēam), flay (§ 153 (5) ).

[^2]3. OE $\bar{x}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>[\mathrm{r} 2], \S \mathrm{I} 26$ ( I ).
clean ( $+[\varepsilon \iota]$ ), deal, heat, heathen, each, lead, lean ( $+[\varepsilon \imath]$ ), leavings, mean $(+[\varepsilon \tau])$, wreath, sheath, sea $(+[\varepsilon 1])$, spread (+ [ $\varepsilon \mathbf{1}]$ ), sweat, tease, wheat.
But $[\varepsilon \tau]^{9}$ in bleach, reach.
4. OE $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>$ [ii], § II9 (2).
breed, breeches, ${ }^{9}$ feed ( $+[\varepsilon 1]$ ), feel, feet, geese, gleed ('glowing'), green, heed, heel, keep, meet, seech (' seek '), teeth.
But [r2] in beet (' kindle a fire'; OE bëtan).
5. OE $\bar{e} o>[\mathbf{i}]$, § II9 (3).
bee, fleece, fleetings ('milk curds'; cf OE flètan), lief, -kneed (< knee), reest (' ploughshare '), see (+ [10]), tree, weeds, wheel, three ( $+[\varepsilon \imath]$ ).
But [ t ] in cleaver, leapt pt.
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \bar{x})>[\mathrm{ii}], \S$ II9 (I).
ate pt pl, greet (' weep '), let, needle, read, seeds, street, cheek. But [ 12 ] in breath(e), dread adj (' afraid '), thread.
7. Angl $\bar{e}(\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{mut}$ of $\bar{e} a)>[\mathrm{i}], \S I I 9$ (5).
need, reech v (' reek'), sheet, sleeve.
8. ME $\bar{a}>[\mathrm{e}:], \S$ IIo.
(a) $\mathrm{OE} \breve{\mathfrak{x}^{-}}$- $\breve{a}-$-, § IIO (2).
ache v, blade, father, lading, lame, late, name, rake v, rather, shape, shave, slade sb ('slope'), snake, spade, stake, swath sb, tale, wade, water.
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-\S 110$ (4).
cake, gape, gate (' way', § IIo (2) ).
(c) $\mathrm{OFr} \breve{a}-\S$ IIO (5).
bacon, braces sb pl, case, dateless ('foolish '), face, favour v, lace, pale, scales, sb pl, space, place, spane ('wean'; + [ D ], § Iog, Note I).

[^3]9. ME $a i>[\mathrm{e}:], \S \S 152,153$.
(a) OE $æ g, \S 152$ (I).
day-, fain, maiden, main, nail, snail, tail.
(b) OE eg, § 153 ( I ).
ail, braid v, -lay, played pt, sail, way.
(c) Angl $\bar{g} g(=W S \bar{x} g), \S I_{52}(2)$.
grey.
(d) Scand ei, § 153 (4).
baitings, gradely, grain ('prong'), lake v ('play'), lait v (' search '), raik v (' wander '), nay, weakly.
(e) Angl $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}+g)$, § 126 ( I ).
either (+ [ii]).
But [ $\varepsilon \mathbf{c}]$ in key, § $\mathbf{I} 53$ (2).
(f) OFr $a i$, §§ 152 (2), 155 ( x ).
bailiff, gay (' very '), quay, pay, ray (the fish), train, complaint.
But [ 12 ] in chain, ${ }^{10} \S 155$ (1).
(g) OFr ci, §§ 153 (6), I55 (2).
pray, rail, paint, sprain, pain.
But [ra] in reinings ${ }^{10_{a}}$ (' reins ').
The above material shows that OE $\check{e}-(\mathrm{I})$ usually becomes $[\varepsilon \iota]$, $\operatorname{OE} \bar{e} a(2)$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}(3)$ become [t2], and that $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e}(4)$, $\bar{e} 0$ (5), Angl $\bar{e}$ (6) and Angl $\bar{e}(7)$ all become [ii]. Further, it reveals clearly that, in Fl , (A) [ $\varepsilon_{1}$ ] may occasionally alternate with both [ri] and [ta], though not with [e:], which regularly represents ME $\bar{a}(8)$ and ME ai (9) ; (B) [tə] may have occasional variants in [ $\varepsilon \imath, \mathrm{i}]$; and (C) [ii] varies, though infrequently, with $[12]$ and $[\varepsilon \iota]$. Now it is a well-known fact that dialect speakers in this country are to-day bilingual. Through their familiarity with RS, they can at will replace almost any one of their customary vernacular vowel sounds by the corresponding sound of RS, or some dialectal modification of it. Thus in this case Fl dialect speakers are evidently aware of the correspondence of the RS cognate [i:] with their own native $[\varepsilon ı]$ and [ $\imath \imath]$, as well, doubtless, as with the very similar [ ri ] in

[^4]the words concerned. Accordingly, on occasions when refined speech seems to them appropriate, instead of dialectal [ $\varepsilon \iota]$ and [ l ] they may use their own vernacular [ii] (and no doubt the RS cognate [i:] too). Thus they arrive, unconsciously of course, at the following equation of local cognates :- $\quad \mathrm{Fl}[\varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon}]=\mathrm{RS}$ $[\mathrm{i}:]+\mathrm{Fl}[\mathrm{ci}]=\mathrm{Fl}[\mathrm{r}]$. This being the case, we can readily understand how, in consequence, the fisherfolk occasionally confuse their traditional [ $\varepsilon \imath$ ] and [ $\mathrm{\imath}$ ] and so come to use analogical, instead of regularly developed forms. Accordingly we may conclude that normally in $\mathrm{Fl} \mathrm{OE} \check{e}-$ (I) $>[\varepsilon \iota]$, ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ $(2,3)>[\mathfrak{l}]$ and ME $\bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)>[i i]$. Further, ME $\bar{a}$ is seen to be levelled with ME $a i$, and both normally give [e:], hence being differentiated from the further development of OE $\check{e}$-. Thus in respect of the phonological points under consideration here, the dialect of Fl, despite its geographical situation, will be seen to have close affinities with those of Adl, Add, Wi, and so may be regarded as a North-Midland, not as a Northern, dialect.

## II. Adlington, Lancs.

The dialect of Adlington was investigated in the first decade of this century by A. Hargreaves, who published A Grammar of the Dialect of Adlington, Lancashive, Heidelberg 1904.

At that time the place had a population of about 5,000 inhabitants who lived on the cotton industry. Adlington lies at the centre of Ellis's Western North-Midland Division, D 22. The distinctive traits of its traditional phonological system were evidently still well preserved.

Hargreaves gives the undermentioned relevant information, his sounds $[\bar{e} \overline{1}, \bar{i} \partial, \bar{i}, \bar{e}]$ (§ I) respectively denoting IPA [ $\varepsilon \mathrm{i}$ :, i:a, i:, e:].
I. (a) OE ĕ- $>$ [eī], § 38 ( I ).
break, eat, heavy, meal, meat, speak, steal v, steal (' handle '), tread, weave.
But [i:] in besom, weasel, § 38 (3).
(b) Scand $\check{e}->$ [eī], § 38 (I).
neif (' fist ').
2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a>[\mathrm{i} 2], \S 37(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{b})$.
beam, bean, dead, deaf, death, dream, heap, head, leaf, leap, seam, stream, sheaf, team, cheap, threap (' contradict').
But [ī], cf § $37(2, \mathrm{~b})$, in flea (OE flēa(h), but pl [fleīp]), east, steep, shed.
And $[\mathrm{e} \overline{\mathrm{i}}]$ in great, $\S 37(6, \mathrm{c})$.
3. OE $\bar{x}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>[i \bar{i}], \S 37(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{a})$.
deal, gleam, lead, lean v , lean adj , least, leave, mean, tease, clean, wheat.
But [i] in wreath, sea (but more often [sē], cf § $37(2, a)$ ). And $[\mathrm{ei}]^{11}$ in bleach, reach, teach, cf § $37(6, \mathrm{a})$.
4. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\mathrm{i}], \S 36(\mathrm{r}, \mathrm{f})$.

Beet v (' kindle' ; § 37 (2, b) ) bleed, breeches ${ }^{11}$, feed, feel, feet, geese, green, heel, keen, keep, queen, meet, seem, seech ${ }^{11}$ ('seek'), sweet, teeth, weep.
5. OE $\bar{e} o>[\overline{1}], \S 36(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{g})$.
be, bee, between, deep, glee, fleet, keel, creep, free, freeze, lief, knee, priest, reed, reel, see, seal, sneeze, tree, thief, three, wheel. But $[\bar{e}]^{12}$ in wick, § $36(5, \mathrm{a})$.
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \bar{x}) \geqslant[\bar{i}], \S 36(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{c})$.
breathe, greedy, eel, evening, needle, seed, sheep, cheek, cheese. But $[\mathrm{ei}]^{13}$ in meal, $\S 37(6, \mathrm{~b})$.
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>[\mathrm{i}], \S 36(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{d})$.
beetle ('hammer', § 36 ( $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{f}$ )), belief (presumably with analogical $[\mathrm{i}]$ from the corresponding verb; see next word), believe, need, sleeve, steeple, sheet.

[^5]8. $\mathrm{ME} \bar{a}>[\bar{e}], \S 35$.
(a) $\mathrm{OE} \check{x_{-}-, ~ \breve{a}-, ~ § 35 . ~}$
bake, bathe, blaze, ache, acre, ale, ape, hate, father, grave, graze, cradle, ladle, lake, lame, late, made pt, make, mane, naked, name, nave, navel, rake, rather, sake, sale, snake, spade, stake, shame, shape, tale, wade, whale, water, wave.
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-$, § 35 .
cake, flake, gape, gate, same, scale, scrape.
(c) Fr $\breve{a}-, \S 50$ (2).
basin, bacon, favour, labour, nature, navy, paper, patent, bale, blame, dates sb pl, able, age, engage, fame, face, flame, grave, cage, cave, lace, page, pale, place, plate, rate, space, stable, stage, table, trace, wage.
9. $\mathrm{ME} a i>[\bar{e}], \S 43$.
(a) $\mathrm{OE} æ g, \S 43$ (a).
brain, day, dataller, daisy, fain, main, nail, snail, tail.
(b) OE eg, §43 (b).
ail, laid pt, play, rain, sail, way.
(c) Angl $\bar{e} g$ (WS $\bar{x} g$ ), § 43 (c).
grey.
(d) Scand ei, eg, § 43 (e).
bait, hail, gradely (' thoroughly'), fake, nay, raise, steak, they, weak.
(e) Angl $\bar{\propto} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}+g), \S 43$ (c).
either, clay.
But [eī] in key, § 45 (b).
(f) $\mathrm{OFr} a i, \S 58$.
betray, delay, disease, fail, grain, grease, complain, quay, May, pay, plain, treat, remain, claim, chain ( $+[i ə])^{14}$, weait, faint,-bailiff, tailor, treat.
(g) OFr $e i$, § 58.
deceit, deceive, conceit, faith, paint, pray, praise, veil, vein, season.
But [ī] in rein (presumably < ME ręne).
The normal developments of the above ME sounds in Adl

[^6]seem to be quite clear ; and, further, the equation of local cognates here is evidently :- Adl [eī] $=$ RS [i:] (and correspondingly Adl [ī]) = Adl [ī]. Accordingly, in Adl, [ei] may alternate with [i:], and by extension with [iə]. Somewhat curiously the words formerly containing $\bar{e}_{1}$ in ME (viz, Nos 4, 5, 6, 7) never show alternative forms with either [iz] or [eī]. On the wholly irregular, and isolated, [ei] in meal (No 6), see footnote 13.

Hence we seem entitled to conclude from the material that normally in Adl, and using IPA notation, OE $\breve{e}-$ (I) $>$ [عi:], ME $\bar{e}_{2}(2,3)>[\mathrm{i}: \partial]$, and $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)>[\mathrm{i}] ;$ and further that ME $\bar{a}(8)$ is levelled with ME ai (9), not however with OE $\breve{e}-$, under the sound [e:].

## III. Oldham, Lancs.

The source of my information here is K. G. Schilling, $A$ Grammar of the Dialect of Oldham, Darmstadt rgo6. Oldham is a large town whose population - 100,000 inhabitants in r906-are chiefly concerned in manufacturing cotton and cotton goods. It lies in Ellis's Southern North-Midland District, D 2I. Schilling's monograph is not easy to work from. It contains far too many misprints. Nor does Schilling cite all the relevant alternative pronunciations, even where these are essential. Thus he often misleads the reader, especially so in the case of the Oldh treatment of Angl $\bar{e}$ ( $=$ WS $\bar{x}$ ), cf No 6 below. Further, the book has two series of paragraphs numbered 83 to 90 . Hence from the first $\S 83$ onwards, I have felt obliged to refer not to the paragraph, but to the page. Lastly, the index of words excludes phonetic transcriptions. Accordingly, I may have overlooked some of the evidence, though not, I hope, distorted the facts.

Schilling's [ī, īə, ē, $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right](\S \mathrm{I})=\operatorname{IPA}[\mathrm{i}:, \mathrm{i}: ə, \mathrm{e}:, \mathrm{e}: \mathrm{l}]$ respectively. Instead of $\left[\bar{e}, \bar{e}^{i}\right]$ Schilling, quite whimsically, often writes [è, ệ ${ }^{1]}$.
I. OE $\check{e}-$ is represented chiefly by [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$, sometimes by [īə] $+[\mathrm{je}]$, and sometimes by $[\mathrm{i}], \S 22(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c})$.
[ē] appears in break, eat (+ [je], § 24), speak, weave, fever (§ 18, B, 5, c), meat (p 88), meal ( $+[\mathrm{i} 2]+[\mathrm{je}]$ ), steal ( $+[\mathrm{i} 2]$ $+[\mathrm{je}])$, tread (+ [ī], § 22 (b), though Schilling actually has [ie], presumably a misprint for [iz]).
But [i] in bequeath (p 103), breakfast, besom (p 95), knead (p $102 ;+[\bar{i} \mathrm{O}], \S 22$ (a), $+\left[\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right], \mathrm{p}$ 102).
Schilling (p II8) also records [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}} 1]$ in speak, tread, weave, eat. It is found, too, in break ( p II7), steal (p 100), knead (p 102). But this [ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right]$ can be explained, except in break, speak and eat, as the appropriate variant of [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ before voiced consonants (cf the development of ME $\bar{a}$ and $a i(e i)$ noted in Nos 8 and 9 below). However, since Schilling nowhere explains the difference between the two sounds - incidentally he fails to include the $\left[\overline{\mathbf{e}}^{i}\right]$ in the " Sounds of the Dialect" described in Chapter I - presumably such difference as may exist is of no real importance.
2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a$ is represented chiefly by [ $\overline{2} \partial]+[\mathrm{je}]$, sometimes by [ $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$, and, rarely, by [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ ], § 16 ( $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}$ ).
[ī]] occurs in beam, bean, beat (+[je]), bread, cheap (+ [ī], p 83), dead (+ [je]), deaf, death (+ [je]), dream, heap $(+$ [i], p 83), leaf, leap, seam, steam, stream.
[je], only, in head.
[i], only, in east, steep, and in belief (p 86; presumably with [i] from the corresponding verb believe, No 7 below).
[ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ in Easter ( $+[\overline{\mathrm{a}}], \mathrm{p} 89$ ), great.
3. OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})$ is chiefly represented by [ī $](+$ occasional [je]) and, rarely, by [i] and [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ ([ $\overline{\left.\left.\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}}\right]\right) \text {, § } \mathrm{r} 6}$ (2, a, b, c, d).
[io] in clean (+ [i], p 99), deal (+[je]), heal (+ [je]), heat $(+[\mathrm{je}])$, heath $(+[\mathrm{je}])$, lead $\mathrm{v}(+[\mathrm{je}] ;+[\mathrm{i}], \mathrm{p} 99)$, lean, least, leave, mean adj, mean v , spread, sweat, wheat.
But [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ in sea ( $+[\overline{\mathrm{i}}]$ ), and, as we might expect, in teach ( $+\left[\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{p}\right.$ 12I), reach ( $+[\overline{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i}]$ ), and $\left[\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right]$ in bleach ${ }^{15}$ (p 97).

[^7]4. OE $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\mathbf{i}],+$, exceptionally, [ī] $([\mathrm{je}]), \S \mathrm{I} 8$ ( $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ ).
[i:] in beech, ${ }^{15}$ bleed, breeches ${ }^{15}$ sb pl, breed (p 119; + [iə], § 18 ( $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{b}$ )), feed, feel, feet, geese, greet (' weep '), keep (p 120), seech (' seek '), sweet, teeth, queen (p 98).
But [ī] in meet (+ [je]), speed.
5. OE $\bar{e} o>[\bar{i}], \S$ I $8(3, a, b, c)$, though some [ī]]- and [ē]forms occur.
[i] in be, bee, between (p 98), creep (pp 9, 31, 102; $+[\mathrm{i} \partial]$, p 72, and also § $\mathrm{I} 8(3, \mathrm{a})$, where [ie] is a misprint for [ i i$]$ ), deep $(+[\mathrm{i} \jmath], \mathrm{p} 83)$, devil $(+[\mathrm{j} \overline{\mathrm{u}}])$, freeze, lief $(+[\overline{\mathrm{e}}])$, see, thief, weed, wheel, knee (p 98), free (p 100), tree (p 100), kneel ( p 120), reek v ( p 4 o ).
But only [ē] in priest (p 100).
6. Angl $\bar{e}$ (Germ $\overline{\mathscr{x}}$ ) is represented by [ $\overline{\mathrm{i}}]$ ( 9 exs), by [ $\overline{\mathrm{i}}]+[\overline{\mathrm{i}} 2]$ ( 6 exs), and by [ï] (3 exs), § 20. This statement corrects Schilling's in § 20, which, through his failure to assemble his own evidence, is misleading. He in fact here records nine [īə]-forms, one of which, needle, has alternatively [i], five [ī]forms (excluding needle), and one [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]-\mathrm{form}$. The additional references given below indicate the extent of his shortcomings.
[ī], only, in cheek, deed, eel, evening, greedy, seed, ate pt ( p II8), wet v (p II9), cheese (p 95).
$[\overline{1}]+[\mathrm{i} \partial]$ in breath (§ 20, p 93), breathe (§ 20, p 10), street (§ 20, p 100), sleep (§ 20, p 99), needle (§ 20), read (p 100).
[ī], only, in dread, sheep, thread.

- [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ ], only, in speech. ${ }^{16}$

7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>[\bar{i}]+$, though abnormally, [i$ə]$ and $\left[\bar{e}^{i}\right], \S 18(4, a, b)$.
[i] in believe, sheet, steeple, tie ( + [วi], pp 38, 74, corresponding to the Oldh development of ME $\bar{i}, \S 25$ ).
But [ī2] in need (+ [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}], \mathrm{p}$ I18), sleeve, steel (§ $20(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{a})$ ).

[^8]8. ME $\bar{a}>[\bar{e}]$ before voiceless consonants $+[\overline{\mathrm{e}} \overline{\mathrm{i}}]$ before voiced consonants, § 14 . This statement, which reverses the pronouncement ${ }^{17}$ of Schilling in this connection, is fully substantiated by the evidence given below and by his rule regarding the Oldh development of ME ai (§34).
(a) OE $\breve{a}-$, $\check{x}-, \S \mathrm{I}_{4}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c})$.
[ē] in ache, drake, hate, lake, naked, snake, staple, taper, gate, maple, water ( $+[\mathbf{i}],{ }^{18}$ p 86).
[ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{1}$ ] in graze, grave, knave, lade, wade, mane, name, spade, tale, ale, shade, blade, raven, father (p 91), bathe (p 93), behave ( p 108).
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-, \S$ I4 (B).
[ $\bar{e}$ ] in cake, gape, gate (' way ').
[ $\left.\bar{e}^{1}\right]$ in gaze, same (§ 14 (a)).
(c) OFr $a_{-}$, § $\mathrm{I}_{4}(\mathrm{C})$.
[ $\bar{e}$ ] in bacon, basin, case, debate, escape, face, mason, nature, place.
[ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}{ }^{1}\right]$ in able, blame, cage, fable, fame, wages (p 86).
9. ME $a i>[\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ before voiceless, but [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}]$ before voiced consonants and when final, § 34 .
(a) OE $\check{\text { g }}$, § 34 ( I ).
$\left[\mathrm{e}^{-1}\right]$ in day $(+[\mathrm{i}]),{ }^{19}$ daisy, may, maiden, nail, say.
(b) OE eg, § 34 ( I ).
[ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}{ }^{\mathrm{i}}\right]$ in play, rain (+ [ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}\right], \mathrm{p}$ 100), sail, way.
But [i] ${ }^{19}$ in lay, laid, lain, § 34 (C, Note).
(c) Angl $\overline{e g}$ (WS $\bar{x} g$ ), § 34 (I).
[ ${ }^{1}$ ] in grey.
(d) Scand ei, eg, § 34 (C).
[ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right]$ in gradely (' properly '), nay, they, fake, laik (' play '), steak, weak.
(e) Angl $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $a i$ before $g$ ), § 34 ( I ).
[ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{i}}$ ] in clay, key, either (p 93).
(f) $\mathrm{OFr} a i, \S 34$ (B).
[ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ in peace, treat, wait.

[^9][ $\overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}]$ in claim, complain, delay, fail, maintain, pay, paint, pain, plain (+ [i] $,{ }^{19} \S 34, \mathrm{C}$, Note), play, rail, ease, treat. But [iə] in chain, ${ }^{20} \S 34$ (C, Note).
(g) OFr $e i, \S 34$ (B).
$[\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ in faint (§ 79 (1) ), obey, pray, rein, veil.
A glance at the above material is enough to reveal the great confusion ${ }^{21}$ that has overtaken the traditional phonological system. After carefully examining all the relevant facts, it seems to me clear that the regular developments of the vowels under discussion are as follows :- OE $\breve{e}-(\mathrm{I})>$ [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ or [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}]$, OE $\bar{e} a$ (2) and $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}(3)$ become [ī], $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e}(4)$, $\bar{e} o(5)$, Angl $\bar{e}(6,7)$ all $>[\bar{i}]$, ME $\bar{a}(8)$ and ai $(9)$ both become [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}]$ or $\left[\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{1}\right]$. Under the influence of RS, the dialect speakers have established the following equation of local cognates :- Oldh [ $\left[\bar{e}, \bar{e}^{i}\right]$ $=\mathrm{RS}[\mathrm{i}:]$ (and correspondingly Oldh [ī) = Oldh [iz]. Thus in Oldh dialect [ $\overline{\mathrm{e}}, \overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}]$ may alternate with [i:], and by extension with [ī] or its further development [je]. Hence we deduce that, in the traditional Oldh vernacular, OE $\check{e}$ - has regularly $>$ (in IPA script) [e:] or [e:l], ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ ( 2 and 3 above) $>$ [i:2], and $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)>$ [i:]; and further, ME $\bar{a}$ and ai become [e:] or [e:l], under which sounds ${ }^{22}$ they are now levelled with OE $\check{e}-$.

## IV. Grindleton, YWR.

Grindleton in the West Riding of Yorkshire is a sparsely populated parish with a mainly agricultural population totaling

[^10]about 850 . Linguistically it belongs to the north-eastern extremity of Ellis's North-Midland Division, D 22. Its dialect has latterly been studied by Mr W. E. Jones, ${ }^{23}$ M.A., who in 1948 wrote, for the B.A. degree, a monograph entitled The Dialect of Grindleton in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Jones has throughout used the IPA system of notation, but in reproducing his material below I have preferred to render his [i] as [i:].
I. (a) OE $\breve{e}->$ [i:], § 88 (iii), 89 .
eat (+ [ij]), eaves, heave, meal, meat, knead, speak, wean, weasel.
(b) Scand $\check{e}->[\varepsilon \iota], \S 89$.
neif (' fist ').
2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a>[\mathrm{i}], \S 88$ (ii).
bean ( + [iə]), beat, bread $(+[\varepsilon \imath])$, dead $(+[\varepsilon \imath]+[12])$, deaf $(+[\mathrm{i}])$ ), death ( + [iə], dream, Easter (Index), heap ( $+[\mathrm{i} \partial]$ ), east, leaf, sheaf, seam, steam, team, cheap ( + [iə]).
3. OE $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>$ [i:], § 88 (i).
each, ${ }^{24}$ clean, cleanings ('placenta'), dealer, heal, heat, lead v , lean adj , least, leave, reach, ${ }^{24}$ sea, sweat ( + [iə]), teach, ${ }^{24}$ tease, wheat.
4. OE $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\mathrm{i}], \S 83$ (i).
beech, ${ }^{24}$ bleed, breed ( $+[\mathrm{i} \partial]$ ), feed, feet, feel, geese, green, heel, keep, meet v , queen, sweet, teeth, weep, wheeze (+ [iə]).
5. OE $\bar{e}_{0}>[\mathrm{i}:], \S 83$ (iv, viii).
be, bee, between, cleaver, deep ( $+[\mathrm{i} \partial]$ ), fleece, free, freeze, meek, knee, reed, three, weed, wheel.
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \bar{x})>[\mathrm{i}], \S 83$ (vii).
bleat, breathe, deed, greedy, eel, evening, meal ( + [iə]), needle,

[^11]read, seat, sleep, speech, ${ }^{24}$ street, sheep, cheek (§ 83, viii), cheese ( $\S 83$, vi).
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>$ [i:], § 83 (vi).
believe, need, sleeve, steeple, steel, sheet.
8. ME $\vec{a}->[\varepsilon l]$ (+ occasional [ $\varepsilon \partial]), \S 79$.
(a) OE $\breve{a}-\breve{x}-\breve{x}-, \S 79$ (1).
bake, baking, blade, dale, ache v and sb , acre, ale, hate v and sb , hazel, frame, game, gate (+[iə] + [غə]), ladle, lame (+ [عə]), lane, late $(+\varepsilon \partial])$, made pt, make, mane, rake, spade, stake, stave $(+[\varepsilon ə])$, swathe sb , shape, -chafer, wave v and sb , acorn (§8I).
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-$, § 79 (ii).
dazed, flake ('gate '), cake, lathe ('barn'), scraper, take agate ( $+[\mathrm{i} j]$ ).
(c) $\mathrm{Fr} \breve{a}$-, § 79 (iii).
bacon, base, basin, date (the fruit), able, face (+ [iə]), flame ( + [ $\varepsilon>]$ ), gable, case, laces sb pl, nature, plate, table, scales, slate, apron (§ 81), ( ?) spane (' wean', § 81), (?) stale (' urinate', § 8I).
9. ME $a i>[\varepsilon i]$ (+ occasional [ $[\partial]$ ), § III.
(a) OE $\nsupseteq g, ~ § ~ I I 2 ~(i) . ~$
brains, daisy (+ [عə]), day, hail, lay pt, maiden ( $+[\varepsilon ə]$ ), nail $(+[\varepsilon ə])$, pail $(+[\varepsilon ə])$, snail $(+[\varepsilon \partial])$, tail $(+[\varepsilon ə])$.
(b) OE eg, § $\mathrm{II2}$ (iii).
ail, lay v, laid pt, play, rain (+ [عə]), say, -blain, way, weigh, sway.
(c) Angl $\bar{e} g(\mathrm{WS} \bar{x} g), \S \mathrm{rI2}$ (iv).
grey.
(d) Scand $e i$, § II2 (vi).
grain (' prong'), raise, (?) caik (' go over on one side of shoe' $; \S \times 13$ ).
(e) Angl $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}$ before $g)$, § II2 (iv).
either ( $+[\mathrm{i}:]$ ), clay.
(f) $\mathrm{OFr} a i, \S 112$ (ii).
$[\varepsilon \imath]+[\varepsilon ə]$ in aim, flail, gain, claim, complain, raisin, saim
(' lard '), traces sb pl, train, chain.
[ $\varepsilon 1$ ], only, in explain, fail, grain, pay, stay v.
(g) OFr ei, § II9 (vii).
faint, pain, plain, rail, rein, sprain, spaved pp adj, strain, obey.
It will have been observed that the usual Gr representative of the three sounds $\mathrm{OE} \check{e}$ - $(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(2,3)$ and $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)$ is the long vowel [i:]. Yet this state of affairs differs vastly from what we have been led to expect from our knowledge of other North-Midland or Northern dialects in this neighbourhood. It seems that, if we accept Jones's account, in Grindleton the traditional phonological system has completely broken down presumably under the influence of RS. It is difficult otherwise to account for the development of $\mathrm{OE} \overrightarrow{\mathscr{x}}$ (the $i$-mutation of $\bar{a}$ ) into [i:], as well as for the sprinkling of [ $\varepsilon$ r]- and [io]-forms all over the groups of words involved. Whence arise these [ $\varepsilon 1]$ ] and [iə]-diphthongs, if not from OE $\breve{e}$ - and ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ respectively? Briefly, I believe that in Grindleton, as in other North-Midland dialects, OE $\check{e}$ - normally $>[\varepsilon \imath]$, $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(2,3)$ $>$ [iə] and ME $\bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)>[i:]$, and, further, that the present confusion and irregularity are entirely due to RS influence. ${ }^{25}$ Lastly, it will have been noticed that ME $\bar{a}$ (8) and ME ai (9) are both usually to-day represented by [ $\varepsilon 2]$, with collateral [ $\varepsilon \partial$ ] occurring occasionally. Again it looks to me as if the regular phonological system has gone to pieces, and that in fact ME $\bar{a}$ and $a i$ would normally become [ $\varepsilon ə$ ], the more usual [ $\varepsilon 1]$-forms, now current, deriving from RS.

[^12]
## V. Addingham, YWR.

Addingham dialect has been recently investigated by Mr F. W. Moody, whose M.A. thesis entitled A Grammar of the Dialect of Addingham in the West Riding of Yorkshire (xxv +522 quarto pp ) was compiled in 1950. The place has to-day a population of about 2,000 inhabitants mostly engaged in the woollen industry. It is localised almost at the point where Ellis's West-Northern Division, D 3I, joins his D 30 (East-Northern) and D 24 (Eastern North-Midland) Divisions (Moody, p xvii). Some 16 miles to the south-east lies Windhill (see VI below).
I. (a) $\mathrm{OE} \check{e_{-}}>$[ Ei$]$, ch II, § 74 .
knead, meal (+ [iə]), meat, speak, steal ('handle'), steal, theak v (+ [iə], 'thatch'; < the Dec-forms of OE Peccean, or $<$ O Scand pekja, or from both), weave( $r$ ), tread (Index). But [io] in instead, even (Index), fever ( + [ri]), ch II, § 78 ; and [ii] in break.
(b) Scand $\check{e}->$ [عi], ch II, $\S 76$.
neif, leak.
2. OE $\bar{e} a>[\mathrm{i} \partial], \mathrm{ch} \mathrm{II}, \S 73$.
beam, bread, cheap, dead, deaf, dream v (Index), head, leaf, sheaf, steam, stream, team, threap (' argue'), beat (+ [zi], p 208 ; $+[\mathrm{li}], \mathrm{p} 245$ ).
3. OE $\bar{x}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>[i 2], \operatorname{ch}$ II, §72.
clean, cleaning (' placenta'), deal(er), heat, lead(er), sea, seal sb ('rope'), sheath, spread, sweat, heal (Index), leave (Index), mean v (Index).
But [si] ${ }^{26}$ in bleach(-ed), reach + reak, teach.
4. ÓE $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\mathbf{i}]$, ch II, § $66(6)$.
feet, heel, keep, meet, teeth. Moody also records (p 210) [ti] in bleed, breed, feed, feel; and in heed (Index).

[^13]5. OE $\bar{e} o>$ [ri], ch II, § 66 (C).
cleaver (+ [iə]), fleece, gritstone, knee, three, wheel, between (Index), creep (Index), reed (Index), see ( + [io], Index).
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \overline{\boldsymbol{x}})>[\mathrm{Li}]+[\mathrm{i}]$ ], ch II, § 66 (a).
[ii], only, in needle, seed, read (Index), sheep (Index), sleep, cheese (Index).
But [iz], only, in breath, meal, sweal v ('gutter '), thread.
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>[\mathrm{ii}]+[\mathrm{i}]$ ], ch II, $\S 66$ (e).
believe (+ [ij]), sleeve ( + [io]), but [ii], only, in steelyard, steeple.
8. ME $\bar{a}>$ [eə] (+ occasional [et], which Moody attributes to RS influence), ch II, §58.
(a) $\mathrm{OE} \breve{a}-$ - $\breve{x}$, ch $\mathrm{II}, \S 58$ (a).
acre, bake, frame, gape, gate, gavelock, lame, mane, shame, spade, stake, swath, grave (ch II, §62).
(b) Scand $\breve{a}$-, ch II, § 60 (b).
cake, dazed, gate (' way '), lathe (' barn '), same.
(c) Fr $\check{a}-$, ch II, §6I (c).
bacon, bale, blame, case, face, lace, paper, place sb and v, (?) spane (' wean '), stable, table, (?) stale (' urine,' ch II, § 62).
9. ME ai > [ez] (+ occasional [el], probably < RS, Moody), ch II, § IO7.
(a) OE $x g$, ch II, § Io8 (a). brain, day, fain, master, nail, tail ( $+[\mathrm{er}]$ ).
(b) OE eg, ch iI, § Io8 (d).
ail $(+[\mathrm{e}])$, blain, braid $(+[\mathrm{e}]$, ' plait'), rain, sailor, way.
(c) Angl $\bar{e} g$ (WS $\bar{x} g$ ), ch II, § Io8 (e).
grey.
(d) Scand ei, eg, ch II, § 108 (f,g).
bait (+ [el]), grain (+ [el];'prong'), laik (+ [el]; 'play'), slape (' slippery '), flay (' frighten ').
(e) Angl $\check{\not x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}$ before $g)$, ch II, § 108 (e).
clay.

But key has [er].
(f) $\mathrm{OFr} a i$, ch $\mathrm{II}, \S$ Io8 (b).
chain (+ [et $]$ ), complain, flail (+ [et]); ch II, § 108 (d).
plain, ray ('diarrhoea'), saim (' lard'), train sb.
But [el], only, in stay sb ('rod '), traces sb pl.
(g) OFr ei, ch II, § Io8 (h).
rail, rein ( $+[\mathrm{e} 1]$ ), sprain ( $+[\mathrm{e} \mathbf{l}]$ ), strain, vein.
In examining the above evidence we notice that normally OE $\check{e}-(\mathrm{I})>[\mathrm{e}]$, OE $\bar{e} a(2)$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ (3) both $>$ [i2], while OE $\bar{e}(4)$, $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} o(5)$ and Angl $\bar{e}(6,7)$ all become [ii]. Further, the equation of local cognates is clearly :- Add $[\varepsilon \imath]=\mathrm{RS}$ [i:] (here rendered by dialectal [ii]) $=$ Add [iə]. Hence Add [ $\varepsilon \imath$ ] may interchange either with [ii] or with [iə]. We accordingly conclude that, in normal Add dialect OE $\stackrel{e}{e}$ $(\mathrm{I})>[\varepsilon \imath], \operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(2,3)>[\mathrm{i} 2], \operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)>[1 \mathrm{i}]$. But it is noteworthy that Angl $\bar{e}(6)$ is represented not only by [ii], but also by [iə], in the proportion of 6 to 4 (cf the corresponding development in Wi where almost the same differentiation is observable, the proportion here being II to 7). It may well be that the confusion is of very long standing and that some of the words formerly containing Angl $\bar{e}$ (Germ $\bar{x}$ ) actually did develop forms with $\bar{e}_{2}$ in ME (cf p 125 below). Lastly, ME $\bar{a}$ (8) and ME ai (9) are both levelled under [ez], and are thus differentiated from the further development of OE $\check{e}-(>[\varepsilon \tau])$. Adding hamdialect is evidently phonologically identical with that of Wi (cf VI below).

## VI. Windhill, YWR.

Windhill, a manufacturing place ${ }^{27}$ which at one time formed part of the parish of Calverley - with a population of 2679 inhabitants in 1906 - lies 3 miles north of Bradford in YWR. Its dialect, which belongs to Ellis's Eastern North-Midland Division, D 24, forms the subject of Wright's notable Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill, London 1892. Fifty years ago its

[^14]phonological system was wonderfully well preserved, a fact which strikes us even more forcibly when we compare it with those of the other dialects under consideration here.

Wright's [ei, iə, ì eə] (respectively §§ $5,6,9,5$ ) $=$ IPA [ $\varepsilon \imath, \imath ə, \mathrm{i}:, \varepsilon ə]$.
I. (a) OE $\check{e}->[\mathrm{ei}], \S 87$.
bead, eat, meal, meat, knead, speak, -stead (+ [tə], § 82), steal, steal (' handle '), (?) steam (' bespeak '), tread, weave. But [io] in fret.
And [ea] in fever (§ 84).
(b) Scand $\check{e}-$, § 87 .
neif (' fist ').
2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a>[\mathrm{i}]$, § 179.
beam, bean, beat, bread, dead, deaf, death, dream, head, neap, east, lead, leaf, belief, peacock, seam, steam, steep, strea ('straw'), stream, sheaf, team, cheap, threap ('contradict'), threaten.
3. $\mathrm{OE} \overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{x}}(i$-mut of $\vec{a})>[i \partial], \S 137$.
breadth, deal, gleam, heal, health, heather, lead(er), lean, least, leave, mean adj, mean v , wreath, sea, sweat, sheath, tease, clean, wheat.
But [ei] ${ }^{28}$ in bleach, reak (' reach '), teach, cf § 138 ; and in lean (§ 139), spread (§ 139).
4. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\mathrm{i}], \S 147$.
bleed, breed, deem, feed, feel, feet, geese, green, greet, heed, heel, keel v (' cool '), keen, keep, queen, meet, seek, sweet, teeth, zeep.
But [io] in wheeze (§ I3I).

[^15]5. OE $\bar{e} 0>[\overline{1}], § I 87$.
be, bee, been, cleave, deep, glee, fiend, fleece, free, freeze, creep, lief(er), knee, reed, reel, priest, see, seethe, sneeze, tree, between, thief, three, weed, wheel.
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \overline{\mathscr{X}})>[\overline{1}]+[\mathrm{i}]], \S \S 130,13 \mathrm{I}$.
[1̄] in greedy, evening, needle, read, seed, sleep, street, sheep, cheese, thread, cheek (§ I8I).
[io] in breath(e), dread, eel, meal, sweal v ('gutter'), weapon. But $[\mathrm{ei}]^{29}$ in leech and speech, cf § 132 , breach (§ 87), (?) meach v (' measure,' $\S 67$ ).
But [ez] in bleat.
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>[\overline{1}], \S$ I50.
belueve, need, steeple.
8. $\operatorname{ME} \bar{a}>[\mathrm{e} \partial], \S 70$.
(a) $\mathrm{OE} \check{\nless-}-\breve{a}-, \S 70$.
bathe, bake, blade, blaze, dale, (?) drag, drake, (?) haig (" haw'), acre, ale, hate, behave, frame, nightingale, gate, grave, graze, crave, ladle, lame, made pt, (?) maig (' maw'), mane, (?) naig ('gnaw'), naked, name, rake, rather, (?) saig sb ('saw'), sake, sale, snake, spade, spane ('wean'), stale, pt ('stole'), staves sb pl, swape ('handle '), shade, shape, shave, stake, tale, tame, wade, whale, wane, (?) wave.
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-, \S 70$.
agate, cake, flake, gape, lathe ('barn'), prate, same, scales sb pl, scrape.
(c) Fr $\breve{a}-, \S 204$.
bacon, bale, bate, blame, date, able, age, fade, face, favour, flame, engage, grace, grate, cage, case, lace, mason, nature, page, pale, pane, pace, place, plate, rage, rate, sacred, scales, stable, table.
9. ME $a i>[\mathrm{e} \partial], \S 65$.
(a) ОЕ $x g, \S 65$.
brain, day, daisy, hail, fain, main, nail, pail, slain, snail, tail.

[^16](b) OE eg, § 84.
braid ('resemble '), gain (' near'), lay, laid pt, lain pp, rain, say, sail, (a)way.
(c) Angl $\overline{e g}(\mathrm{WS} \tilde{x} g), \S$ г 33 .
grey.
(d) Scand ei, eg, § 84.
bain (' near '), bait, nay, steak, they.
(e) Angl $\bar{x} g$ ( $i$-mut of $\bar{a}+g$ ).
clay (§ 3I5).
But [ei] in key, § 139.
(f) OFr ai, § 204.
bailiff, claim, dainty, aim, fail, gay, grains sb pl, pay, pain, pain, paint, plain, saim ('lard'), saint, tailor, trail, train, wait.
(g) OFr ei, § 204.
bray (' beat '), faint, faith, pray, praise, vein.
In Wi-using IPA notation-OE $\check{e}$ - (1) normally becomes [ $\varepsilon 1$ ], ME $\bar{e}_{2}(2,3)$ becomes [ 12 ], and $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)$ becomes [i:]. But there are instances of apparently irregular development. Firstly, OE $\check{e}$ - gives [ $\varepsilon \iota$ ], beside, occasionally, [ı]. This twofold development, however, can be explained by the equation of local cognates:-Wi [ $\mathrm{\varepsilon} \mathrm{l}]=\mathrm{RS}[\mathrm{i}]=\mathrm{Wi}[$ te]. Secondly, Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \overline{\boldsymbol{x}})$ - but not the OE $\bar{e}$-sounds of other origins, viz Nos 4 and 7 - often appears as [12], beside the expected, and more frequent [i], though never, so it seems, in one and the same word. There is here, indeed, a rigid differentiation, and it is difficult to say how far back this goes. Nevertheless, the fact that the neighbouring Addingham, with a similar phonological system, reveals a parallel development with precisely the same words differentiated, seems to imply that the present cleavage dates back to ME times, that in fact certain words which should have normally contained ME $\bar{e}_{1}$ ( $[\mathrm{e}:]),>$ Angl $\bar{e}$ (Germ $\bar{x})$, actually had the vowel $\bar{e}_{2}([\varepsilon ;])$ even as early as the ME period itself. Thus OE $\bar{e}$ (Germ $\bar{x})$, in the ME precursor of some South Yorkshire dialects, becomes [e:] ( $\bar{e}_{1}$ ) beside [ $\varepsilon$ :] ( $\bar{e}_{2}$ ); see further p 125 below.
ViI. Lindsey, Lincolnshire.

Information about the dialect of Lindsey, the northernmost of Lincolnshire's three divisions, is contained in The Lindsey Dialect (Leeds 1940) by J. E. Oxley, according to whom ( p 6) the vernacular is, except for the Isle of Axholme in the north-west, pretty uniform over the whole of this extensive area. The region belongs to Ellis's Border-Midland Division, D 20. Although Oxley points out some of he phonetic variants used in certain parts of his dialectal area, one is handicapped by his not limiting his survey to a much more restricted locality. As things are, his information cannot be attached to any precise locality.
Oxley's [ij, i, e2] (respectively $\S \S 17,3,15$ ) correspond to IPA [ıə, i:, $\varepsilon$ ].
I. (a) $\mathrm{OE} \stackrel{\text { è- }}{->}[\mathrm{i}]], \S 127$ ( I$)$.
fever, eat, meal, meat, speak, steal, tread.
2. $\mathrm{OE} \tilde{e} a>$ [iə], § I 27 (3).
beam, bean, beat, belief, dead, deaf, dream, great, head, heap, Easter, leaf, steam, steep, stream, team, cheap, threap (' contradict ').
3. $\mathrm{OE} \overline{\mathcal{X}}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>[\mathrm{i} \partial], \S \mathrm{I} 27(2)$.
breadth, bleach ${ }^{30}$ deal, heather, clean, lead v , lean adj, least, leave, mean, reach, ${ }^{30}$ sea, sweat, spread, tease, wheat.
4. OE $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>$ [i:], § 123 ( I$)$.
beech, bleed, breed, feed, feel, feet, geese, green, keen, keep, queen, meet, sweet, teeth, weep.
5. OE $\bar{e} o>[i:], \S 123(6)$.
been, deep, fleece, freeze, reel, priest, tree, between, thief, three, weed, wheel.
But [iz], cf § I27 (4), in bee, cleave.

[^17]6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \bar{x})>[\mathrm{i}:]$, § 123 (3).
cheek (§ 123, 5), deed, greedy, evening, eel, needle, seed, sieep, street, sheep.
But sweal v ('gutter' ; § 127 (2) ) has [iz].
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>$ [i:], § 123 (2).
need, steeple, sixteen.
8. ME $\vec{a}>$ [eə], § 12 I .
(a) $\mathrm{OE} \breve{x^{2}}-\breve{a}-, \S \mathrm{I} 2 \mathrm{I}$.
bake, blade, blaze, drake, ache, acorn, acre, ale, behave, father, frame, graze, lame, mane, nave, name, rake, rather, vaven, sale, same, snake, spade, shade, shave, tame, wade, whale, wave.
(b) Scand $\breve{a}-$, § 170 .
daze, gate (' way'), gape, same, scrape, cake.
(c) Fr $\check{a}-$-, § 195.
blame, age, able, engage, face, flame, cage, case, lace, page, place, plate, slate, scales, stable, wage.
9. $\mathrm{ME} a i>[\mathrm{e} \mathrm{\partial}], \S$ I 45 .
(a) OE æg, § I45 (I).
brain, day, daisy, hail, lay, maid, may, nail, tail.
But [i:] ${ }^{31}$ in snail.
(b) OE eg, § I45 (4).
ail, away, laid pt, played pt, rain, say, sail, way, weigh.
(c) Angl $\bar{e} g$ (WS $\breve{x} g$ ), § I45 (2).
grey.
(d) Scand $e i, e g, \S$ I77.
raik v (' wander '), slape (' slippery '), (?) sway, gain (' near ').
(e) Angl $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}+g), \S I 45(2)$.
(n)either, clay.
(f) OFr ai, § 203.
bray, fail, gay, claim, master, pay, plaint, saim (' lard'), tailor, train, wait, vain.
But [iz] in chain ${ }^{32}$.

[^18](g) OFr $e i, \S 203$.
faith, pray.
But [iə] is recorded (§ I97 (4)) in rein (which is incorrectly spelt rain in §203), stain, strain. ${ }^{33}$

The Li treatment of the ME sounds under consideration seems, superficially, to present no historical problems. OE $\check{e}-$ (I) $>$ [iə] and is thus levelled with the existing equivalents of $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a(2)$ and $\mathrm{OE} \overline{\mathcal{X}}(3)$. Furthermore, all three are to-day differentiated from the continuation of $\mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(4,5,6,7)$, which itself is represented by [i:], as well as from ME $\bar{a}$ and $a i$, both of which have given [eə]. All these phonological distinctions are apparently maintained in Li to-day with a rigidity that is perhaps a little surprising.

## VIII. Biddulph Moor, Staffordshire.

Biddulph Moor, a village of some 1,400 inhabitants subsisting on farming or mining, is in the extreme north of Staffordshire. Its dialect has been described by Mr R. Groom in a B.A. thesis entitled The Phonology of the Dialect of Biddulph Moor (fol pp xir +156 , 1950). Groom believes that the dialect is quickly disintegrating (cf, eg, Nos 8 and 9 below). Linguistically, the locality lies in Ellis's West-Midland Division, D 25.

It will be observed that the development of the various ME sounds has here been quite different from that in the other dialects previously discussed.

Groom uses IPA symbols, but his diphthong [ $\mathrm{e}^{1}$ ] (§ 18 ) is probably more accurately written [ $e^{\left.\cdot{ }^{2}\right]}$, if not [e: ${ }^{[1]}$. In any case the sound is quite distinct from his diphthong $[\varepsilon \tau]$ (§ 19) found in Nos 4-7 below.
I. (a) OE $\check{e-}>$ [i:], § 9 I (3).
bead, break, eat ( $+[\varepsilon 1]$ ), easing (' eaves'), eaves, even, fret, knead, meal, meat, speak, steal ('handle'), tread, wean, weave.
But only [ $\varepsilon 1$ ] in besom.
(b) Scand $\check{e}->[\mathrm{i}]$, § 9 I (4).

## leak.

[^19]'2. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a>[\mathrm{i}:], \S 9 \mathrm{I}(2)$.
beam, bean, beat, bread, cheap, deaf, death, dream (+ [eı]), east, great, heap, leaf, sheaf, steam, stream, team.
But only [ $\varepsilon 1$ ] in belief (§ 85 (5); probably influenced by believe, which has [ EL ], cf No 7 below).
3. OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}(i$-mut of $\bar{a})>[\mathrm{i}:], \S 9 \mathrm{I}$ ( I$)$.
clean, cleanings ('placenta'), deal(-er), heat, heathen, lead $\mathrm{v}(+[\varepsilon \mathrm{l}])$, lean adj, least $(+[\varepsilon \imath])$, leave $(+[\varepsilon \imath])$, mean adj, mean v , sheath, spread ( $+[\varepsilon \mathrm{l}]$ ), stean (' earthenware vessel '), sweat, tease, wheat.
But only [ $\varepsilon 1]^{34}$ in bleach, (?) bleat, each, reach, teach (er).
4. $\mathrm{OE} \bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{o})>[\varepsilon 1], \S 85(2)$.
beech, ${ }^{34}$ bleed, breech $(e s),{ }^{34}$ breed, feed, feel, feet, geese, green, heel, keen, keep, meet(ing), queen, seek (+ [i:]), speed, sweet, teeth ( + [i:]).
5. OE $\bar{e} o>[\varepsilon 1], \S 85(3)$.
be, bee, cheave(r), creep(ing), deep, free, freeze, knees pl, see, sneeze, thief, thieve, three, tree, weed(ing), wheel (+ [عı]]).
6. Angl $\bar{e}(\operatorname{Germ} \bar{x})>[\varepsilon \imath], \S 85$ (1).
(?) cheek, cheese (§85,5), deed, eel, meal, needle, read, seed, sleep, speech, ${ }^{34}$ sheep, street.
But [ $\mathrm{i}:]$ in breathe, evening.
7. Angl $\bar{e}(i$-mut of $\bar{e} a)>[\varepsilon \imath], \S 85(6)$.
believe, need, sheets, sleeve.

[^20]8. $\mathrm{ME} \tilde{a}>[\mathrm{e}], \S \S 79,80$.
(a) OE $\breve{\mathfrak{c}}-, \breve{a}-$ - § 80 ( I ).
ache, acre, ale, bake, behave, cradle, father, game, gate(-) (+ [i:]), lading, ladle, lames 3 sg pr ind, mane, naked, name, nathe (' nave'), name, rake sb, sake, sale, shade, shake (+ [i:]), shame, shape, shave, spade, stake, stave, tale, tame, waken ( + [i:]), water ( + [i:]).
(b) Scand $\breve{a}$-, § 80 (3).
cake, gape, rake v, same, thrave, scrape v (§ 81).
(c) Fr $\breve{a}-$, § 80 (2).
able, bacon, bale, blame, brace, cage, case, chase, face, flame, gable, lace(rs), mason, planed pp, place, rate, slates, stable, table, wage.
But [ i :] in wager.
9. ME $a i>[\mathrm{i}:]$ (alternating, when final, with $[\varepsilon 1], \S \S 118,15$ ).
(a) OE $x g, \S 118$ (i).
brain(-less), daisies pl , day, hail, main, may, nail, snail, tail, whey (§119, 2).
(b) OE eg, § II9 (i).
lay v , laid pp, play, rain, say, way.
(c) Angl $\bar{e} g$ (WS $\bar{x} g$ ), § II9 (2).
grey.
(d) Scand ei, § II9 (Note).

No instances of the development to [i:] + [ii] occur. But [ $\left.\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}}\right]$ alone appears in bait, grained (' pronged ').
(e) OE $\bar{x} g(i$-mut of $\bar{a}+g, \S 119(2)$.
clay, key.
(f) $\mathrm{OFr} a i, \S \mathrm{II} 8$ (2).
chain, gain, grain (§ II9 (3) ), pay, plain, raisins (§ II9 (3) ), stayed pt , stays sb pl , train v , waiting, delay.
(g) OFr ei, § 1 I9 (3).
faint, paint, pray v, rail, sprain, strain.
But [ $\mathrm{e}^{1}$ ] in faith, rein (§ II8 (2)) vein,
In the material above, OE $\check{e}-$ (I), $\bar{e} a(2)$, and $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ (3) have all normally become [i:], whereas OE $\bar{e}(4), \bar{e} O(5)$ and Angl $\bar{e}(6,7)$ have given [ $\varepsilon \imath]$. Thus ME $\bar{e}_{2}>[\mathrm{i}:]$ and $\mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{1}>$ [ $\left.\varepsilon \imath\right]$, though
there are sporadic anomalies. The equation of local cognates appears to be BM [ $\varepsilon 1]=\mathrm{RS}$ [ i$]$. Thus we can explain the alternation of [ev] and [i:] observable in several words in Nos 3,4 , and 6 .

ME $\vec{a}$ (8) and ME ai (9) to-day show undoubted evidence of levelling under BM [i:], even though ME $\bar{a}$ nowadays mostly appears in the recorded material as [ $\left.\mathrm{e}^{1}\right]$. Groom, in my opinion rightly, regards this diphthong as an intrusion from RS. Consequently, according to this interpretation, ME $\bar{a}$ and $a i$ may be regarded as being normally levelled with the further development of $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(\operatorname{Nos} 4,5,6,7)$ under the vowel [i:].

This concludes our survey of all the available evidence based on direct investigation and we are now in a position to consider all the above material as a whole. On examining it closely, we see the clearly defined outlines of four different patterns of development. These are as set out below in IPA phonetic notation:-

## Pattern I.

| OE $\check{e g-(1)}$ | $>$ [ $£]$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(=[\varepsilon:] ; 2,3)$ | $>[\mathrm{i} 2, \mathrm{l} 2]$ |
| $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{1}(=[\mathrm{e}:] ; 4,5,6,7)$ | $>$ [i, li$]$ |
| ME $\bar{a}$ (8). |  |
| ME ai, ei (9) | $>$ [e., e., eə, eə] |

This pattern is examplified by $\mathrm{Fl}, \mathrm{Adl}, \mathrm{Gr}$, Add, and Wi, all of which belong to either Lancashire or South Yorkshire.

## Pattern 2.

| OE er- $^{\text {( }}$ ( $)$ | $>$ [e:, e: ${ }^{\text {] }}$ ] |
| :---: | :---: |
| ME $\bar{e}_{2}(=[\varepsilon:] ; 2,3)$ | $>$ [i:2] |
| ME $\bar{e}_{1}(=[e:] ; 4,5,6,7)$ | $>$ [i:] |
| ME $\bar{a}$ (8) | [e: |
| ME ai, ei (9) | [e. |

This is exemplified by Oldh, ${ }^{35}$ in which, unlike Fl, Adl, Add

[^21]and Wi, the further development of OE $\check{e}-(\mathrm{I})$ has been overtaken by the sound arising from both ME $\bar{a}$ (8) and ME ai/ei (9).

Pattern 3.

| OE $\check{e g-(1)}$ | $>$ [เə] |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{2}(=[\varepsilon:] ; 2,3)$ | $>$ [ 1 ] |
| ME $\bar{e}_{1}(=[\mathrm{e}:] ; 4,5,6,7)$ | $>$ [i:] |
| ME $\bar{a}$ (8) | [ $\varepsilon$ ] |
| ME ai, ei (9) |  |

Exemplified by Li.

## Pattern 4.

$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { OE } \check{e}-(\mathrm{I}) & >[\mathrm{i}:] \\ \left.\text { ME } \bar{e}_{2}=[\varepsilon:] ; 2,3\right) & >[\mathrm{i}:] \\ \text { ME } \bar{e}_{1}(=[\mathrm{e}:] ; 4,5,6,7) & >[\varepsilon \imath] \\ \text { ME } \bar{a}(8) \\ \text { ME ai, ei }(9)\end{array}\right\} \quad>[\mathrm{i}]$

Exemplified by BM.
As already pointed out above, certain discrepancies in detail appear in all the dialects under consideration; but most of them can be satisfactorily explained by the appropriate equation of local cognates. Yet in some of the dialects characterised by Pattern I, there is one rather conspicuous anomaly, viz the treatment of both OE $\bar{x}_{2}$ ( $i$-mut of $\bar{a}$; No 3 ) and OE $\bar{x}_{1}$ (Germ $\overline{\mathscr{x}}$; No 6). Especially in Add and Wi, and to some extent in Fl, as well as possibly in Oldh (Pattern 2), where the picture is very confused, we find evidence of a two-fold development of OE $\overline{\mathscr{X}}_{1}$ (No 6). Here, certain words involved are to-day pronounced, not with the expected [i:], as if from ME $\bar{e}_{1}$, but with the diphthong [iz], a sound that undoubtedly presupposes ME $\bar{e}_{2}$. Among these we note, in particular, breathe, dread, thread, meal (' time'), and sweal ('gutter'). Now all these words contain a dental consonant following the vowel; but there are also words in which the OE vowel was not followed by a dental, viz sheep and sleep (Oldh, Add), and
weapon and wheeze (Wi). Moreover, reference to the old $\overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{x}}_{2}$ - words (see No 3 above) reveals that except in Oldham - a debased regional dialect - only rarely in this group do we come across an [i:]-form, presupposing ME $\bar{e}_{1}$, instead of the regularly developed form with [iə] ( $<\mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{2}$ ); and even then, we may reasonably suspect RS influence. No examples occur in Fl, Add and Wi, but in Adl (where OE $\widetilde{\mathscr{B}}>$ [i:] only) we find [i:] in weeath and see (but more usually [se:]). Thus, inevitably, we seem driven to the conclusion that for some reason or other OE $\vec{x}_{1}$ in the ancestral dialects concerned had either developed, abnormally, into ME [ $\varepsilon$ :], or else come to be represented, analogically, by [ $\varepsilon$ :], the further development of OE $\overline{\mathscr{X}}_{2}$. Whatever the reason, it seems quite plain that OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1}$ in some words had already in ME times become levelled under $\operatorname{ME} \bar{e}_{2}$ ( $=[\varepsilon:]$; and not that $\mathrm{OE} \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}_{2}$, in certain words, perhaps by a combinative change, normally became $\bar{e}_{1}(=[\mathrm{e}:])$.

Before accepting the foregoing conclusion, however, it would be advisable to await additional evidence that may come to light from other (separately investigated) localities in Lancashire and South Yorkshire; but the point has special interest in connection with the assumption ${ }^{36}$ that OE $\bar{x}_{2}$ before dentals may have been raised to $\bar{e}_{1}$ ([e:]) by the ME period.

One further point requiring attention here is the treatment of ME $\bar{e}$, both close and open, before the ME sound [ $\mathrm{t} /]$, orthographically ch (< OE palatal $c$ ). The several words involved belong to three classes containing respectively (i) OE $\bar{x}_{2}$ (No 3 above), viz bleach, each, reach, teach, (ii) OE $\bar{x}_{1}$ (Angl $\bar{e}$, No 6 above), viz breach, leech, speech, and (iii) OE $\bar{e}$ ( $i$-mut of $\bar{o}$, No 4 above), viz beech, breeches, seech (' seek '). Briefly, the question is whether these words to-day show the same vowel sound as that representing OE $\check{e}$-. The material above (excluding that relating to Gr, which is here unhelpful) shows, firstly, that bleach, reach, teach, exhibit coalescence

[^22]with old $\breve{e}$ - under an $[\varepsilon \imath]$-diphthong in $\mathrm{Fl}, \mathrm{Adl}$, Add and Wi, and under [e:] in Oldh; secondly, that breach, leech, speech show coalescence under [ $\varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon}]$ ] in Wi, and speech, but under [e:], in Oldh; and thirdly, that beech, breeches, seech ('seek') never show levelling of the kind under discussion. Incidentally, preach (< OFr prechier) nowadays reveals the same vowelelement as that from OE $\check{e}$ - at Fl, Adl, Oldh, Add and Wi.

Apparently here, apart from at Oldh, we have to do with the possible occurrence of a combinative change, which consisted of the raising of the final part of the old long vowel to an [l]sound before the voiceless palato-alveolar affricate [t/].37 The change occurred quite normally when the vowel concerned arose from OE $\overline{\mathscr{X}}_{2}$, sometimes when it was from OE $\overline{\mathscr{X}}_{1}$ (Angl $\bar{e}$ ), but not when it was from OE $\bar{e}(i-m u t ~ o f ~ \bar{o})$. The question of the date of the change cannot be decided from the evidence available, though it is tempting to assume that it occurred concurrently with the change of OE $\check{e}$ - to [ $\varepsilon 1]$.

This survey may be appropriately concluded with a suggestion for a possible path of change taken, in Pattern I above, by OE $\check{e}$ - in passing into present-day [ $\varepsilon \imath$ ]. Luick ${ }^{38}$ considers that in this region OE $\check{e}$ - developed into a sound lying between ME $\bar{e}_{1}$ (mid-front-tense, viz IPA [e:]) and ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ (low-front-narrow, corresponding presumably to IPA $[\varepsilon:])$. But I find it incredible that this supposed intermediate sound could for any appreciable length of time preserve its separate identity without colliding and subsequently being levelled with either $\bar{e}_{1}$ or $\bar{e}_{2}$. It seems to me rather more probable that the new $\bar{e}$ from OE $\check{e}$ - was more open than ME $\bar{e}_{2} \cdot{ }^{39}$

On purely theoretical grounds, it seems to me quite possible that so far as concerns Lancashire and South Yorkshire (viz

[^23]Pattern I), the ME sounds we have been considering developed as under:-

ME LME/ENE ENE NE
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\operatorname{Angl} \bar{e}(6,7) \\ \operatorname{OE} \tilde{e}(4) \\ \operatorname{OE} \tilde{e} O(5)\end{array}\right\}>[\mathrm{e}:]$
$>[\mathrm{i}] \quad>[\mathrm{i}:]$
$>$ [i:]
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{OE} \bar{e} a(2) \\ \mathrm{OE} \overline{\mathcal{X}}(3)\end{array}\right\} \quad>[\mathrm{e}:] \quad>[\mathrm{e}:] \quad>[\mathrm{e} \partial] \quad>[\mathrm{i}]\right]$
OE $\check{e}-(\mathrm{I}) \quad>[\varepsilon:]$ (lowered $)>[\varepsilon:] \quad>[\varepsilon \imath] \quad>[\varepsilon \imath]$



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ An Elementary Middle English Grammar, 2nd ed, Oxford 1946.
    ${ }^{2}$ English Dialect Grammar, Oxford 1905.
    ${ }^{3}$ A Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill in the West Riding of Yorkshire, London 1892. (N.B. The Preface is dated Jan 1893).
    ${ }^{4}$ On Early English Pronunciation, Part V, London 1889.
    ${ }^{5}$ Untersuchungen zur Englischen Lautgeschichte, Strassburg 1896.

[^1]:    ${ }^{6}$ These dissertations have all been deposited in the Department of English Language and Medieval Literature, University of Leeds. The authors concerned are in the order in which they appear in this paper - Messrs. P. Wright, B.A., W. E. Jones, M.A., F. W. Moody, M.A. and R. Groom, B.A.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ The following abbreviations may be noted: $\mathrm{Adl}=$ Adlington, La; Add $=$ Addingham, $\mathrm{YWR} ; \mathrm{BM}=$ Biddulph Moor, $\mathrm{St} ; \mathrm{Fl}=$ Fleetwood, $\mathrm{La} ; \mathrm{Gr}=$ Grindleton, YWR; $\mathrm{Li}=$ Lindsey, $\mathrm{L} ; \mathrm{Wi}=$ Windhill, YWR. $\quad$ RS $=$ Received Standard English; IPA = The International Phonetic Association. All the other abbreviations used in the article are conventional and will be readily understood.
    ${ }^{8}$ Clearly, the vowel element has developed irregularly. The stem vowel in the OE etymon, a word borrowed from Latin, was either long or short $e$, cf OED and Wyld sub fever. The vowel element of the Fleetwood form corresponds to ME $\bar{a}$ or aijei, cf Nos 8 and 9 .

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ This diphthong, which corresponds to OE ${ }^{-}$- (cf No I above), also occurs in preacher (with ME $\bar{e}_{2}<\mathrm{OFr} e ; \S 126,5$ ). It apparently results from a combinative change before ME [t/] (see p 126). Each (No 3) to-day has [10]. It is noteworthy that the vowel in breeches (No 4 above), seech ('seek', No 4), and reech ('reek', No 7) have experienced the normal isolative development of ME $\bar{e}_{1}(=[1 i])$ P. Wright does not record teach, breach or leech.

[^4]:    10 The [12] presupposes ME $\bar{e}_{2}$, cf Nos 2 and 3. OED records (sv) Northern forms in chen- from the 14 th century onwards. See also my monograph The Phonology of a South Durham Dialect (London 1933), § 140. ıo $\mathrm{o}^{\text {a }}$ Presumably formed on rein (< ME rēne).

[^5]:    11 This [ē̄] also normally represents $O E$ - (cf No I above). It also occurs in preach, § 5 I (3). Note the [ $\overline{\mathrm{l}}]$ in breeches, seech ('seek,' OE sècan), cf No 4. Each, leach, speech and beech have not been recorded by Hargreaves.
    ${ }^{12}$ The vowel is here quite irregular, as well as unique, as the representative in Adjington of ME $\bar{e}_{1}$. The etymology is disputed: OED derives from OE weoc(e), and Wyld from OE wice.
    ${ }^{13}$ The development has been abnormal, but the diphthong (to which there is no alternative) presumably arises on the analogy of the [ ei$]$ in meal (< OE melo), cf No r.

[^6]:    ${ }^{14}$ The [iə] presupposes ME $\bar{e}_{\mathbf{2}}$, cf footnote 10.

[^7]:    15 Thus bleach, reach, teach, today contain the same vowel element as that corresponding to OE $\ddot{e}$ - (cf No 1 above). This is also found in preach, $\S 16$ (B, II, a), and speech (cf No 6). But [i] occurs in beech, breeches (cf No 4, below). Schilling omits each and breach.

[^8]:    ${ }^{16}$ See footnote 17 .

[^9]:    17 This reads: "ME, $\bar{a}$ appears as $\bar{e}$, when final or before voiced consonants as $\bar{e}^{i}$ before unvoiced", cf Schilling, § 14.
    18 See footnote 23.
    19 See footnote 23.

[^10]:    ${ }^{20}$ Cf footnote 12.
    ${ }^{21}$ If ever a warning were needed to adopt the most cautious possible attitude in studying the dialect of a large town, we have one here in this example of a debased regional dialect. Schilling was himself aware of the adulteration of the Oldh vernacular (cf his Introduction, $\mathrm{I}-5$ ). Knowing the circumstances, he had, in my opinion, at least three reasonable courses open to him. He might well have avoided the town altogether and sought to find a historically more remunerative locality in the near neighbourhood; or, secondly, concentrated his attention upon half a dozen elderly natives of local parentage; or else provided his readers with infinitely more help in sorting out this confused material and in determining the further development of the medieval sound-system.
    ${ }^{22}$ There are, however, two or three exceptional pronunciations with [i], viz water (No 8, a), day (No 9, a), lay, laid, lain (No 9, b) and plain (No 9, f). These may, perhaps, be the sole survivals of a regular sound-change of ME $\bar{a}$ and $a i$ to [ $\bar{i}$ ] (a development that seems to have occurred normally at BM, see below p r24). Such being the case, the abundant [ $\bar{e}]$ ]and [ $\left.\overline{\mathrm{e}}^{i}\right]$ - forms might well be loans from RS. But if the latter are indeed genuine, the [ $[\mathrm{i}]$ - forms might prove to have infiltrated from some neighbouring dialect. However, we shall probably have to wait until the whole region has been investigated in detail before the point can be finally settled.

[^11]:    ${ }^{23}$ Now Lecturer in Phonetics at the School of Oriental and African Studies in the University of London.

    24 Note that each, reach, and teach show the same vowel element as the other words of this group. Note also that beech (No 4) and speech (No 6) exhibit no abnormality. Jones omits bleach, breech, leech.

[^12]:    ${ }^{25}$ Since writing this article I have been in correspondence with Mr Jones. He informs me that he paid a total of five visits to Grindleton, and spent there nine weeks. During all of this time, he actually lived and worked on a farm where both the farmer and his wife were dialect-speakers, as well as natives of the village. Further, he gave most of his attention to the phonetics of the dialect. Although he is himself a native of Doncaster and readily speaks the local (North-Midland) vernacular, he was not familiar, when investigating Gr speech, with the historical problems of the North-Midland dialects. Thus he was in the main content to record what he heard, and did not attempt to dig down into the older forms of pronunciation. His information claims to be representative of what exists, but not of what existed two or three generations ago. Jones's monograph affords an instructive lesson for students of English dialectology and especially of geographicalinguistics.

[^13]:    ${ }^{26}$ This same diphthong, which also represents OE $\check{e}$-, may here be considered normal before [tf]. Reak with [E1] is notable, especially since it has the same pronunciation at Wi (cf p rib below, sub No 3). According to the view taken here, Moody's alternative form reach (with [ $\mathrm{t} /$ ]) shows the regularly developed [ $\varepsilon 1$ ], and reak would normally occur with [iəj (before [k], cf footnote 3r below. Preach has [ $\varepsilon 1$ ] ( + [io]), ch 11, § 78). Moody omits leech, speech, beech, and each. He records breeches with [1].

[^14]:    ${ }^{27}$ Wright terms it a village, cf Windhill Dialect, Introduction, 1.

[^15]:    ${ }^{28}$ This diphthong also represents OE $\check{e}$-(cf No I above). Its occurrence before [t f] may be regarded as normal (cf also breach, leech, meach, speech in No 6 above, and preach, §234). But it seems quite abnormal before a [k], as in reak, for except in Add where the word has this same pronunciation (of p 13 above, sub No 3), not one of the dialects under discussion manifests the change of either ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ or ME $\bar{e}_{1}$ before [ k ] to an [ $\varepsilon_{1}$ ]- sound. It may well be that reak has its (irregular) [ $\varepsilon_{1}$ ] from some neighbouring dialect; its regular form in Wi would presumably be (in Wright's notation) [riək]. Wright has not recorded each or beech.

[^16]:    ${ }^{29}$ See footnote 28 above.

[^17]:    30 The vowel element here shows the normal development of ME $\bar{e}_{2}$ : there has been no combinative change before the following [ $\mathrm{t} /]$, as in Fl (cf footnote 9 above), Adl (cf footnote $x$ I above), Oldh (cf footnote 15 above), Add (cf footnote 27 above), Wi (cf footnote 29 above).

[^18]:    31 The vowel is here anomalous; it corresponds to $\mathrm{ME} \bar{e}_{1}$ (cf $\operatorname{Nos} 4,5,6,7$ ).
    ${ }^{32}$ On the [iə], which here presupposes ME $\tilde{e}_{2}$, cf footnote ro above.

[^19]:    ${ }^{33}$ All three are presumed to derive from ME forms containing $\bar{e}_{2}$ (cf Oxley, loc cit, and footnote $10^{a}$ above).

[^20]:    ${ }^{34}$ The [ $\varepsilon_{1}$ ] is specially interesting here. Clearly OE $\overline{\mathscr{F}}$ normally appears as [i:], but before [ $\mathrm{t} f$ ] becomes [ $\varepsilon 1$ ]. The same differentiation is observable in the other - all North-Midland - dialects so far considered, but in these, the representative of OE $\overline{\mathfrak{x}}+[\mathrm{t} /]$ also corresponds to OE $\check{e}$ - (cf footnotes $9,11,15,27,29$ above). But this is not the case in BM where OE $\overrightarrow{\mathscr{X}}+[\mathrm{t} f]$, as here, becomes [ $\varepsilon 1]$, while OE $\check{e}$ - now appears as [i:]. Possibly, however, bleach, each, reach, and teacher, owe their present diphthong to the analogy of the - apparently regularly developed - [el] in beech and breeches (cf No 4), and in speech (No 6) and preacher (§91, 5 (b) ). But the point will probably only be settled when reliable evidence is forthcoming from neighbouring dialects.

[^21]:    ${ }^{35}$ But ME $\bar{a}$ (8) and ai/ei (ro) may just possibly have become [i:] in Oldh (cf footnote 22 above).

[^22]:    ${ }^{36}$ Cf, however, K. Luick, Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache, § 361, n 2, as well as Untersuchungen, §§ 203, 349); J. P. Oakden Alliterative Poetry in Middle English (Manchester University Press 1930), 24; R. Jordan, Handbuch der Mittelenglischen Grammatik (revised H. C. Matthes; Heidelberg 1934), §48, n 2.

[^23]:    ${ }^{37}$ Thus Luick, Untersuchungen, § 267. But Wright, Windhill Dialect, § 138, assumes shortening of the ME long vowel with a subsequent development like that of OE
    ${ }^{38}$ Untersuchungen, $\S \S 269,270$, and Historische Grammatik der` Englischen Sprache, Leipzig 1921-40, § 391, n 4.
    ${ }^{39}$ Luick, Untersuchungen, § 269, argues against this supposition on the basis of deductions drawn from the theoretical consequences of combinative changes involving OE $e$ - before $r$ and of ME $\bar{e}$ before $c h(=[t /]$, but he seems to me unconvincing.

