

**Univerzita Karlova**  
**Filozofická fakulta**

**Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky**

**Bakalářská práce**

Renata Bočková

**Staroanglické substantivní sufixy *-el*, *-els*, *-incel*: vývojový přehled**

**Old English nominal suffixes *-el*, *-els*, *-incel*: a survey in diachrony**

Praha, 2017

vedoucí práce: Prof. PhDr. Jan Čermák, CSc.

I should like to express my warmest thanks to prof. Jan Čermák for his patience and kind guidance throughout the creation of this thesis.

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned, and that this thesis has not been used in the course of other university studies or in order to acquire the same or another type of diploma.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval/a samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval/a všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 29. 5. 2017

.....

Renata Bočková

## **Abstract**

The aim of this paper is to provide detailed characterizations of three Old English nominal suffixes, *-el*, *-els*, and *-incel*, none of which survived to Middle English. Each of the suffixes is given a detailed description of the grammatical and semantic properties of its bases and derivatives, its productivity in Old English, a diachronic overview of the development of the suffix from Proto-Germanic to Early Middle English, including its cognates in other Germanic languages, and presumed causes of its early disappearance. Attention is also paid to the typological framework of the history of English and its effect on the productivity of the suffixes.

## **Abstrakt**

Cílem této práce je poskytnout detailní charakteristiku tří staroanglických nominálních sufixů, *-el*, *els* a *-incel*, které nepřetržily do období střední angličtiny. U každého sufixu jsou podrobně popsány gramatické a sémantické vlastnosti jeho bází a derivátů, jeho produktivita ve staré angličtině, diachronní přehled vývoje daného sufixu z proto-germánštiny do rané střední angličtiny, jeho případné kognáty v jiných germánských jazycích a předpokládané příčiny jeho vymizení. Důraz je také kladen na typologické změny spojené s vývojem angličtiny a jejich vliv na produktivitu a podobu jednotlivých sufixů.

Key words

Old English, Old English nominal suffixes, derivation, language typology

Klíčová slova

Stará angličtina, staroanglické nominální sufixy, derivace, jazyková typologie

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	7
2. General section.....	9
2.1. Criteria for defining a derivational suffix.....	9
2.2. Changes taking place from Proto-Germanic to Old English.....	11
2.2.1. Sound changes.....	12
2.2.2. Orthographical variation.....	13
2.3. Changes taking place in Late Old English and Early Middle English.....	14
2.3.1. Sociolinguistic background.....	14
2.3.2. Sound changes.....	15
2.3.3. Orthographical changes.....	17
2.4. Typology: typological framework.....	19
2.4.1. Summary of typological changes from Proto-Germanic to Early Middle English.....	19
2.5. Nominal suffixes.....	23
2.5.1. Old English.....	23
2.5.1.1. General overview.....	23
2.5.2. Early Middle English.....	24
2.5.2.1. General overview.....	24
2.6. Previous studies.....	25
3. Research project.....	27
3.1. Methodology.....	27
3.1.1. The aim of this paper.....	27
3.1.2. On the choice of the suffixes.....	27
3.1.3. Sources.....	28
3.1.4. The analysis.....	29
3.2. Suffixes.....	31
3.2.1. <i>-el</i> .....	31
3.2.1.1. The derivational bases.....	31
3.2.1.2. Productivity in Old English.....	32
3.2.1.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English.....	32
3.2.1.4. Development from Old English to Middle English.....	33
3.2.1.5. Disappearance of the suffix.....	34
3.2.2. <i>-els</i> .....	36
3.2.2.1. The derivational bases.....	36
3.2.2.2. Productivity in Old English.....	37
3.2.2.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English.....	37
3.2.2.4. Development from Old English to Middle English.....	37
3.2.2.5. Disappearance of the suffix.....	38
3.2.3. <i>-inzel</i> .....	40
3.2.3.1. The derivational bases.....	40
3.2.3.2. Productivity in Old English.....	40
3.2.3.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English.....	40
3.2.3.4. Development from Old English to Middle English.....	41

3.2.3.5. Disappearance of the suffix.....	41
4. Conclusion.....	43
Bibliography.....	45
Sources.....	46
Czech Summary.....	47

## 1. Introduction

Derivational affixes in Old English played much more important role among the word-formation processes than they do now, in Present Day English, but still their place in the texts on Old English is usually not very prominent; therefore, their descriptions are often quite scarce. And generally, it can be stated that the number of studies concentrating on the Old English word formation is still very small, and that there could be found no detailed descriptions of the Old English nominal suffixes (see 2.6.). This is so regardless of the fact that their development shows in many aspects how the typology of English nominal system has changed over time, and along with it, also the nature of the productive word-formation processes. It is connected to the fact that, due to the various causes, many of the Old English suffixes disappeared before the end of the Middle English period.

This thesis tries to map diachronic characteristics from Proto-Germanic to Early Middle English of three Old English nominal suffixes of those that have not survived until the present day: suffixes *-el*, *-els*, and *-incel*, and it focuses also on the typological framework in the given periods.

The second chapter presents an overview of some of the most important theoretical issues connected to the study of word-formation processes and to the development of English until the Early Middle English period.

The first part of this chapter concentrates on the definitions of derivational suffixes in contrast to the definitions of words which often occur as frequent parts of compounds and to inflectional suffixes.

Sections 2.2. and 2.3. deal with some of the most important phonological and orthographical changes in the language, and also with the sociolinguistic background from Proto-Germanic until Early Middle English. Attention is also paid to the definitions of typological classifications, and the importance of them in the development of English.

Section 2.4. discusses the nature of nominal suffixes in the Old and Middle English periods and the significance of the orthographical variation of the forms of Old and Middle English nominal suffixes.

The last part of the second chapter presents an overview of the previous studies on Old English word formation paying attention to derivation and nominal suffixes.

Chapter three presents detailed descriptions of the three above-mentioned nominal suffixes. Each of the suffixes is given a separate section.

Each section contains a characterization of the derivational bases of the suffix under scrutiny and their morphological and semantic information.

The next section describes the productivity of each suffix in the Old English period. And this is followed by information about their development from Proto-Germanic to Old English and from Old English to Middle English.

The last part of the characterization of each suffix concentrates on the analysis of the reasons for its later disappearance.

The results of the analyses are then once more summed up in chapter 4, Conclusion, where it is attempted to give the causes of the loss of productivity in the Middle English period which are common for all the suffixes.

## 2. General section

### 2.1. Criteria for defining a derivational suffix

In defining the nature of derivational suffixes, it is important to take into account that they can be described in the contrast to a) clitics, or b) to the words that frequently appear as parts of compounds. For the purposes of this paper the latter contrast (b) was chosen as more suitable according to the fact that in case of derivation in Old English, the division between clitics and affixes was clear, but not so much between words appearing frequently in compounds and affixes because some of these words later became affixes, when due to their frequency they were reanalyzed by the speakers. Therefore, diachronically, they could be taken as affixes, but from the synchronic point of view, it is thus sometimes not clear when exactly this reanalysis began and whether or not certain parts of compounds should not rather be understood as affixes.

It should be noted that most of the suffixes actually originated as independent words, and they later gained the status of bound morphemes, as the separate words ceased to exist in everyday vocabulary (Marchand, 1969: 209).

Nevertheless, many suffixes in Old English already existed in Proto-Germanic (e.g., suffix *-ing*), and only some of them could be synchronically still seen as free morphemes, rather than bound, which had changed in later periods. Still, it is possible to find many words which frequently occurred in compounds, and yet they could not be seen as suffixes because they had never gained the status. Marchand claims that, if a word appears often in compounds, it has no right only for this reason to be called a suffix (1969: 210).

Hans Marchand then offers this definition of a suffix: “A suffix is a bound morpheme which in a syntagma AB occupies the position B, it thus is the determinatum of a syntagma whose determinant is a simple or composite free morpheme”; such syntagmas he calls derivatives (1969: 209). He also states that a two-morpheme word behaving as one-morpheme word and being grammatically equivalent in all constructions in which it occurs should be regarded as having a root and a derivative affix (*ibid.*).

This is put into contrast to what he calls semi-suffixes, which corresponds to Kastovsky’s term suffixoid (2008: 356). These semi-suffixes in the case of Old English were those which

synchronically did not behave fully as suffixes, but in many ways they shared their characteristics (Marchand, 1969: 209). It is possible to classify Old English suffixes *-lāc*, *-ræd(d)en(n)*, *-stafas*, and *-wist* as these semi-suffixes (Kastovsky, 2008: 363-364).

Another distinction that should be clarified is the one of derivational suffixes and inflections. In older stages of Indo-European languages, these two were not easily separable, but later in daughter languages this division became more clear-cut (Kastovsky, 2006: 151). In Old English and already in Proto-Germanic, this distinction was clear.

Dieter Kastovsky distinguishes between derivational morphology, i.e. word-formation, and inflectional morphology. The former deals with the derivation of new lexemes, for which reason, he claims, it should be called rather “lexeme-formation”. The latter deals with the creation of word-forms from uninflected simple or complex bases (Kastovsky, 2006: 151). The outputs of word-formation are complex lexemes, which can be analyzed by the meaning of each of their constituents. In case of inflection, the output is still the same lexeme only carrying new grammatical information (Kastovsky, 2006: 154).

Another difference between the derivational and inflectional affixes is that the derivational suffixes can change the word class of the bases, but the inflectional suffixes cannot (ibid.). However, this is not true of diminutives which behave mostly as derivational suffixes, but do not alter the word class. Generally, diminutive affixes cause discussions among linguists as to where they should belong (Bauer, 2004: 289) also because they show much greater productivity concerning the types of bases to which they can be attached, than is typical of other derivational suffixes. In this aspect too, they resemble inflectional suffixes (ibid.).

For these reasons, some linguists classify them into various groups outside of derivation, or invent for them special categories (ibid.), but for the purposes of this paper their non-derivational features are not taken into account, and thus they are included here, since most of their features agree with those of derivational suffixes.

Nevertheless, from the typological perspective, the nature of inflectional morphology is the same as the nature of derivational morphology so, if a language prefers synthetic structures (see below in 2.4.), word-formation processes such as derivation, or compounding are among the most significant. These languages use inflections.

If a language tends to have analytical structures, the most prominent is, e.g., conversion, and these languages then do not have inflectional morphology (see 2.4.) (Kastovsky, 2006: 155).

This is related to the typological changes that English underwent over time, and for this reason the importance of suffixation became lower in later periods.

## **2.2. Changes taking place from Proto-Germanic to Old English**

Proto-Germanic, or Old Germanic, is a parent language of all Germanic languages. It is generally unattested, and therefore its grammar and vocabulary were reconstructed from the forms of the descended daughter languages (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 576).

Proto-Germanic first split up into individual dialects of West, North and East Germanic and later these again divided into separate languages. The West Germanic branch further split into Anglo-Frisian, Low and High German. Old English later developed from Anglo-Frisian.

The period of Old English conventionally started around the year 700, when it is supposed that English already developed into a separate language. The end of this period was around the year 1100 – this was the time after the Norman Conquest, when English began to be heavily influenced by French.

The Old English period is sometimes further subdivided into Early Old English (700 – 900) and Late Old English (900 – 1100) (Wright, 1908: 3). The first period is the time, when the Anglo-Saxons were settled on the British Isles and defeated the Celtic tribes, who had been forced to move from their previous territories to Cornwall and Wales, or across the Channel to France. Those of the Celtic population who remained assimilated into Germanic culture so the Celtic languages did not have big influence on English, apart from a few (usually cultural) borrowings (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 152 – 154).

The Late Old English period started around the year 900, when the Vikings, (who already around the 9<sup>th</sup> century started their invasions to England) had defeated the Anglo-Saxons and this resulted into a pact which allowed the Danes control over the area called the Danelaw, which contained all of the previous Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, except for Wessex.

The rule of the Danes caused a great impact of Old Norse on Old English. Since the languages were mutually intelligible, the contact between them resulted in a number of borrowings from Old Norse including even pronouns. The similarity of the languages and their morphological structures also contributed to the leveling of inflectional suffixes in the Middle English period which affected the derivational suffixes as well (see 2.3.1. and 2.3.2.) (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 167-169).

The end of the Late Old English period is given around the year 1100, and it is connected to the Norman Conquest in 1066, which caused that for many years English became only a spoken language (see 2.3.1. and 2.3.2.) (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 241).

### **2.2.1. Sound Changes**

The sounds of Proto-Germanic gradually changed into those of the individual languages. The processes that modified the phonological system of Old English had an impact on the forms of Proto-Germanic suffixes as they developed into Old English.

During the period of prehistoric Old English, the language underwent the change called umlaut. This was of two kinds: palatal (generally known as *i*-umlaut) and guttural (*u*-umlaut and *a/o*-umlaut). This change was still occurred in Old English and it usually accompanied derivation.

The *i*-umlaut, sometimes also called the *i*-mutation, was a process in which an accented vowel was palatalized through the influence of either /i/ or /j/. Later, the *ī*-sound shifted into /i/ which became /e/ in the period of Early Old English (Wright, 1908:28-29). Due to this change, e.g., Germanic /æ/, /o/, or /a/ became /e/, an example of this could be the Proto-Germanic word \**ban̥kiz* “bench” which in Old English developed form *benc* (ibid.).

The guttural umlaut change affected accented vowels by the influence of guttural vowels (/o/, /a/, /ū/) in the next syllable, whereby a guttural glide was developed after the vowels /a/, /e/, and /i/, and they later became diphthongs /ea/, /eo/, and /io/. This change happened only before a single consonant (Wright, 1908: 30). One type of the guttural umlaut, the *u*-umlaut, was the case in which the vowel causing umlaut was /u/ (this was the most frequent type of guttural umlaut); otherwise the process of guttural umlaut is called *o/a*-umlaut; according to which vowel was affected by it (Wright, 1908: 31).

Another change underway during this period was breaking. This took place due to the influence of consonants /r/, /l/, or /h/ (+ another consonant, or preceding a vowel) by which a guttural glide was formed between the vowel and the consonant, and later it developed into a diphthong. An example of this process could be Old English verb *leornian* “to learn”, which was formed from Proto-Germanic *\*lirnōjan*, where /i/ became /io/, and later the Old English /eo/ (Wright 31-32).

Many Germanic vowels were in Old English modified by nasals that followed them. It usually influenced only the quality of the vowel, e.g., /a/ became more similar to /o/ (low wide back a), if it was preceded by a nasal; /e/ became /i/ before /m/, etc. (Wright, 1908: 38-39).

In Old English, if followed by a voiceless spirant, nasals disappeared, and the preceding /a/, or /o/ became /o:/ through the intermediate stage of a long nasalized vowel (Wright, 1908: 40). Final /e/'s were lengthened to /e:/ in monosyllabic words, especially in pronouns, resulting in e.g., *hē* “he”, *mē* “me”, *wē* “we” (Wright, 1908: 49). Still, many vowels remained either unchanged, or only slightly changed, depending on their environment (Wright, 1908: 69).

Generally, the phonological changes were not as drastic as those in the later stages. They often involved only a change of the quality of the vowel, and some of the changes still could be observed in Old English, e.g., the umlaut change. Thus, it is possible to see that certain suffixes retained very similar forms in Old English to those in Proto-Germanic, e.g., Proto-Germanic *-dōma* and *-ingō* corresponded to Old English forms *-dōm* and *-ing*, respectively.

### **2.2.2. Orthographical variation**

Old English orthography was surprisingly uniform for an old language, but still, it was possible to find, to a certain degree, orthographical variation (Fulk, 2014: 68). The most common was the interchangeability of the letters thorn <þ> and eth <ð>; therefore, the seeming allomorphy in certain derivational suffixes could be explained thus. In some of present-day grammars and dictionaries of Old English, the authors use only one of these two variants for all the words which in original contained one of these symbols.

Some of the orthographical variations could be observed only in certain dialects (Fulk, 2014: 68), but Old English was much less regionally diverse than Middle English.

### **2.3. Changes taking place in Late Old English and Early Middle English**

By the term Late Old English is usually meant the period between 900 and 1100 (Wright, 1908:3), while Middle English is then dated between 1100 and 1500 (Horobin, 2002: 1). This period is often further divided into two parts: 1100 – 1250 (Early Middle English) and 1250 – 1500 (Late Middle English).

The first period was the Anglo-Norman period, when the Normans still had connections to the continent (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 241).

The second period started after losing Normandy in 1204, when the connections to France were broken, and England became much more isolated. This brought about a situation in which the Normans started to perceive themselves also as the English. This national feeling helped to the gradual reestablishment of English. And by the end of the Late Middle English period, the dialectal diversity of the language was gradually being replaced by one common variant which later became standard (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 241-246, 312).

#### **2.3.1. Sociolinguistic background**

As mentioned above, the period of Middle English started with the Norman Conquest in 1066. The French-speaking Normans thus became the ruling class and the elite with tremendous social and political influence. This caused that English was reduced to only one of three components in a multilingual situation, other components were French and Latin. French, spoken by Normans, became the language of governing classes and was used in many areas including the law, the Church, and the military. English was used by common people in everyday communication. And lastly Latin, which was used for official reports. Of course, in England still remained the other linguistic communities that had been present there before the Conquest – the Celtic-speaking population in the far North-West of the country, and Scandinavian speakers, but both of the communities were quickly undergoing assimilation with the English-speaking population. As a result of such a close contact situation of English,

Latin and French, many borrowings from these Romance languages entered the English vocabulary at the time (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 248 – 251).

This multilingual situation had other consequences as well: due to the rise of importance of French and Latin during the 11<sup>th</sup> - early 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, English was primarily a spoken language, with very little number of texts being written. This resulted in great diversity in spellings of individual words, and because of the lack of written standard the Old English conventions mingled with those of French and Latin. The problems were also brought about by the discrepancy between the spellings of Norman French and Central French words.

These borrowings, which were for certain time in competition with native words, influenced the inconsistency of the writing conventions only partially. Another cause was a great dialectal variety that appeared during the Middle English period. Traditionally, five dialects can be distinguished: the Northern, the West-Midland, the East-Midland, the South-Eastern, and the South-Western (or Southern) (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 254-255).

In the North, the influence of Scandinavian was quite visible. This dialect was the most radical and most innovative of all. The Southern dialects, on the other hand, resembled the most Old English, and therefore they were very conservative. The East and West Midland dialects showed certain innovations, but not as radical as those in the North, since they preserved some Old English features (ibid.).

### **2.3.2. Sound changes**

In the course of the periods of Late Old English and Early Middle English, the phonological system changed affecting primarily the final unstressed syllables, including both derivational and grammatical suffixes.

During this period, both short and long Old English diphthongs were monophthongized as /eo/ merged with /e/, and /ea/ with /æ/, so e.g., Old English word *eage* “eye” corresponded in Middle English to *ege* (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 282).

The unstressed vowels were reduced or even lost, and this led to the leveling of inflections, and the change of forms of derivational suffixes, or to their complete loss. The leveling

caused that the English grammatical paradigms merged in one for all the nouns regardless of their stem vowel.

The reduction of unstressed vowels had several stages. First, unstressed /a/, /o/, and /u/ merged with /e/, and later the /e/ was reduced to /ə/. Then, all the final /e/'s were completely silenced and medial /e/'s lost, e.g., an Old English word *talu* “tale” was in Middle English *tale*, at this stage, the <e> was no longer pronounced (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 282).

Derivational suffixes were often affected by the reduction, since they were usually formed by a vowel and a consonant. And once the vowel was lost in pronunciation, some derivational suffixes ended up having the same form, which sometimes led to a merge of several suffixes. Very often, the remaining consonant was reanalyzed as a part of the root and this resulted in the complete loss of the suffix, e.g., the Old English word *flig-el* “an instrument for threshing grain” became Middle English *flail*, where the final *-l* was seen as a part of the root.

Similarly, when the inflectional suffixes merged into one paradigm for all nouns, and *-s* became the only suffix indicating plural number, the result was reanalysis of the words ending in *-s* as plurals, and the final *-s* was thus in singular deleted. This is why, e.g., the suffix *-els* merged in Middle English with another nominal suffix *-el* so e.g., the Old English word *fēdels* “a fatling” had in Middle English a form *fēdil*.

If the suffixes contained only one vowel and no consonant, as e.g., the nominal suffix *-u*, after the loss of the vowel, the suffix simply disappeared. Some of the losses also happened due to the analogy with words that underwent the reduction. Generally, analogy was used to remove irregular or anomalous forms (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 283).

This, of course, affected also the orthographical form of derivational affixes, so it is possible to find many different spellings of one suffix. Since the *e*-sound no longer appeared at the end of the words, grapheme <e> was added to words for disambiguation of the new pronunciation (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 267-271). This was one of the reasons why many words and derivational suffixes in Middle English had a variant with final *-e* that was silent, e.g., Old English *-el* could in Middle English appear also as *-elle*.

In unstressed syllables, final inflectional *-n*'s, and final /tʃ/'s were lost resulting in, e.g., Middle English *sterre* “to steer” (from Old English *steoran*), or *ich* “I” (from Old English *ic*).

In Late Old English, the vowels before certain consonantal clusters (e.g., before /mb/, /nd/, /ld/) lengthened, this also happened in the open syllables, e.g., *blind* changed into *blīnd*, similarly, *lamb* > *lāmb*, *mild* > *mīld*. In contrast to that, the vowels in closed syllables shortened (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 272).

The *y*-sound changed into unrounded /i/, but <y> remained for some time still the spelling, e.g., Old English *cynn* “a kind” later changed into *kin* (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 268 – 269).

This again caused various spellings of certain words and affixes.

The consonant inventory of Middle English remained more or less the same as the one of Old English. During this period, some of the allophones of Old English were phonemicized and created new oppositions of distinct sounds, i.e. those of /s/ and /z/, /f/ and /v/, and /θ/ and /ð/, which could be reflected in the orthography as well.

This happened due to the loss of final /e/, and to the simplification of geminates, which meant that the voiced vowels appeared in environments where Old English would have never had them, i.e. word initially and finally (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 263). Another reason for the phonemicization was the French and Latin borrowings, as e.g., a borrowed word *zeal* (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 263-265).

In addition to this, the consonantal clusters such as /hr/, or /hl/ were reduced by the deletion of the *h*-sound, so for example Old English word *hnutu* “nut” became Middle English *nut(e)* (ibid.).

Some other changes such as metathesis, assimilation, or addition of consonants appeared too, but they were not as prominent as those mentioned above (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 263-266).

### **2.3.3. Orthographical changes**

The changes of the phonological system were interconnected with the changes of the orthographical system. They both affected the forms of the nominal suffixes, and resulted in many orthographical variants of one affix, which was the reason why many of them in Early Middle English showed such a great variety.

After the Norman Conquest under the influence of French, the English spelling was altered. The previous one-to-one correspondence of the letters and sounds disappeared. This was brought about not only by the borrowings from French, but also from Scandinavian.

Middle English spelling was much less uniform as well due to the loss of its prestige of a written language. This lasted for about 300 years during which English was primarily spoken, and if it was used in the written form, the conventions of both Old English and Romance tradition were relied upon.

Lastly, the dialectal variety influenced the spelling of certain words which caused not only allomorphy of the derivational suffixes, but generally many varied spellings for one word. Middle English, therefore, lacked the uniformity in writing conventions that could be found in Old English (Brinton – Arnovick, 2011: 259-260).

Yet still, certain dramatic changes in the spelling were made. Firstly, the former runic symbols were no longer used, and, just like other non-standard letters, they were replaced by more suitable letters of the Latin alphabet. Both thorn <þ> and eth <ð> were replaced by a digraph <th> (thorn remained as a variant of the spelling well until Early Modern English, but it was usually used for grammatical words), wynn <ƿ> was replaced by <w>, or digraph <uu>, but also the letter ash <æ> disappeared and the letter <a> or <e> replaced it. Only the letter yogh <ȝ> remained for a longer time, and it was still used even in the Early Modern English spelling (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 259-262).

Secondly, during the Middle English period, new digraphs were introduced: apart from <th>, it was <ch>, which indicated the sound /tʃ/. Due to this, some of the native words were respelled, as e.g., Old English word *cild* “child” in Middle English appeared as *child*, but most of the words spelled with <ch> were of Romance origin, as e.g., *chaunge* “change” (ibid.).

Another new digraph was <sh> for the sound /ʃ/, so the original spelling of the word *scip* “ship” was altered during the Middle English period into *ship*. The digraphs <ch> and <sh> were sometimes interchangeable, and they were used in opposition to <sk>, or <sc> that indicated /sk/ in pronunciation, which was often found in the borrowings of Scandinavian origin (ibid.), cf. *skirt* vs. *shirt*.

The further problem was with the sound /k/, in Old English period spelled as <c>, in Middle English also as <k>, but French borrowings had also <c>, which was not always used only for the *k*-sound (c.f., the English word of Germanic origin *knitte* “knight” vs. the word of Romance origin *castle*) (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 261), so these two graphemes started to be used for the same sound.

Another spelling convention was that, if the vowels in a word were doubled, it usually indicated that the vowel in a closed syllable was long, as in, e.g., *feet* (pronounced with /e:/).

Since final /e/'s disappeared from the pronunciation, the graphemes were introduced to the spelling to indicate the length of vowels in open syllables, as in *name* (then pronounced with /a:/).

Lastly, doubled consonants were used to indicate that the preceding vowel is short, e.g., in *dinner* (ibid.). Some of the nominal suffixes were sometimes respelled with a doubled consonant, e.g., Old English *-el* was sometimes written as *-elle*, although it is questionable whether it was to indicate the length of the vowel, or if it was only confusion of the speakers regarding the new conventions.

The spelling was usually dependent on the individual regional varieties (see the dialectal division in 2.3.1.), which were much more prominent in written texts than they had been in the Old English period.

All this meant that the Middle English spelling lacked the regularities that could be found in the Old English period, and at that time it did not have any variant which could be assumed as standard (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 259-262).

## **2.4. Typology: typological framework**

### **2.4.1. Summary of typological changes from Proto-Germanic to Early Middle English**

In linguistic typology, there can be found several typological frameworks, but for the purposes of this paper the theory of the Prague School typological framework was chosen as most suitable.

This framework is based primarily on the theory developed by Vladimír Skalička, who classifies languages into five basic types: agglutinative, isolating, introflexional, inflectional, and polysynthetic (Skalička, 1994: 335-336).

The distinction between these language types is based on the function of individual morphemes (and on whether they have one, or more functions), on existence of grammatical inflections and their forms, and on the type of word order (whether it is free, or fixed). Generally, it can be stated that, if a language has grammatical inflections, it has also very probably a free word order, and if the inflections are non-existent, it implies a fixed word order (Skalička, 1994: 336).

The first language type that can be distinguished based on the parameters mentioned above is agglutinative type. Here, all morphemes have one function only; the distinction between morphemes and words, and words and clauses is clear (Popela, 2006: 9). Although the word classes are usually not distinguished (Skalička, 1994: 336), a word exists here as a well differentiated grammatical unit (Popela, 2006: 9). These languages have grammatical affixes, but they are monofunctional, and the order in which they are attached to the basis is usually very strict. Thanks to the presence of the inflections, this language type uses free word order (Skalička, 1994: 337).

With regard to the typology of English, the agglutinative type could be found in Present Day English noun inflection. In this aspect, the language type could be seen as shifting from inflectional to agglutinative. For example, the word *child-ren-'s* can be divided into three morphemes: *child* being the root, *-ren* a grammatical suffix indicating the plural number, and *'s* indicating the genitive case (Kastovsky, 1990: 221). According to the fact that all the morphemes here have one function only, it could be an example of agglutination. However, in Old English there was a separate morpheme for the genitive plural case, i.e. the suffix was multifunctional. Old English, therefore, can be identified as inflectional language (see below).

Another language type is isolating, also called analytical by Trnka and Vachek (Skalička, 1994: 338), where morphemes have too only one function each, but the differentiation between morphemes and words is not as clear as in agglutinative languages (Popela, 2006: 9). Here, the inflectional and derivational affixes are absent, and this leads to the fixed word order which defines the relations between individual words, and distinguishes the word classes. This means that the word order in isolating languages serves the same function as

inflections in an agglutinative or inflectional language. The number of monosyllabic words in this language type is higher than in other types, and the prevailing word-formation process is, therefore, conversion/ zero-derivation (Skalička, 1994: 338).

The historical development of English is usually characterized as a typological change from an inflectional language to isolating because in Present Day English the number of monosyllabic and monomorphemic words is great, and word classes can be sometimes identified only by the word order (Kastovsky, 1990: 205). The change from inflectional type started as early as at the end of the Old English period due to the influence of Scandinavian languages, and continued throughout the course of Middle English - where both inflectional and derivational suffixes suffered great reduction in comparison to the previous period - until the present day.

In Present Day English, for example, one of common word-formation processes is conversion. An illustration of this could be, e.g., the word *pen*, which usually functions as a noun, but if it precedes a noun, it can change its word class and become an adjective, as in *pen name*.

This was not possible in Old English, when the change of the word class was usually done by the means of derivational suffixes. The decreasing productivity of the suffixes in Middle English illustrates the tendency of the language towards greater analyticity.

The third type is introflexional, or synthetic in the terminology of Trnka and Vachek (Skalička, 1994: 339), in which morphemes are usually multifunctional, and here again the distinction between words and morphemes is difficult, just like in isolating languages (Popela, 2006: 9). Here, the form of a morpheme can be interrupted by infixes, which serve the similar purpose as suffixes and prefixes in agglutinative or inflectional languages.

Even in English, it is possible to find instances of introflexion; however this process was productive mostly in the earlier periods. The change of ablaut - a vowel gradation in both a stem and a suffix (Wright, 1908: 96) in Old English could be an example of introflexion (cf. Old English singular of the word *fōt* “foot” vs. the plural form *fēt*). These phonological processes in Old English usually accompanied derivation, e.g., when to an adjective *fūl* “dirty” a nominal suffix *-iþ(u)* was added, it resulted in *fylþ* “filth” (Mitchell, 2012: 154), or e.g., the word *bydel* “one who bids” was made from the strong verb *beōdan* “to bid, proclaim”

by adding the nominal suffix *-el* to the root. Both of these examples show *i*-umlaut change, another example of introflexional process (Kastovsky, 2008: 384). In these words the previous vowels /u:/ and /eo:/ were changed to /y:/ and /y/, respectively.

In the fourth, inflectional type, which can also be called synthetic, the morphemes are multifunctional, just as those in introflexional languages, but the distinction between words and morphemes, and between individual word classes is here much clearer (Popela, 2006: 9). The word order in inflectional languages is free, and this corresponds to the richness of grammatical inflections, which are attached to lexical words, including nouns, verbs, adjectives, and numerals. The inflectional and derivational affixes may change the structure of the stem/root to which they are attached, but in this type, unlike in agglutinative languages, the inflections feature a large amount of homonymy and synonymy (Skalička, 1994: 338). The number of derivational affixes signifies that one of the most common word-formation processes is derivation.

These characteristic features can also be found in Old English, which had free word order and rich system of both inflectional and derivational affixes. The affixes at that time showed a great amount of morphological variation, which was increased by *i*-mutation/*i*-umlaut, West Germanic consonant lengthening, and the later shortening and lengthening processes (Kastovsky, 1990: 218).

An example of the inflectional type in Old English could be the word *drohtap* “a way of life”, which was formed by adding the nominal suffix *-ap* (which forms masculine abstract nouns from the second class of weak verbs) to the root *droht* (Wright, 1908: 294). Here, the derived word is in singular nominative case, so the grammatical inflection is a zero morpheme, which had two functions – denoting the case and the number. In Old English, many examples similar to this one could be found, although sometimes the root is slightly changed due to the phonological alternations mentioned above (the cases of introflexion). Old English thus, just like other inflectional languages, preferred affixation to other word-formation processes.

The last type is polysynthetic, where some of the lexical words can function also as grammatical words. Languages belonging to this type have, therefore, no grammatical inflections, and this leads to the fixed word order. For these languages, the most common word-formation process is composition (Skalička, 1994: 338), and this results into many polymorphemic words.

In the history of English, it would be very difficult to find an example of this language type.

This distinction of the language types can be also reduced into a more general dichotomy - analytical vs. synthetic. Synthetic languages would be all that have certain type of affixation. As an opposition to analytical or isolating languages, where grammatical relations between words are not marked by inflectional affixes, but by the fixed word order.

In the periods from Proto-Germanic to Early Middle English, the change of typology of English from inflectional to isolating (from the synthetic to analytical type) was not yet as drastically visible as in the later periods. It is possible, however, to observe certain tendencies as early as at the end of the Old English period, where they were connected with the sound changes (see 2.3.2.), and with the borrowings from Scandinavian languages. The structural changes that took place in Middle English - the loss of inflectional endings, the reduction of final unstressed syllables, etc. (see 2.3.2.) - were significant for the change of typology of English, and they very much contributed to its further development towards analyticity.

As can be seen from the examples from the history of English mentioned above, the language types are relative, and they are never manifested fully in a natural language. In many cases, examples of constructions of all types can be found in one language, but generally languages tend to have one type as predominant (Popela, 2006: 37).

## **2.5. Nominal suffixes**

### **2.5.1. Old English**

#### **2.5.1.1. General overview**

In Old English new words could be created by different word-formation processes such as, e.g., compounding, but the affixation was the most common of all (Millward, 2012:124).

The derivation was usually accompanied by certain morphophonemic alternations of the root/stem to which the suffixes were added. One of them was an ablaut change, which was inherited from Indo-European. This alternation characterized nouns and adjectives that were related to strong verbs, e.g., *brecan* “to break” and from that formed *bræc* “a breaking” (Kastovsky, 2006: 170-171).

The most notable of the alternations was so-called *i*-mutation, or *i*-umlaut (Kastovsky, 2008: 382), which is a kind of regressive assimilation, in which an original /i/ or /j/ caused the vowel in the preceding syllable to be fronted or raised (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 580), as in, e.g., when to an adjective *fīl* “dirty” a nominal suffix *-iþ(u)* was added, it resulted in *fýlþ* “filth” (Mitchell, 2012:154). This change, however, was no longer predictable at the end of the Old English period, and it appeared often only on the base of analogy (Kastovsky, 2008: 382).

Other alternations were consonant gemination, palatalization, and assibilation. In the Late Old English and in the Middle English periods, more quantitative alternations arose due to the phonological changes underway (see 2.3.2.). This led to a largescale allomorphic variation, which was later in the Old English period no longer predictable (Kastovsky, 2006: 171).

As the typology of English was changing from synthetic (inflectional) to more analytical (isolating), the form of the suffixes changed as well. In the Middle English period the suffixes no longer caused *i*-mutation. Along with the disappearance of the introflexional patterns, the importance of suffixation grew smaller. Due to the reduction of final unstressed syllables and other phonological changes, suffixation was often abandoned in preference to, e.g., conversion (Kastovsky, 2008: 382-383).

## **2.5.2. Early Middle English**

### **2.5.2.1. General overview**

Middle English nouns experienced the processes of reduction and analogy (see 2.3.2.), which led to a dramatic reduction in the system of inflections. Hence, the inflectional suffixes lost the features that indicated the stem class to which the nouns belonged. In this period, the case marking was shared by all the nouns in the whole paradigm, unlike in Old English. The reductions were also connected to the loss and to great allomorphy of certain derivational suffixes.

In Old English, it was common for the individual nominal suffixes to form nouns of one particular stem class and gender (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 285). This feature was inherent to all of the derivational suffixes. Unlike in Present Day English, grammatical gender often did not correspond to the natural gender (*ibid.*).

In contrast to that, in Middle English, the classes were no longer indicated and if any nominal suffixes carried information about gender, they were only those creating agent nouns, as e.g., suffixes *-ere* and *-ester*, but not even in these cases the distinction could always be made, e.g., the word *backere* “baker” was used for both male and female agents.

In this period the number of borrowed words grew immensely in comparison to Old English. The majority of borrowings was of Romance origin, i.e. either from Latin, or French (both Norman and Central), but many of them were also from Scandinavian languages. Those were usually loaned already during the Old English period, and therefore they were well established in the vocabulary of Middle English. The borrowings then influenced the structure of certain suffixes and were one of the reasons why some of them stopped being used altogether (Brinton - Arnovick, 2011: 248 - 252).

## 2.6. Previous studies

For various reasons, Old English word-formation usually occupies very little space in grammars and studies on Old English. Derivational suffixes thus are often presented as mere examples, and if the author created a list of them, then the list is not sufficient for the text itself, and the suffixes are given only very brief descriptions.

One of the most detailed studies can be found in Dieter Kastovsky's chapter “Semantics and Vocabulary” in *The Cambridge History of the English Language* where he presents not only most of the Old English suffixes and their descriptions, but in addition to that, where possible, he gives some of Germanic cognates. This is the only study dealing at least partly with the diachronic aspect. The suffixes that Kastovsky includes are *-d/-t/(o)þ*, *-dom*, *-el(e)/-l(a)/-ol*, *-els*, *-en*, *-end*, *-ere*, *-estre*, *-et(t)*, *-had*, *-incel*, *-ing*, *-lac*, *-ling*, *-ness*, *-ræden*, *-scipe*, *-þ(o)/-t*, *-ung/-ing*, and *-wist* (2008: 384). Unlike most of the authors his list covers also the morphemes which function in Old English not only as suffixes, but also as separate words that very frequently appear as parts of compounds. For these problematic cases, he introduces a term suffixoid (Kastovsky, 2008: 356), which corresponds to Marchand's term semi-suffix (Marchand, 1969: 210). As such are here classified *-dōm*, *-hād*, *-lāc*, and *-ræden* (Kastovsky, 2008: 356); for some reason his list does not contain the suffix *-stafas*, which would otherwise belong in his category of suffixoids.

Another text dealing with this topic is a chapter in *An Old English Grammar* by Randolph Quirk and C. L. Wrenn, which is dedicated to word-formation processes in Old English including a list of recurrent affixes (containing both prefixes and derivational suffixes). The authors present only, as they state, “suffixes and prefixes that recur in the most frequently read texts” (Quirk - Wrenn, 1960: 109). The lists are graded according to the frequency of the suffixes in those texts, but not to their overall use in Old English. Here, many suffixes are missing, and no diachronic insight into their earlier/ later development is included. The lists are created only as a help for a translator/ student.

Another list offers Joseph Wright in his *Old English Grammar*, but here only the word-formation elements that were considered synchronically as derivational suffixes are presented; and hence many of the suffixes which are described by either Quirk, or Kastovsky cannot be found here, but, unlike in many other grammars, the number of Germanic cognates given in the chapter on suffixation, is quite high and sometimes he even adds forms in Proto-Germanic from which the suffixes developed.

The last long list of suffixes is in H. Krahe and W. Meid's *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft III. Wortbildungslehre* where they describe most of the suffixes which can be found in the Germanic languages in general. The book deals primarily with their development from Proto-Indo-European/ Proto-Germanic into individual Germanic languages, but only to their early stages. They include the cognates not only of Germanic origin, but also sometimes those from e.g., Greek or Latin.

One of the most detailed texts can be found also in *Selected Papers in Structural Linguistics*, where Trnka presents his article on the Old English diminutive suffix *-inċel*. The primary focus of the study is on different theories of the development of *-inċel* as they were described by various linguists in the past, and partly on the function of the form. Trnka also concentrates on the theory why the English language does not have any stable productive diminutive suffix. Unfortunately, the study does not offer any deep insight into the grammatical properties and characterization of the suffix.

As can be seen, the studies on this topic are quite rare, and they often do not contain enough information about the nature of the suffixes, or their development.

## 3. Research Project

### 3.1. Methodology

#### 3.1.1. The aim of the paper

For the purpose of this paper, three Old English suffixes were chosen: *-el*, *-els*, and *-incel*. This choice was based on their low productivity in Middle English; therefore, one of the aims of this paper was to find the reasons for their disappearance in the later medieval period. The analysis principally focused, against the general background of the evolution of these suffixes from Proto-Germanic to Middle English, on grammatical properties regarding the derivatives, i.e. the word classes of their bases, gender and class, their semantic profile, their productivity in Old and Middle English, and text types in which they appeared.

#### 3.1.2. On the choice of the suffixes

Originally, the paper was aimed at creating a list of all Old English nominal suffixes. The decision to exclude those which survived until the present day was made due to the limited length of the paper, and because their characteristics are usually much better documented.

In Old English, there were many suffixes which did not survive in Present Day English and many of them disappeared as early as at the beginning of the Middle English period. From those suffixes that are now extant, it was decided to exclude those which did not have yet the status of suffixes in the Old English period. This was the case of *-lāc*, *-rāed(d)en(n)*, *-stafas*, and *-wist*. They functioned rather as suffixoids, i.e. semi-suffixes which synchronically did not behave fully as suffixes, but in many ways they shared their characteristics (Kastovsky, 2008: 363-364).

These suffixes were in some Old English grammars (e.g., in Quirk's *An Old English Grammar*, Wright's *Old English Grammar*) in the lists of derivational suffixes completely omitted. Dieter Kastovsky in his chapter "Semantics and Vocabulary" in *The Cambridge History of the English Language* classified these cases as suffixoids. And Joseph and Elizabeth Mary Wright in *Old English Grammar* mentioned only some of them (*-lāc* and *-wist*), but they stressed the fact that they had been primarily used as individual words.

During the individual analyses, some of the remaining Old English suffixes had to be excluded as well: these were *-en*, *-end*, *-ett*, *-ap*, and *-po*.

The Old English suffix *-en* (which occurs in e.g., *ǣ-fæst-en* “a legal fast”) created not only nouns, but also adjectives, and in the Middle English period it formally merged with many other suffixes (e.g., with Germanic *-el*, *-els*, *-ne* and with some Romance suffixes, e.g., *-le*) due to the reduction of final unstressed vowels, and the loss of final nasals. According to the fact that not only nouns, but also adjectives and verbs could then end in *-en*, it would be, especially in the Middle English period, very hard to distinguish between the derivational processes and mere conversion.

The suffix *-end/-nd* (forming e.g., *be-pǣc-end* “a deceiver”) was one of the most productive suffixes during the Old English period since it formed agent nouns from almost all verbs (both weak and strong), but it is originally the same suffix which in this period formed present participles. Hence, this suffix could be understood as a grammatical formation rather than lexical.

In the case of Old English *-ett* (that occurs e.g., in the words *brēost-nyrw-ett* “tightness/narrowness of chest” and *ān-ett* “solitude”), the exclusion was due to the small number of entries which would contain this suffix in the online version of the *Dictionary of Old English*. On such a small sample, the conclusion of the analysis would not be very exact.

The problem of the suffixes *-ap* and *-þo* (which occurred e.g., in the words *dar-ap* “a spear” and *cēn-þu* “boldness”) consisted in the high number of their allomorphs (*-þ*, *-oþ*, *-eþ*, *-að*, *-oð*, *-noþ*, *-naþ*, and *-neþ* for *-ap*, and *-þ*, *-þu*, *-ð*, *-ðo*, *-ðu* for *-þo*) occurring already in Old English, which seem not to have been phonologically conditioned according to the fact that some allomorphic variants could be found with same roots, e.g., *fisc-ap* vs. *fisc-naþ*. Sometimes, it was even difficult to see which allomorph belonged to which of the two suffixes. This was the case especially when the letters <þ> and <ð> merged into one digraph <th> in the Middle English period.

### 3.1.3. Sources

The basic source for the analyses of the Old English data was the electronic version of the *Dictionary of Old English*. This version of the dictionary is a collaborative work in progress, and contains only words beginning with letters A-H; therefore, the extent of the used material was narrowed down to this sample. The reasons for this choice were very detailed descriptions provided in the *Dictionary*'s individual entries, each including numbers of

occurrences of the particular word in texts, text types, basic grammatical information, and its forms in Middle English, and references to semantically related words.

The results from the search in the *Dictionary* were used to provide information on the types of derivational bases and grammatical categories of class and gender for the individual suffixes. As a supplement for these data, grammars dealing with this topic were also used - primarily Dieter Kastovsky's chapter "Semantics and Vocabulary" in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, which offered most detailed description of the individual suffixes, and *Old English Grammar* by Joseph and Elizabeth Mary Wright for the reasons mentioned in the previous chapter.

Some information about the text types was taken from the electronic version of the *Thesaurus of Old English*, which distinguishes words that are rare and those that are quite common, and whether it is a poetic word or whether it is also used in regular texts.

For the diachronic perspective of the development of the individual suffixes, the main source for Proto-Germanic roots and Germanic cognates was Krahe's *Germanisches Sprachwissenschaft* and the electronic version of *Oxford English Dictionary*, which was also used for the Middle English period, and for etymology of the suffixes and of the individual words.

The *Middle English Dictionary* was used as a primary reference for the data from the Middle English period. It was searched for the words containing the nominal suffixes and their allomorphs. This dictionary provided information about the derivatives in this period including their etymology, text types, number of occurrences, and the year in which the texts were written.

### **3.1.4. The analysis**

The first analyses were based on the information from the electronic version of Bosworth and Toller's *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, which initially served as the basic source. The Middle English entries were searched via the links from *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* to the *Middle English Dictionary* so the words in Old and Middle English corresponded.

At this stage, the dictionary was searched for all the entries that contained any of the Old English nominal suffixes. The entries were sorted out according to their suffixes and analyzed

regarding their class, gender and their bases. This amount of information was later considered not sufficient enough so the basic source was changed to the *Dictionary of Old English* for the reasons mentioned above.

After the change of the basic source, the *Dictionary of Old English* was then searched again for the entries containing any nominal suffixes, and the data were sorted out according to the suffixes.

The newly obtained data were again analyzed regarding the same characteristics as those from *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, but, in addition to that, information was supplied about the semantic profile of the suffixes, their productivity in Old English, and the text types in which they occurred.

Already during the first stage, the allomorphy of the suffixes was analyzed as well, but it was problematic to find the conditions for the individual allomorphs. This was made even more difficult by the fact that in some cases the allomorphs appeared even with the same roots. At the later stage again, the individual words from *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* were analyzed to try to establish the conditions in which the allomorphy occurred.

Later, when the amount of the data was proved to be too great for the length of the paper, it was concluded to reduce the number of them (see 3.1.2.).

Now, for the Middle English data, the *Middle English Dictionary* was used in this stage, not only via *Dictionary of Old English*, but it was also searched for all the entries containing one of the three suffixes (i.e. *-el*, *-els*, *-incel*), or their allomorphs. This time, attention was also paid to the text types in which the words occurred.

Initially, the productivity of the suffixes was assumed to be done by the Old and Middle English corpora (*Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*, *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* and also by *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English*) for attaining more exact data, but later it was discovered that the frequencies from the corpora depended on the frequencies of the individual words with the suffixes in question, rather than on the productivity of the suffix

itself. Moreover, in *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* the suffixes were not tagged as such due to the loss of their status before the Early Middle English period.

Another problem was that among the results from *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, words of Romance origin could be found along with the Germanic words because they happened to end with the same vowels as those of Germanic origin having with the suffixes in question.

In the final stage, analyses were conducted to find the causes of the loss of productivity and the disappearance of the suffixes in the Middle English period, based on the data obtained from the *Dictionary of Old English* and the *Middle English Dictionary* and on the phonological, morphological, and lexical changes underway in Middle English.

In addition to this, it was searched whether or not these suffixes disappeared in other Germanic languages, but the grammars of e.g., Old High German or Gothic offered even shorter chapters dedicated to the derivational suffixes of the period than those of Old English, and it is very difficult to find any study which would concentrate on this topic. Thus, it was possible to find only the cognates in some of the older variants of the Germanic languages in Krahe's *Germanisches Sprachwissenschaft*, but its later productivity could not be found there. The similar results came from the search in *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology* by Vladimir Orel. Therefore, this attempt had to be abandoned.

## 3.2. Suffixes

### 3.2.1. *-el*

#### 3.2.1.1. The derivational bases

The suffix *-el* (found e.g., in the words *fore-ryn-el* “forerunner”, *ealu-gaf-ol* “tribute paid in ale”, *æfter-geng-el* “a successor”, *beorg-seð-el* “a mountain dwelling”, *deād-hræg-el* “a garment of a dead person” ) created mostly masculine nouns (with a few exceptions which were of either neuter or feminine gender, e.g., *bydel* “messenger of God/ the one who bids” was feminine) of the first class (*a*-stems) from verbs. The majority of the derivatives was created on the bases of strong verbs, partly on the full grade of the present tense form, and partly on the reduced grade. Many derivatives also showed the *i*-umlaut, e.g., *bydel* formed from the verb *beōdan* “to bid, proclaim” (Kastovsky, 2008: 384). Although it was possible to

find nouns derived from weak verbs, they were not very frequent. This fact could signal that the productivity of this suffix was much higher during the period before the West Germanic languages divided, or shortly after it (Kastovsky, 2008: 385).

The derived nouns with this suffix were of a great variety of semantic categories — they denoted, e.g., action (e.g., *fyndel* “invention/ finding”), agents (e.g., *fæfel* “player”), but also objects, results, or instruments (e.g., *fligel* “instrument for threshing grain”). Some semantic categories tended to take only one specific gender; therefore, it is possible to see that nouns with feminine gender were mostly the action nouns, while those with masculine gender mostly represented agent and instrumental nouns. Those of neuter gender were quite rare, and they possessed no semantic specification which would be common for all of them.

Another specification based on different genders was that feminine nouns mainly took weak declension, while those of masculine gender mainly the strong one (Kastovsky, 2008: 385).

If the suffix was added to a noun, it formed a diminutive – e.g., *forc-el* – a diminutive of *furca* “fork” (this function was quite rare) (OED).

### **3.2.1.2. Productivity in Old English**

The productivity of this suffix in Old English was quite high. Although some words with *-el* occurred only a few times (1–4 times) in various texts, most of them were quite frequent. Words containing this suffix occurred in all text types including poetry.

On the other hand, already in Old English, the suffix showed a high degree of allomorphy, with the other forms being *-ele(e)*, *-l(a)*, and *-ol*. The forms *-ele* and *-l* were very rare. The reason for allomorphy was probably neither phonologically, nor morphologically conditioned. Its cause could be reanalysis of stems vowels which had happened before the Old English period (see below).

### **3.2.1.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English**

The fact that most of the derivatives were from strong verbs shows that this suffix is of an ancient, pre-Old English date. It developed from Proto-Germanic suffix with forms *\*-ilo*, *\*-ilon*, *\*-ilôn* (OED).

This suffix appeared in other Germanic languages as well – e.g. as, Gothic *-ils*, or Old High German *-il*. In these languages just like in Old English, the suffix showed a certain degree of allomorphy, which was usually due to reanalysis of a stem vowel, e.g., the form *-ula* in Gothic developed from words such as *magu-la* “a little boy” (Krahe, 1967: 84-85). It is possible that the allomorphy generally originated before the Germanic languages had split up.

#### **3.2.1.4. Development from Old English to Middle English**

As was mentioned above, in Old English, the suffix *-el* was very productive, but even at this stage it developed a high degree of allomorphy.

In Middle English, the suffix was no longer productive, although it could be still found in spelling. A few of its derivatives disappeared completely from the vocabulary, but most of them were retained with a somewhat modified form. Some of them even continued to display *-el* in the spelling, e.g., *fōrrīdel* “messenger” from Old English *forerydel*. The loss of productivity was apparently due to its phonological inconsistency — the vowels preceding the *l*-sound were in this period interchangeable and this led to even higher degree of allomorphy.

Still, the words with this suffix in Middle English texts occurred quite frequently in both poetry, and prose, including religious prose texts (e.g., *Wycliffite Bible*), verse allegory (e.g., *Piers Plowman*), and various translations (e.g., Higden's *Polychronicon*). Some of the words could be found in glossaries (e.g., in the *Glossary of plant-names* in Durham Cathedral). The dates of the Middle English texts go as far as into the 15<sup>th</sup> century, one of the newest texts being from 1450.

The only problem here is that the texts contain not only words directly descended from Old English words with suffix *-el*, but also with *-els*, or even *-en*. Probably because the suffix *-en* had in Old English similar functions as *-el* (among other functions it formed deverbal action nouns, instrumental nouns, and nouns denoting objects/results, and just like *-el* it could be used to form diminutives), and the phonological changes underway in the Middle English period brought about the merger with *-en* and *-el* in many cases.

Moreover, in Middle English, the form *-el* appeared also with words which in Old English contained the suffix *-els*. After the final *-s* in *-els* disappeared (see 3.2.2.4. and 3.2.2.5.), the two forms were no longer distinguishable. During the later period, the allomorphy grew to develop into the spelling variants *-le*, *-el*, *-elle*, *-la*, *-il*, *-ul*, *-eles*, and *-les*. These variants often resembled the suffixes which were brought into English via French and Latin borrowings (see 3.2.1.5.).

Another problem appeared when the phonetic reduction in unstressed syllables caused that the quality of the vowels preceding the *l*-sound was no longer recognizable. Then, they all merged into /ə/ – this led, along with orthographical variation, to the great allomorphy.

In addition to this, the suffix appeared already in Old English in adjectives; some of them were also of deverbal origin. During the Middle English period, when the inflections were much less prominent, the distinction between these adjectives and nouns was sometimes signaled only syntactically, by the word order. Many nouns in this period could thus serve both as adjectives and as nouns due to conversion.

### **3.2.1.5. Disappearance of the suffix**

As mentioned above, this suffix did not remain productive in Middle English period. The reasons for this were numerous. One of them was, as already mentioned, its phonological structure. When it became a suffix in Old English, it had lost the final *-n* which has been reconstructed for the common Germanic forms. Later on, the suffix underwent an even more radical reshaping, and formed many phonological variants. They all featured *l*-sound, but the vowel preceding it could differ; however, the *-el* form seems to have been most frequent.

Another cause for its disappearance can be found already in Old English — and that was its wide semantic characteristic. A suffix which formed, on the one hand, action and agent nouns, and, on the other hand, objects and instruments may, over time, have become highly impractical for the language, and even more so when it had other suffixes that could express these semantic categories individually. For example, the suffix *-ing* also created nouns denoting an action from verbs, as can be seen in e.g., *ærn-ing* “a running/riding”. This suffix showed much less variation, which could be one of the reasons why it stayed productive in the language.

Another problem appearing as early as in Old English could be the fact that some of the nouns rather took weak declension, and some of them preferred the strong one. For this, it seems, no strict rules could be drawn, and it depended on the specific noun only. This could have confused the speakers as to which declension they should use, and it could lead to the avoidance of the derivatives, or at least of the suffix.

The next problem, occurring since Old English was concerning the bases to which the suffix *-el* was added, the formation from the stems of strong verbs could not last at a productive level very long after the Late Old English period, when the classes of strong verbs were no longer open to many new creations. Due to the increasing typological peripheralization of the introflexional principle, the *i*-umlaut-based allomorphy of the derivatives ceased to be productive as well. It is true that during the Old English period the suffix was added also to some weak verbs, but this was rather a rare occurrence.

Last reason that could be found already in the earlier stages of the language would be the lack of unity regarding the grammatical gender of *el*-formations. It is true that the masculine nouns were prevailing, but there were occurrences of both feminine, and neuter gender.

During the Middle English period, the changes affecting the final unstressed syllables reduced the *e*-sound to /ə/, and it later disappeared completely. Such a weak phonological form could no longer be taken for a suffix, and its productivity grew smaller. In spelling, many variants occurred, some words retained the sequence *-el*, but some underwent metathesis into *-le*, maybe under the influence of the French suffix *-le*. The *-el* was retained only where phonetic law, or the orthographical convention did not permit the *-le* variant, i.e. after <ch, g, n, r, sh, th, m>, and after <m> the suffix became *-ble* (OED).

Some bases with which the suffixes occurred survived into Middle English, but only few of them were still frequently used. The phonological changes caused that a derived word was reanalyzed as monomorphemic, and since the Middle English period the *l*-sound was a part of the root, e.g., the Old English *gafol* “tax, tribute” had in Middle English form *gavel* (the final vowel before /l/ varied), which no longer appeared without the final *-l*, and the Old English root was no longer used for new derivatives. Some of the bases did not survive at all, so the derived words were no longer used by the speakers and they disappeared altogether.

Moreover, the forms were indistinguishable from the now reduced form of *-els*, but also from the suffixes that were brought into English along with French and Latin words, and from the words which had /l/ as a part of their root. The borrowed words could have Old French suffix *-el* which appeared, e.g., in the word *castel* “castle”, Latin suffix *-ellum* and *-icula* which were diminutive suffixes, Latin *-āle* as in *captāle* “cattle”, French *-aille* (originally neuter plural form) as in *battaile* “battle”, or French *-eille* as in *boutteille* “bottle” (OED).

These forms eventually merged together, and this resulted into one homonymous form, which was no longer distinguishable from the original one, and apparently, the suffix *-el* could not be recognized, and this too led to the loss of its productivity.

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons which were most important for the disappearance of the suffix *-el*, but it is possible to see that its lack of both semantic and grammatical unity occurring already since the Old English period surely played an important part. It is very likely that the suffix was productive much more in Proto-Germanic and that in Old English there could be found only remnants of its previous frequency. This is signified also by the high number of allomorphy which had its origins, probably, in the Proto-Germanic period.

### **3.2.2. *-els***

#### **3.2.2.1. The derivational bases**

The suffix *-els* (which occurred e.g., in *bīg-els* “an arch/ a vault”, *brǣd-els* “anything spread”, *cnytt-els* “a knitting thread”, *fēd-els* “a fatling”, *hȳd-els* “a place of concealment”) formed primarily concrete masculine nouns of the first class (*a*-stems) - only a few words deviated from this, e.g., *byrcels* (its meaning is uncertain) was neuter. Also, some words appeared to belong to both the first and the second class (i.e. both *a*- and *ō*-stems). The bases of the derivatives were mostly from verbs both weak and strong. If a word was derived from a strong verb, then it usually featured the *i*-umlaut change (Kastovsky, 2008: 385). The newly-formed nouns usually denoted concrete objects or places, e.g., *byrgels* “tomb”.

### 3.2.2.2. Productivity in Old English

Most of the words with *-els* occurred quite frequently – more than ten times in various texts. They seem to have occurred most often as glosses, but they also could be found in poetry, and legal and religious texts. The number of different words shows that the suffix was very productive during this period. And at this stage, there could be found no allomorphy.

### 3.2.2.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English

This suffix originated from Proto-Germanic *\*-sla* (used for masculine), and *\*-slō* (used for feminine), these were formed from the suffix *-lo* and *-s* which was a part of the root. Sometimes, a dental or other consonant was added, resulting in *\*-isla-n/\*-islo-m/\*-isljo-m/\*-islo-z*. At that time, the suffix formed primarily abstract and instrumental nouns of neuter, or feminine gender (masculine was quite rare) from verbs. One of its allomorphic variants – the one with a vowel (e.g., *\*-isla*) – was attached to weak verbs (Krahe, 1967: 89-90). The final nasal vowel of the Proto-Germanic forms was taken probably from the verbs which ended in *-jan* (OED).

In West-Germanic, *-els* had the form *\*-islja* which later became only *\*-isl*. And even later, it underwent metathesis, and became *-els* (Wright, 1908: 295). The metathesis of *-sl* appeared only in unstressed syllables (Wright, 1908: 135). The suffix can be found as well in other Germanic language, one of its cognates being e.g., Old High German formant *-isli* (Wright, 1908:295).

### 3.2.2.4. Development from Old English to Middle English

Many Old English words survived until the Middle English period. However, they lost the final *-s* because of the reanalysis in association with the common plural suffix *-s* which established itself in the Early Middle period (see 2.3.2.), e.g., the Old English word *bīg-els* “an arch/ a vault” appeared as *beile*, and also as *baill* in Middle English (the words were reanalyzed at that time as monomorphemic).

Due to the phonological changes in the Middle English period (i.e. the reduction of final unstressed vowels and later the leveling of inflections) many derivatives became unrecognizable from those that originally had the suffix *-el*. This caused that some of words with this suffix replaced it by completely different one, e.g., Old English word *candel-sny̅t-els* “an instrument used for trimming candles” in Middle English appeared as *candel-snit-ing*.

The phonological changes also created substantial allomorphy. The suffix occurred as, e.g., *-le*, *-l*, *-els*, *-iles*, etc. The lack of an orthographical standard increased the number of variants even more. Similarly as with the suffix *-el*, the words ending in *-els* could be in the later periods of various origins, and they often did not correspond to the original forms. Moreover, they could be confused with the words of Romance origin which also ended in *-el* (see 3.2.1.5.).

Still, the number of words in Middle English exhibiting an allomorph of *-els* as formant was quite high. They occurred in different types of texts — in glossaries (e.g., *Ælfric's Glossary* in Worcester Cathedral Manuscript), in allegorical poetry (e.g., *Piers Plowman*), in medieval plays (e.g., *The Chester Plays*), in religious texts (e.g., *Homily on the Creed* in Cambridge), in translations (e.g., *Lanfranc's Complete Art of Surgery*), in accounts (e.g., *Churchwarden's Accounts of the Parish of St. Mary*), etc. The texts were written mostly during the 13<sup>th</sup> - early 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, but some of them were of a much later date, e.g., *The Chester Plays* are from 1607.

Despite of the frequent occurrences, the suffix seems not to have formed any new derivatives, and so it could not be seen as productive. The high frequency is only due to the number of earlier derived words that still remained in the language and were relatively often used.

### **3.2.2.5. Disappearance of the suffix**

In Old English, the suffix held a fairly stable position. Although some words took neuter gender instead of masculine, or could belong to both the first, and the second inflectional class (i.e. both *a-* and *ō-*stems), the number of these discrepancies was too small to be significant.

A problem arose once the formation of strong verbs and their derivatives was no longer productive, and neither was allomorphy induced by the *i*-umlaut change. In this case, the

number of bases started to be much more limited. The suffix *-els* permitted also formation from weak verbs which helped its stability in Old English. In addition to this, the semantic characteristics of *-els* seems to have been specific enough to keep up the productivity during this period.

As English was undergoing the phonological changes drastically affecting all final unstressed syllables, the prominence of the suffix grew smaller due to its phonological weakening. With the leveling of inflections in the Middle English period, the number of inflectional suffixes was reduced, and this resulted into a situation when the plural of nouns came to be marked by only one common grammatical suffix, *-s*. Words ending in *-s* were then reanalyzed as plurals. This also affected the suffix *-els* and the final *-s* disappeared.

This reanalyzation caused that the distinction of *-els* and *-el* was impossible. After the phonological changes, the suffix could no longer be recognized as such, and hence could no longer be productive which meant that the final *l*-sound could be no more than a root/stem consonant. Moreover, many Latin and French borrowings had the same suffix as well (see 3.2.1.5.) so despite of the fact that most of the bases occurring with this suffix survived until the Middle English period (some of them even until nowadays), it ceased to be productive.

In some cases, the derived words were reanalyzed as monomorphemic. In Middle English, then this base + suffix functioned more often as a whole, i.e. as one morpheme, e.g., Old English word *fēd-els* corresponded to Middle English *fedil*. Question remains for how long exactly the speakers of Middle English would have been able to recognize the suffix, even though it was no longer productive.

Another reason for its disappearance would be that at that time, the language had other suffixes at its disposal which could easily supply the lost *-els* suffix, e.g., *birg-els* vs. *birg-en* both meaning “a burying place”.

All in all, the suffix *-els* was not only very much phonologically weakened, but also it had a competition of other suffixes, at least at that time phonologically much more prominent. The loss of productivity was thus quite expectable.

### 3.2.3. *-inzel*

#### 3.2.3.1. The derivational bases

In Old English, this suffix formed denominal diminutives of neuter gender and of the first class of *a*-stems (e.g., *dōc-inzel* “bastard”, *cof-inzel* “a little room”). The bases were usually names of things and animals, but sometimes it occurred also with names of persons. Just like in any other Germanic language, Old English did not form other than nominal diminutives; therefore, all the bases were nouns, as can be seen from these examples: *fisc-inzel* “small fish”, *byrþ-inzel* “little burden/ bundle”, *bōg-inzel* “small bough, or twig”.

#### 3.2.3.2. Productivity in Old English

In Old English, the status of *-inzel* as a suffix was indisputable, although it seems that by that time already, it had ceased to be productive. Words with *-inzel* occurred quite rarely, often not more than just once or twice. Moreover, their appearance seems to be limited only to glosses of Latin words (often those featuring a Latin diminutive suffix *-(i)cellus*) – with the exception of the word *fiscinzel*, which can be found in texts other than glosses.

One of the reasons for the rare occurrence of this suffix may be the fact that English had also other suffixes which could be used in diminutive sense. As mentioned above, the suffix *-el* was used to form diminutives, although quite rarely. Other suffixes were *-en* which, among other functions, could be used in this function as well, e.g., in the word *cȳc-en* “chicken”, and *-ling* – as in *deōr-ling* “darling”, which was the most productive of them all.

It is probable that the suffix was revived by the scribes who compiled the glosses because of its close resemblance to the Latin diminutive suffix *-(i)cellus* only for the purposes of the glossary making. In other cases, the authors seem to have preferred *-en* and *-ling* to *-inzel*.

#### 3.2.3.3. Development from Proto-Germanic to Old English

One of the first theories about how this suffix came to existence was that it developed from Old English word for child – *wincel* (Trnka, 1982:256), but this theory was soon proved

wrong, and instead it was thought that it could be a borrowing based on the Latin diminutive suffix used by the scribes who were creating the glossaries (Trnka, 1982: 254-256).

Trnka argued that it developed by combining two suffixes *-ing* (meaning “one of a kind“), and *-el* (a formant used with diminutive sense) (Trnka, 1982: 256-257).

Despite these theories, *-incel* most probably arose from the suffix generally shared by West Germanic languages with a form *\*-inklīna*. Added to Germanic *n*-stems, it formed diminutive words primarily denoting animals, but its use with the words for things and persons can also be found (Krahe, 1967: 217-218).

The origin of this suffix is, however, not traceable further to a common Proto-Indo-European origin, and thus it can be assumed that it developed once the Indo-European split into individual dialects (Wright, 1908: 297).

The suffix *\*-inklīna* was similar to Germanic *\*-ikīna* which formed diminutives too. It later became *-ken/-chen*, *-lein/-līna* which are suffixes recognizable in, e.g., Present Day German (Krahe, 1967: 217-218). They seem to have been much more productive than the suffix *-incel* (or its cognates) in other Germanic languages. Old English *-incel*, therefore, corresponded to, e.g., Old High German suffix *-inklīn*, which later disappeared, giving way to the more frequent suffixes mentioned above.

#### **3.2.3.4. Development from Old English to Middle English**

Considering the rare occurrence of this suffix as early as in Old English, it is not surprising that it cannot be found any more in the Middle English texts.

#### **3.2.3.5. Disappearance of the suffix**

Despite its grammatical unity of gender and class, the suffix was in Old English used very rarely, and the writers seem to have preferred other diminutive suffixes (*-el*, *-en*, *-ling*), which were used more often in this period.

The borrowings from French and Latin brought other diminutive suffixes of their own (e.g., Latin *-culus*, *-il*, *-illus*, *-le*, *-cellus*, French *-el*, *-et(te)*, *-ine* (OED)), but the speakers often used the words without the diminutive meaning, e.g., the word *pock-et* originally had the French diminutive *-et*, but English used it with neutral meaning (Trnka, 1982: 255-256).

The bases to which the suffix *-inzel* was added survived, with few exceptions, not only until Middle English, but also until the present day so the reason for the disappearance of the suffix cannot be the nature of its bases.

In this case, the reasons for its disappearance could have been semantic. As Trnka noted, English seems not to have any need for the use of diminutive suffixes, and this Trnka justified by the statement that English does not need words that by themselves show some degree of emotion (Trnka, 1982: 255).

During the Middle English period, on the other hand, the diminutive suffix *-ling* seems to still have occurred with considerable frequency. The general disappearance of the diminutive suffixes could be thus, just like with the other suffixes, more likely connected to the typological changes.

In Present Day English the diminutive meaning can be still expressed by the adjective *little*. The analytical construction later became much more frequent as the typology of English was changing more towards the analyticity. These changes were already underway during the Middle English period, and thus the suffixes were gradually being replaced by more analytic constructions.

The reason, why *-ling* survived longer than *-inzel* was presumably that, as mentioned above, *-inzel* was already quite infrequent in Old English, unlike *-ling*. The other suffixes which could likewise be used to form diminutives (*-en* and *-el*) had in Old English other more prominent functions; moreover, in the Middle English period they were no longer seen as suffixes due to the reduction of final unstressed syllables which was underway at that time.

As can be seen, the productivity of this suffix was questionable already in the Old English period so it is not surprising that *-inzel* did not survive to the Middle English period.

## 4. Conclusion

This paper attempted to present detailed descriptions of three of the Old English nominal suffixes: *-el*, *-els*, and *-inzel*, and their development from the Proto-Germanic period to the Early Middle English period, with paying attention to the typological changes underway during this course of time.

Apart from their early disappearance (none of them was productive by the beginning of the Early Middle English period), they do not share much characteristics so the reasons for their eventual loss were numerous.

Those which seem to be the most important were the sound changes during Middle English (which started already at the end of the Old English period), the most prominent of these changes was probably the reduction of final unstressed syllables because it affected forms of the suffixes, and it contributed to the reanalysis of their status.

These phonological innovations were connected to the typological changes in the language that ended in the loss of many grammatical inflections, and in a merger of many of those that remained in Middle English. At this stage, English had only one paradigm for all nouns regardless of their stem vowels, which indicated declensional classes in Old English. Middle English was thus in its nature much more analytical than Old English, which was closely related to its preference of borrowings, conversion, etc. instead of derivation.

The existence of the high number of Romance borrowings in Middle English was another significant reason (although probably considerably less than the phonological changes) because they brought into English their own nominal suffixes, in many cases with similar forms and functions.

These changes in language probably gave cause to confusion among speakers who reanalyzed the suffixes as parts of roots of the individual words, or replaced them by others, more productive suffixes with forms phonologically more prominent.

In case of the suffix *-inzel*, another factor for its eventual loss could have been its plausibly artificial nature (if it was revived by the scribes based on the similarity of form with Latin diminutive suffixes) and its rare occurrence already in Old English. It could have been caused

also by the fact that English does not tend to use diminutives very often, but this was not yet true in Middle English which used other diminutive suffixes (e.g., *-ling*) more often.

To conclude, this thesis is the first detailed description of Old English nominal suffixes which sums up not only their grammatical properties, but also their development and productivity. Unfortunately, the extent of this paper did not permit the descriptions and analyses of other Old English nominal suffixes. Therefore, the analyses of the rest of them should be done as well in future so the full picture of the Old English nominal suffixes could be presented, and serve as a guide to at least one part of the Old English derivation.

## Bibliography

- Bauer, Laurie. "The function of word-formation and the inflection-derivation distinction". *Words in their Places. A Festschrift for J. Lachlan Mackenzie*. Eds in H. Aertsen, M. Hannay & R. Lyall. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit. 2004. pp. 283-292.
- Brinton, Laurel J.; Arnovick Leslie K. *The English Language: A Linguistic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Fulk, R. D. *An Introductory Grammar of Old English*. Tempe: ACMRS, 2014.
- Horobin, Simon; Smith, Jeremy. *An Introduction to Middle English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. "Semantics and Vocabulary". *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume I: The Beginnings to 1066*. Ed. R. M. Hogg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008, pp. 290-409.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. "Typological Changes in Derivational Morphology". *The Handbook of the History of English*. Eds. A. van Kemenade and B. Loos. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 151-176.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. "Typological Status of Old English Word-formation". *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 1990, pp. 205-225.
- Krahe, Hans; Meid Wolfgang. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft III. Wortbildungslehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.
- Marchand, Hans. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. München: C.H. Beck, 1969.
- Millward, C. M.; Hayes Mary. *A Biography of the English Language*. Boston: Thomson Learning, 2012.
- Mitchell, Bruce; Robinson Fred C. *A Guide to Old English*. Wiley: Wiley Blackwell. 2010.
- Popela, Jaroslav. *Skaličková jazyková typologie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.
- Quirk, Randolph; Wrenn Charles L. *An Old English Grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 1960.
- Skalička, Vladimír; Petr Sgall. "Praguin typology of languages". *Prague School of structural and functional linguistics: A short introduction*. Ed. Luelsdorff, Philip A. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 1994, pp 333-357.
- Trnka, Bohumil; Fried Vilém. "The Old English Diminutive Suffix -incel". *Selected Papers in Structural Linguistics*. New York: Mouton, 1982, pp. 253-257.

Wright, Joseph; Wright, Elizabeth M. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908.

## Sources

Dictionary of Old English, 2017: <https://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html>

Middle English Dictionary (MED), Middle English Compendium, 2017:  
<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>

Oxford English Dictionary Online (OED), 2017: <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/>

Thesaurus of Old English, 2017: <http://oldenglishthesaurus.arts.gla.ac.uk/>

# Résumé

## 1. Úvod

V úvodu je popsána struktura práce a nastíněna problematika staroanglických nominálních sufixů. Přestože byla jejich role v procesech slovo tvorby daleko výraznější, než je tomu v současné angličtině, věnuje se tomuto tématu jen velmi málo odborných textů.

Tato práce charakterizuje alespoň tři z nich – *-el*, *-el* a *-inzel* – a to z hlediska morfologických a sémantických rysů jich samotných a jejich bází. Navíc se také věnuje jejich produktivitě ve staré a střední angličtině a příčinám jejich zániku během období rané střední angličtiny.

## 2. Teoretická část

Druhá kapitola popisuje teoretická východiska dané problematiky, jak je uvádí příslušná odborná literatura. Jedná se o výklady týkající se derivace, slovo tvorby ve staré a střední angličtině a vývoje angličtiny od pragermánštiny až po raně střední angličtinu. Tato kapitola je rozdělena na několik částí.

První sekce se věnuje definicím derivačních sufixů. Jedna z nich se zabývá jejich vymezením vůči samostatným slovům, která se velmi často vyskytují v kompozitech, ale ze synchronního pohledu je nelze za sufixy považovat. Dále jsou derivační sufixy odlišeny od flektivních sufixů, jež nemění slovní druh báze. Výjimkou jsou ovšem deminutivní sufixy, ty jsou daleko produktivnější než ostatní derivační sufixy a slovní druh při tom nemění.

Druhá a třetí část pak popisují fonologické a ortografické změny, které v angličtině proběhly ve vývoji od pragermánštiny do rané střední angličtiny. Nejdůležitější změnou, která nastala v období vývoje z pragermánštiny do staré angličtiny, je umlaut (přehláska), proces palatalizující přízvučnou hlásku, většinou /i/. Avšak daleko podstatnější byly změny na konci staroanglického období a na začátku toho středoanglického, kdy došlo k redukci, či úplné ztrátě hlásek v nepřízvučných slabikách na konci slov. Kvůli tomuto procesu tak mnoho sufixů, ať už derivačních, nebo flektivních, z jazyka vymizelo, nebo ztratilo svůj status a bylo mluvčími reanalyzováno na součást kmene/ kořene. V této době také došlo k monoftongizaci dvojhlásek, k fonemizaci některých alofonů pod vlivem románských výpůjček a k zjednodušení některých souhláskových skupin.

Vliv na formu fonémů měla také ortografická nejednotnost angličtiny, která po určitou dobu byla převážně mluveným jazykem. V textech se pak odráží velký vliv jednotlivých dialektů a pravidel pravopisu přejatých z románských jazyků a skandinávštiny. Tato pravidla byla často v rozporu s těmi, jež byla přejata ze staré angličtiny.

Čtvrtá část prezentuje typologické rozdělení jazyků podle teorie Pražské školy ve vztahu k vývoji angličtiny. Tato teorie rozděluje jazyky do pěti skupin podle toho, zda v nich existují gramatické sufixy a zda je u nich volný slovosled. Jedním z typů je aglutinační typ, kde se vyskytuje set gramatických afixů ve striktně daném pořadí, vzhledem k tomu, že každý z nich má pouze jednu funkci. Zde se slovní druhy na základě bází nedají rozlišit. V takových jazycích je slovosled volný.

Podobně je tomu u flektivního typu, kde se také vyskytují sufixy nesoucí gramatickou informaci. Avšak jejich pořadí je o něco volnější a sufixy často kumulují dvě a více gramatických kategorií, které určují. Zde se slovní druhy rozlišují již na základě bází a slovosled je opět volný.

U introflektivního typu se nevyskytují sufixy, ale jednotlivé gramatické vztahy se vyjadřují pomocí změny hlásek v kořeni.

Dalším typem jazyka je typ izolační. Tyto jazyky nemají gramatické afixy a vztahy mezi slovy se vyjadřují primárně pevným slovosledem. Zde se u bází většinou nerozlišuje slovní druh.

Posledním typem je typ polysyntetický, v němž lexikální slova mohou fungovat i jako gramatická. I tento typ preferuje pevný slovosled.

Co se týče angličtiny, dá se říci, že se postupně vyvíjí od flektivního typu směrem k typu izolačnímu s tím, že vykazuje i prvky jazyka aglutinačního.

Další, pátá část této kapitoly představuje teoretický popis povahy nominálních sufixů ve staré a střední angličtině. Ve staré angličtině byla derivace velmi produktivním slovo tvorným procesem. V tomto období byla často doprovázena změnami hlásek ve kmenech/ kořeni, ke kterému byly afixy přidány. V takových případech se jednalo nejčastěji o změnu zděděnou

z proto-indoevropštiny: ablaut. Tato alternace se vyskytovala u substantiv a adjektiv vzniklých ze silných sloves. Mezi další změny provázející derivaci patřily také umlaut, geminace, palatalizace a asibilace. Avšak na konci staroanglického období se tyto alternace vyskytovaly již jen zřídka a to zejména na základě analogie s existujícími tvary.

Alomorfie nominálních sufixů ve staré angličtině byla po většinou méně častá než ve střední angličtině, kde mimo fonologické změny hrála roli také nejednotná ortografie.

Během středoanglického období se pak produktivita nominálních sufixů snížila, kvůli redukci koncových nepřízvučných slabik a zjednodušení konsonantických skupin a kvůli tomu, že typologie angličtiny začala směřovat spíše k izolárnímu typu, kde převládají jiné slovtvorné procesy, např. konverze.

Poslední sekce se zaměřuje na rozbor předchozích studií věnujících se sufixaci ve staré angličtině. Mnoho studií tuto problematiku pouze ukázkově nastiňuje. Nejdetailněji se jí věnuje Dieter Kastovsky, který kromě synchronních vlastností sufixů popisuje jejich kognáty v jiných germánských jazycích.

### **3. Praktická část**

Cílem praktické části této práce bylo poskytnout podrobný popis tří staroanglických nominálních sufixů, *-el*, *els* a *-incel*, včetně jejich produktivity během období staré a střední angličtiny a podání příčin jejich zániku.

Ze slovníku *Dictionary of Old English* byla vybrána hesla obsahující jeden z výše zmíněných sufixů. A poté tato data byla analyzována z hlediska typologie derivačních bází, produktivity a typů textů, v nichž se dané sufixy vyskytovaly.

Z výsledků analýz bylo zjištěno, že sufix *-el* ve staré angličtině tvořil převážně substantiva mužského rodu, patřící do první deklinační třídy, převážně ze silných sloves. Vzniklé deriváty mohly pak mít různé významy, např. agens, objekt, instrument, apod. Velmi zřídka tento sufix mohl tvořit i deminutiva. Ačkoliv byl ve staré angličtině velmi produktivní, již tehdy vykazoval vysokou míru alomorfie, která se pravděpodobně objevila již v pragermánském období, vzhledem k tomu, že se vyskytuje i v jiných germánských jazycích, tudíž k ní došlo nejspíše tak, že koncové hlásky kořene/ kmene byly reanalyzovány na součást sufixu.

Ve střední angličtině vykazuje tento sufix ještě větší alomorfii. Poté, co se obecným sufixem pro plurál stalo *-s*, proběhla reanalýza sufixů končících na tuto hlásku, a tak *-els* získalo stejnou podobu jako *-el*. Navíc mnoho románských sufixů připomínalo svou formou tyto dva, a tak nutně klesla jejich produktivita.

Důvodů, proč se nominální sufix *-el* přestal používat, je mnoho. Jedním z nich je jeho vysoká alomorfie již ve staré angličtině, pak také vysoká sémantická variabilita vzniklých derivátů. Navíc pro jazyk bylo pravděpodobně jednodušší uchýlit se k sufixům, které tvořily např. pouze instrumenty, či pouze činitelská substantiva a kde tudíž byla sémantická variabilita mnohem nižší.

Ve střední angličtině pak k vymizení sufixu přispěla redukce koncových nepřízvučných slabik, která oslabilu formu sufixu a způsobila, že mluvčí jej přehodnotili jako hlásku, která je součástí kořene. Nadto se v této době tvořila substantiva od spíše slabých než silných sloves.

Sufix *-els* ve staré angličtině tvořil převážně substantiva mužského rodu první, či druhé deklinační třídy od slabých a silných sloves. Vzniklé deriváty měly význam objektů. Ještě ve staré angličtině byl tento sufix produktivní a vyskytoval se v všech typech textů, ačkoliv převažoval v glosách. V té době nevykazoval žádnou alomorfii. Vzhledem k tomu, že vznikl již v pragermánštině, tak se vyskytuje i v jiných germánských jazycích.

Během střední angličtiny ztratil koncové *-s* kvůli reanalýze s plurálem. Navíc probíhající fonologické změny způsobily, že jeho osud byl stejný jako u sufixu *-el* a, ačkoliv se většina slov s ním zachovala i ve střední angličtině, přestal být produktivní a na základě reanalýzy vymizel. Z toho vyplývá, že důvodem pro jeho zánik byla jeho příliš redukovaná forma.

Posledním zkoumaným sufixem byl deminutivní sufix *-incel*, který měl velmi širokou škálu bází, i když převážně tvořil deminutiva pro názvy zvířat a věcí. Již ve staré angličtině je jeho produktivita celkem sporná vzhledem k tomu, že se vyskytuje pouze v glosách jako překlad latinských slov s deminutivními sufixy. Je tak možné, že byl použit uměle na základě podobnosti s latinskými ekvivalenty a že již během staroanglického období nebyl produktivní vůbec.

Jedná se sice o sufix společný i ostatním germánským jazykům, ale ty daly většinou během svého vývoje přednost jiným deminutivním příponám např. nějaké z forem *-chen*, či *-lein*. I stará angličtina, zdá se, preferovala pro tento způsob derivace jiné sufixy: *-el*, *-en* a *-ling*, což je dalším důvodem k spekulaci, že *-incel* nebylo příliš produktivní.

Tento sufix se ve střední angličtině nevyskytuje vůbec — nelze ani najít slova, která by končila na podobnou sestavu hlásek, jako je tomu u jiných sufixů. Navzdory tomu, že angličtina obecně nepoužívá deminutivní sufixy příliš často, se *-ling* udrželo i do střední angličtiny, kde bylo stále produktivní. Avšak později s tím, jak se anglický jazyk typologicky vyvíjel ve více izolační, se i tento sufix postupně vytratil a byl nahrazen analytickou strukturou *little* + dané podstatné jméno.

#### **4. Závěr**

V závěru práce jsou shrnuty výsledky analýz jednotlivých sufixů a důvodů, proč se později přestaly používat. Mimo jiné, je zde zdůrazněno, že zánik lze připsat hlavně jazykově typologickým a fonologickým změnám, které se udály ve středoanglickém období a které měly za následek reanalyzaci forem sufixů a upozadění jejich funkce. Často se také stalo, že sufixy byly nahrazeny jinými, produktivnějšími sufixy s více prominentní fonologickou strukturou a s vyhraněnějším sémantickou charakteristikou. Ale v případě sufixu *-incel* se dá spekulovat, že byl již ve staré angličtině archaickým a že byl použit uměle na základě podobnosti s latinskými deminutivními sufixy.