

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS
OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DERIVATIVE SUFFIXING IN ENGLISH

by 594

KENNETH RUSSELL REID
B. A., Kansas State University, 1967

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:

William Brundell
Major Professor

LD
3668
79
1968
R45
c.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF CHANGE IN THE SUFFIX SYSTEM . . .	3
THE SUFFIXES OF MIDDLE ENGLISH	20
NOTES	34
APPENDIX A. THE CORPUS	36
APPENDIX B. SUFFIX INVENTORIES	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. OLD ENGLISH SUFFIXES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH	22
II. SUFFIXES BORROWED WITH EARLY FRENCH LOAN-WORDS	23
III. EARLY XIIIITH-CENTURY SUFFIXES	25
IV. MID & LATE XIVTH-CENTURY SUFFIXES	28

INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this study to examine a single class of word-formation phenomena--that of selective productivity and obsolescence among individual items within the class of English derivative suffixes. The specific aims are: (1) to identify members of the derivative suffix classes of Middle English and present-day English; (2) to account for the loss and gain of suffixes, and for contrasts in their productivity and frequency at one stage of the language as opposed to the other; and (3) to formulate a linguistically tenable hypothesis concerning the reasons for the changes observed.

A hypothesis that would account for these changes must describe and inter-relate the effects of three groups of phenomena: (1) on the socio-linguistic level, the pressure exerted by a politically and socially dominant language in contact with English; (2) on the lexical level of language structure, pressures generated by reiterated borrowing of identical or similar morphemes and morpheme sequences; and (3) on the phonological level, the "set" or tendency of speakers to utter speech sequences as nearly as possible like those already sanctioned by the phonotactics of their language.

This study will suggest that three primary factors combined to alter the English system of derivational suffixing. These were the enforced acculturation of English speakers following the Norman Conquest, radical change in the balance between proportions of native Germanic and borrowed French words in the English lexicon, and the development of a limited number of preferred syllable patterns in English.

A single basic premise underlies the hypothesis developed in this study. All language phenomena are conditioned rather than arbitrary, and are therefore ultimately explicable in terms of events.

Since the effects of all three factors mentioned become apparent to the modern investigator only through his study of the recorded written language, it was logical to select the writings of the Middle English period as a source for the data to be studied. There, the earliest clear picture of the language becomes available. Additional advantage lies in the fact that change was progressive throughout the period; examination of language practices at the beginning and end of the era permits estimation of both the extent and the direction of the change.

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF CHANGE IN THE SUFFIX SYSTEM

Analysis of the change in non-inflectional suffixing might conceivably proceed by identifying, listing, and describing each sound, syllable, morpheme, or word that appeared, disappeared, or altered during the course of time. To do so would yield a comprehensive statement, but not necessarily one that would illuminate the patterns of change. Since language structure is made apparent through perceived patterns of relationship, such an analytical procedure would not serve the purposes of the present discussion. A more promising approach lies in trying to identify and describe classes of language elements, noting the sorts of change in which they have participated, and then seeking the relationships with external conditioning factors that produced such changes.

In the case of the derivative suffixes, if all those in the inventory can be assigned to classes defined in terms of related conditioning factors, the patterns upon which this method of word forming is constructed may become clear.

Whereas, during the last century language historians described in traditional terms the evolution of the English language, in recent decades linguists have addressed themselves more to the task of proposing adequate theoretical models for describing the underlying structural features of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the language. Because they have been

interested in the tangible, formal aspects of language, structural linguists have tended to defer the study of lexical and semantic structures. At times, these levels of the language hierarchy have been considered by some linguists as areas more appropriate for investigation by psychologists, philosophers, and semanticists. One consequence of this attitude has been a partial fusing of interests in certain sectors where disciplines overlap. Yet, many of the structures and systemic relationships that prevail are still only partly perceived. Much remains to be done in terms of methodical re-examination of the available data and definitive description of the phenomena observed.

Among contemporary linguists, only Marchand seems to have probed deeply into the field which includes the sort of word-formation processes considered here.¹ But because of the broad scope of his work, he has concentrated more on cataloguing phenomena than on explaining them in terms that would reveal patterns of linguistic behavior. The hesitancy of other linguists to attack the problem is understandable. Information from which answers must be derived consists in observed language behavior. The behavior must include expression in all the modes characteristic of the language. That is, it should depict all the style variants that make up the written record as well as the various dialects that comprise the spoken tongue. Because of this requirement, the investigator whose diachronic examination extends back beyond the era of electronically recorded speech sounds encounters an immediate deterioration in the quality of the data with which he must work. The sounds of language are relayed to him through writing. And the graphic system, at best an approximation of spoken language, confronts him with a

compressed, abbreviated encoding--symbols of symbols, as it were--from which he must try to deduce the nature of the speech patterns represented. Moreover, when he studies a stage of language development reflected in a very early period of literary activity, there is no guarantee that the matter found there will accurately picture the spoken tongue of the day. Most Old English and early Middle English writing is subject to this criticism. Although it reflects a certain amount of information concerning dialect differences among the geographical regions, it is almost barren of material in which various levels or situation-keyed types of discourse appear in truly representative volume.

But despite the difficulty of diachronic investigation, the importance of derivative suffixing has attracted scholars' attention. This is attested in the space devoted to discussion of it by Skeat, Jespersen, and Marchand among others. For example, volume six of Jespersen's study of English is devoted to a detailed treatment of the origins and functions of non-inflectional suffixes.² Skeat, too, treats the etymology of suffixes thoroughly.³ Marchand's intricate examination of the matter is evidence of the importance he attached to the process. Historians of the language furnish similar, if less detailed, lists of suffixes, their probable dates of appearance, and their language sources. Comparable treatments are encountered in the writings of numerous lexicographers and philologists. Yet most of these scholars have apparently concerned themselves more with items (i.e., discrete lexical phenomena) than with patterns. Despite the difference between word-formation processes in Old English and in modern English, traditional philologists seldom try to identify or explain factors which may have conditioned the evolution of suffix types.

Motivation for studying this narrow sector of English morphology stemmed from the realization that despite the existence of numerous competent works, there was, even in texts by modern structural linguists, no extensive treatment of this particular problem. Jespersen's grammar contains a fairly complete listing of present-day suffixes, together with some remarks on their frequency of occurrence.⁴ Histories of English by Albert C. Baugh, H. C. Wyld, Albert Marckwardt, and Morton W. Bloomfield and Leonard Newmark give less complete listings, and do little more than mention the sources and discuss some of the sociological considerations associated with the suffixes.⁵

A survey of typical discourse sequences in English reveals that the variety and number of suffixes found today differ sharply from what is found at earlier stages in the language. A modern dictionary lists at least 245 suffix forms. While many of these are lexical items, existing as combining forms or free words, or are compounds of several simple suffixes, well over one hundred simple derivative suffixes remain. These are used to transmute lexical items from one function class to another, (substantive to predicative, predicative to adjunctive, etc.). In practical terms, the use of members of this class of derivative morphemes in combination with members of a much larger class of content words enables a language to function with optimum flexibility and versatility. And when the permutational opportunities inherent in such a system are enhanced by relatively unrestrained compounding of words and concatenation of suffixes, virtually unlimited denotative and connotative possibilities are realized. Theoretically, at least, one is free to characterize an action as having been "antidisestablishmentarianistically" conceived. It is only the speaker's preference for brevity in word-length phonological

sequences that makes very long words rare in discourse. Modern German speakers indicate that they consider it quite normal to construct single locutions from congeries of compounds and affixes.

In contrast to the modern practice, Old English, with its smaller lexicon, seems to have operated with only about three dozen derivative suffixes.⁶ Of these, no more than one-third survive in modern reflexes; only a few may be characterized as productive. It is the almost wholesale replacement of these functional morphemes by borrowed forms, together with the puzzling viability of a few surviving OE suffixes, that provide the phenomena examined in this study.

The principal method employed to accumulate a corpus for examination consisted in consulting lexical sources appropriate to each stage of English in order to determine the suffixes that were then in use. Next, exhaustive inventories of suffixes appearing in text samples from the writings of each period were made. Suffix identities, recurrence rates, and grammatical functions were noted. Thus, both the list and lexicon frequencies of suffixes were ascertained for the Middle English and modern periods. The raw data so obtained were next studied in an effort to detect changes in the item composition of each list and in the frequency ranks of individual items and functional classes. The items were then tested to discover whether there were any correlations which might indicate that phonological form, multiplicity of loan sources, or articulatory simplicity might have conditioned the evolution of particular suffixes.

In selecting textual material representative of the Middle English period no effort was made to discriminate on the basis of literary merit.

Criteria for selection included: (1) a manuscript date in the thirteenth or fourteenth century; (2) to the extent compatible with the first requirement, original composition within one of the two centuries; (3) manuscript and (when possible), original language in the dialect of the East Midlands; and (4) the popularity or influential nature of a work as evidenced by numerous surviving manuscript copies, or apparent effect on contemporary or later writers. The latter consideration resulted in relaxation in several instances of the third criterion--justifiable perhaps, if one attributes a formative influence on vocabulary development to the popularity or wide currency of an early composition.

Despite the fact that techniques of counting and numerical ranking were used, as were also those of calculating and referring to indices based on the counts, the study was not visualized as primarily a statistical procedure; its methods were far too unsophisticated to sustain such a claim. For the limited purpose of ascertaining and comparing item occurrence rates, text samples were large and varied enough to provide reasonable bases for statements concerning numbers of suffixes in use and their frequencies.

The propensity of English speakers toward borrowing useful or attractive bits from the languages of others is not a habit of recent origin. Early evidence of such borrowing is apparent in the words taken from Latin during the time when Angles, Jutes, and Saxons, together with other West Germanic tribes, still occupied areas in continental Europe. Not only did the language which was to become English share many traits in common with its neighbors, it borrowed many of the same Latinisms. These loan words were

usually concrete substantives that reflected those things found most noteworthy by the German people in their first contact with Roman culture. In English, these borrowings evolved into words like OE calic 'cup,' mynet 'coin or coinage,' and pund 'pound.' Although words of this sort were able to enter freely into many word compounds, there was at first little tendency toward using them with either native or foreign suffixes. Even later, in 5th and 6th Century Britain, where the next period of language interchange occurred, the borrowings--again chiefly from Latin--consisted mainly of short, simple words with concrete referents; for foreign concepts of more complexity it was usual for English to employ so-called loan-translations, as in heahfæder 'patriarch.' In these, the elements of the non-native referent were expressed by compounding native roots or stems which corresponded on a one-to-one basis with the elements of the foreign terms. Only after Roman Catholicism had permeated the entire social fabric, did familiarity with Latin begin to influence English to any marked degree. Even then the change appeared primarily in the speech and writing of a small, literate ecclesiastical community. And some of this change was more apparent than real. Entire lexical items were borrowed in close association with their extra-linguistic referents. When these items included suffixes, there was no certainty that these would be perceived as such. This is easily seen in words like processiun, which must have been in use long before its appearance in the early 12th-Century Peterborough Chronicle. Its suffix -iun was not perceived as a potential word-forming device until later, when two centuries of French loan words had contributed their share of reinforcing examples.

When the Conquest spread French influence across England, the native tongue had already been exposed to nearly five hundred years of intermittent struggle with competing languages. By 1066, linguistic borrowing was already a well established characteristic of English. It is important to note here the difference between the two periods of language interaction--the early Latin and the Norman French. The former was characterized by the learned and clerical aspects of its borrowings, and its relation to only a limited range of cultural activity. Interaction between the Normans and the English on the other hand, occurred at nearly every social level; moreover, it embraced the whole range of cultural activities. Civil and ecclesiastical administration, military affairs, popular religious ritual, as well as commercial and agricultural activities, brought Norman masters and English subjects of all ranks into frequent, close, and continued contact. The exposure to one another's languages was intensive, and it endured for centuries. Of the several outcomes possible under such circumstances, the one which actually ensued saw the evolution and eventual disappearance of an Anglo French dialect quite distinct from the one which developed in the central regions of France. Even more important, it saw English persist as the national language of England. But the language that emerged there during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries differed markedly from Old English. Its lexical component, in particular, gave ever increasing evidence of the influence exerted by the Latin and French patterns to which it had been exposed.

Yet, superficial resemblances between early Middle English words and those of French or Latin may not safely be taken to signify that new

patterns in suffixing constituted an actual structural change in the morphology of the former language. Even as late as the beginning of the thirteenth century, many derivative words--perhaps a majority of them--were still direct borrowings rather than coinages. Native English speakers may occasionally have been vaguely aware of the syntagmatic relations between some of the borrowed stems and the suffixes that gave them precise meanings. But it was only as a suffix was learned and used with a second or third lexical root or stem that the mere intellectual awareness of relationships could have been transformed into an established, effortless, kinesthetic habit of articulation. And only then could the process of analogy have been assured a favorable linguistic climate in which to operate with flexibility, free of conscious intellectual effort. It is as this stage is reached that it becomes proper to speak of structural change. The rapidity with which hybrid words have appeared in the language ever since the Middle English period indicates the degree to which this favorable climate was realized.

Concurrent with the adoption of foreign lexemes and morphemes was a partial abandonment of some of the features of the old language. Syntax and phonology had for a long time been evolving toward their modern forms. Alteration of these two subsystems had its own effect on morphology. Among elements that slipped into disuse were many of the OE derivative suffixes. Some of these were rendered unnecessary by the shift from a grammatical to a natural gender. In this class were -bora, -lȳc, and -ræden, their functions assumed by suffixes like -er(e)--a native form reinforced through multiple, phonetically similar loans from French and Latin, and -nes(se)--a suffix no longer restricted to the grammatically feminine. Other OE suffixes

disappeared through direct replacement by loan morphemes that showed greater versatility. Adjective-forming -cund and -bære gave way to -ous, which could form adjectives from either nouns or verbs, and -ant, which converted verbs to either agents substantive or to adjectives. Also contributing to the decline of the older forms was the expanded productivity of other OE suffixes like -lic and -nes(se). These, in their simplified forms, combined readily with foreign loan words and produced utterance segments that were easily articulated.⁷

When the changes typified by these examples are examined, it becomes evident that they stemmed from two distinct sets of predisposing factors. The first of these was the process of language evolution already long at work in English. The second resulted from pressures generated by the wholesale introduction into England of an alien culture, complete with its language.

In the process of establishing their dominance over England, the Normans very early assumed a position of primacy in the Church. After Latin, French rather than English became a second high language, thus effectively interrupting the continued development of an English literary tradition and decreeing that the once important West Saxon literary dialect should be preserved only in relic form. At the same time, imposing their own systems of jurisprudence and civil administration, the conquerors introduced a host of terms that pertained directly to their own world view and social organization. Corresponding features of the Anglo Saxon culture were first suppressed, then, in many instances, entirely supplanted. It was natural that when an extra-linguistic referent had ceased to be a matter for consideration, the need for its language symbol had little justification for continued existence.⁸

New concepts introduced through acculturation included many for which there were terms belonging to more than one grammatical form class or functional slot. That is, there were stems or roots intuitively associated with specific extra-linguistic phenomena. But, as the aspect from which a particular experience was viewed shifted--that is, as a speaker tried to convey his varying attitudes and the changing functional roles played by the "core" content of a stem, he needed to modify it somehow. The implication here is not that Old English had provided no means for doing this. Rather, it is that in the new language, the frequent reiteration of a few suffixes that appeared in combination with a wide variety of stems helped instill in the listener a sensitivity to the syntagms that were being represented. Once syntagms were perceived, it became easy in most cases to apply them analogously to the coinage of new words. The French word 'court' offers an interesting example of how the process worked. Appearing in curteis 'courteous,' and curteise 'courtesy,' as well as in its simple, unaffixed form, the basic morpheme was readily distinguished from its suffixes. That these same suffixes appeared with other stem morphemes reinforced the inference that here were distinct meaning-conveyors that might be used in still further creations. As for the word court, it too, when perceived as a distinct form, was seen to combine easily with some of the native suffixes, yielding such new words as courtliche, and later, courtlinesse. The process involved is not much different from that by which a child gains control over the structure of his native language.

Thus appears, at least in part, the method by which foreign suffixes were able to superimpose themselves upon the structure of English. But, since these after all represented foreign sound sequences, and as such might

have been expected to pose articulation problems that would have militated against their acceptance, it is necessary to look carefully at their phonetic shapes.

Among languages as similar as members of the Italic, Germanic, and Romance families, it is not surprising that there should be a certain degree of phonological coincidence between lexical or grammatical morphemes with similar meanings.⁹ Morphemes from different but related languages will occasionally possess roughly the same phonetic shape. In such cases, even though semantic shift may have occurred in one of the languages so that similar forms no longer denote the same thing, their phonetic similarity will induce naive speakers to regard them as somehow equivalent. Such reinforcement helps explain why a suffix, even though it did not conform to one of the preferred phonetic shapes of English, may have survived, been accepted as a borrowing, or renewed its productivity due to the falling together of a native form and a foreign borrowing. This happened in the case of -er, which had functioned with minor phonetic variation as an agentive suffix in both the Germanic and the Romance languages.

In attempting to evaluate the role played by phonology, it is first necessary to determine the generalized phonetic shapes of the sound sequences of English suffix morphemes. If among these shapes certain ones prove to be predominant or to include a significant proportion of the highly productive suffixes, there is reason to regard these as preferred canonical forms. Further, if a correlation between phonetic shape and the identity of OE suffixes retained at later stages of the language can be demonstrated, the

probable validity of phonological criteria as descriptive and predictive tools is increased. In the same manner, discovery of suffixes with non-preferred shapes among those abandoned during the early stages of the language, or among any foreign ones which English speakers rejected or modified to conform to customary canonical forms would confirm the conditioning effect claimed for phonetic pattern pressure. If, however, when this has been done, the behavior of certain suffixes refuses to conform to predicted patterns, the theory must be revised until it does account satisfactorily for all the data in the corpus examined. For any unaccounted-for residue, other conditioning factors must be sought.

The thirty-four most common derivative suffixes of Old English are listed in Table I, p. 22. These were realized in the following phonetic shapes:

V (vowel)	[-u ^o -o] [-e] [-a]
C (consonant)	[-d--t]
VC	[-et:] [-an] [-ad ^o -od] [-en] [-ed] [-ol ^o -el] [-iʃ] [-ig]
CV	[-re] [-we-] [-si-]
CVC	[-nes] [-dom] [-ʃip] [-bor-] [-ha:d] [-la:k] [-læk-] [-ræð-] [-līk] [-ful] [-læs] [-bær-] [-sum]
CVCC	[-liŋg] [-kund] [-fæst] [-wist] [-weard]
VCC	[-ung] [-est] [-eis] [-end]

Seven syllable patterns are discernible among the suffixes. Of these, two (CVC and VC) account for twenty-five of the forty-five syllable actualizations that comprise the inventory. Among the most frequently

recurring suffixes in the table (i.e., the first nine substantive and the first seven adjunctive-forming ones), ten are formed exclusively on the VC or CVC patterns, while two of the remaining six include a sequence CVC as their major component. The evidence is sufficient to warrant regarding the utterance of CVC or VC as preferred phonotactic practices in English. The OE suffixes that survived in early derived words or that continued their productivity (-ing, -dom, -ness, -less, -full, -ish, and -hood) were all manifested in the preferred forms. OE forms -scīpe, -lic, and -ig, which also survived, did so in modified form. The latter two--and most important--members of this set, unlike -scīpe, did not assume either of the two popular shapes. Their subsequent high productivity in patterns CV and V constitutes an apparent anomaly that demands further investigation.

It does seem reasonable, though, to suspect a connection between the productivity of these two suffixes and the articulatory ease with which their terminal phonemes /-iy-/-i-/-i/ slur into the following vowels or consonants at morpheme margins which result from the compounding of suffixes. The phonetic similarity between high front or high central vowels and the front glide /y/ plays a part here. This glide and the central glide /H/ do figure prominently in transitions near syllable boundaries. Such boundaries frequently coincide with those of morphemes. While the evidence cited is not by itself conclusive, it does support the contention that departure of the suffixes -ly and -y from the otherwise preferred phonetic shapes is less an anomaly than it is evidence of another aspect of phonetic pattern pressure at work. In any case, it seems probable that phonotactics

was a major conditioning factor among those that determined the nature of English derivational suffixing.

The plausibility of this assumption is further enhanced when it is noted that among the many OE suffixes that disappeared in Middle English, only six had displayed the patterns CVC or VC. Still more support is found in examples provided by modern English. List C of Appendix B describes suffix identities and frequencies found in a corpus derived from a sampling of contemporary literature. Here again, with respect to the two preferred syllable patterns for suffixes, proportions roughly similar to those noted in Middle English obtain. Of the nineteen most frequently recurring suffixes, eleven follow the patterns -CVC and -VC. One of the remaining eight consists of a sequence -VC.VC. Clearly, the preference for these canonical forms has been a persistent feature of English for nearly a thousand years. This in turn goes far to explain why such forms as -bora, -ræden, -cund, or -estre gave way to borrowed forms like -er--ar--or, -ier, -age>[-ad₃], and -ous, -al--all of which conform to the preferred shapes.

Yet it would be incorrect to regard phonological compatibility with established patterns, and linguistic domination of English by French as the only factors according to which the fate of a suffix was decided. Among the borrowed morphemes previously cited are several whose forms and grammatical functions corresponded in French and English. Examples are furnished by -er and -en. In cases where this sort of relation existed, the effect was to facilitate acquisition of the borrowed form and at the same time stabilize the native form. If the borrowed suffix happened to manifest

itself in more than one functional class, there was a strong possibility that prior familiarity with its phonetic shape inclined English speakers to employ it readily in its new syntagmatic associations as soon as these were perceived. Moreover, there was the likelihood that it would be used freely with both foreign and native stems.

The final consideration in contrasting the derivational systems of the two periods of English concerns the actual disappearance of so many of the OE suffixes. Two inferences are possible. Either many of the suffixes were no longer being treated as component elements of syntagms in which they occurred, and were given up along with their associated stems; or, they were discarded due to the pressure exerted by foreign suffixes that combined greater simplicity of articulation with wider flexibility in application. Also, ability to combine with stems without regard for their grammatical gender became increasingly important in determining the viability of a suffix. This factor began operating as soon as the disappearance of grammatical gender from English resolved the problem of maintaining the masculine-feminine distinction among derived substantives and adjunctives.

Summarized, the hypothesis presented here states that derivational suffixing in modern English represents a word-forming subsystem that operates at both the morphological and lexico-semantic levels within the structural hierarchy of the language. This subsystem differs from the one employed in Old English by being more flexible and by carrying a heavier functional load. It developed largely during the early Middle English period and was the direct outgrowth of three major factors. These were socio-political pressure, lexico-semantic intrusion, and an inherited phonotactic "set."

The entire phenomena of development represent a linguistically normal course of development. Given a similar situation having two languages in contact within a single speech community, results are predictable for such instances of diglossia whenever the quantitative values of the relevant factors can be determined accurately and integrated on the basis of known postulates of linguistic behavior and language structure.

CHAPTER II

THE SUFFIXES OF MIDDLE ENGLISH

Despite a pronounced discontinuity in dialectal form between the literary language of the late West Saxon Kingdom and the East Midland speech of the emergent Middle English literature of the twelfth century, it must be emphasized that the dialects in which the new literature began appearing were still direct descendants of the earlier language. During the hiatus in English letters immediately following the Norman Conquest, much the same leveling factors had been at work in all the districts of England, operating to produce a group of dialects which, however much their phonological and morphophonemic idiosyncracies varied, were all moving along the same evolutionary track from a synthetic, highly inflected grammar toward an analytical, hypotactic grammatical structure. The dialects shared a common, if swiftly changing, vocabulary. And it was precisely in the area of vocabulary that one of the major features differentiating the English of the two periods developed.

English speech, through the medium of borrowing, first from Norman French, later from Latin and the dialect of central France, acquired a large number of new lexical items. Many of these were formed from substantive or predicative roots or stems combined with derivative suffixes. Some of the suffixes were similar to earlier English forms. Others differed phonetically but performed functions common to certain OE suffixes. Still others served purposes not previously appreciated in English.

Table I, p. 22, depicts the general nature of the Old English suffix inventory. For contrastive purposes, the variety of comparable forms made available by the end of the fourteenth century through multiple borrowings from French appears in Table II, p. 23. The OE forms are attested by Wright as well as by Quirk and Wrenn.¹ Baugh and Skeat are in general agreement concerning the identities of the French loan words.² List B, Appendix B, shows the total suffix inventory of the corpus.

Comparison of the suffixes listed in the two tables reveals that, while several of the OE forms had functions narrowly defined by the dictates of grammatical gender, this was not true of the borrowed suffixes. In view of the well developed trend in late Old English away from grammatical gender and toward a natural one, this factor may be presumed to have enhanced the versatility of certain French suffixes, thus facilitating their extension by analogy to combine with English words. The resultant gradual change in the suffixing habits of English speakers is reflected in the lists of Appendix B. These depict the suffix inventories and show item frequencies in representative samples chosen from the writings of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Appendix A describes the text sources from which the corpus was gathered.

Although List B, Appendix B, contains all the suffixes encountered in the text samples, not all of the forms listed have been subjected to further analysis. The reason for excluding some suffixes was twofold. Treating their added number would have extended the scope of the thesis and increased its volume to an unacceptable degree. More important, some of the suffixes, on the basis of their high recurrence rates or records of subsequent high

TABLE I
 OLD ENGLISH SUFFIXES
 IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

OE Suffix ^a	Grammatical Function
<u>Substantive-forming</u>	
-nes(s)	feminine abstract N<adj.
-ung	feminine abstract N<vb.
-dom	abstract N<noun or adj.
-end	masculine agent N<noun or vb.
-scipe	masculine abstract N<noun or adj.
-ad -od	masculine abstract N<vb.
-bora	masculine agent N<noun.
-els	masculine concrete N<abstr. noun.
-en	feminine N<masculine noun.
-ere	agent N<noun or vb.
-estre	feminine agent N<noun or vb.
-had	masculine abstract N<noun or adj.
-lac	neuter abstract N<noun or vb.
-ling	diminutive masc. N<noun.
-ræden	feminine abstract N<noun.
-e -t	feminine abstract N<noun or adj.
-wist	feminine abstract N<noun or adj.
-u ^o -o	feminine abstract N<adj.
<u>Adjunct-forming</u>	
-ig	Adj.<noun.
-lic	Adj.<noun or adj.
-ful(l)	Adj.<abstract noun.
-ed	privative Adj.<noun; Adj.<vb.
-leas	Adj.<noun.
-en	Adj.<concrete noun.
-baere	productive Adj.<noun stem.
-cund	qualitative Adj.<noun stem.
-oT -el	Adj.<vb.
-isc	Adj.<noun.
-sum	Adj.<noun.
-weard	directive Adj.<noun.
-fæst	Adj.<noun or adj.
<u>Verb-forming</u>	
-ettan	frequentive or intensive V<vb.
-læcan	V<adj. or noun.
-(e)sian	V<adj. or noun.

^aSuffixes appear in order of frequency.

TABLE II
 SUFFIXES BORROWED WITH EARLY FRENCH LOAN WORDS
 (ACCORDING TO GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION)

Function	Suffix ^{a, b}	Typical Loan Words
abstract N<noun	-ty -age	authority, nobility, property homage, courage, pilgrimage
abstract N<adj.	-y -ty -ess -ment	courtest adversity, purity largess garment, sacrament
abstract N<vb.	-age -ance -(i)on -ment -al -ure -y	heritage, marriage dalliance vision tournament, punishment, judgment battle tenure inquiry
agent N<noun	-(i)er -ar(y)	messenger, soldier apothecary, notary
agent N<vb.	-(i)er -(i)or -ant	juggler juror lieutenant, servant
fem. N< masc. noun	-ess	abbess
Adj.<noun	-ous -al	perilous, treacherous royal, loyal, actual, principal
Adj.<vb.	-ant -ous -able -ive	abundant covetous probable, amiable active
Vb.<adj. or noun	-ffy	purify, satisfy

^aSuffixes and loan words are given in their modern graphic equivalents rather than in the various manuscript spellings.

^bSuffixes repeated in more than one functional category are considered to be identical.

productivity, seemed to offer more profitable objects for study. Thus, many of those whose ultimate etymons were Greek or Latin, but whose chief applications appeared later in quite specialized vocabularies, do not merit extensive discussion here. Many of them, moreover, became current in the language only after the Middle English era when change in the vocabulary structure was already well advanced. Similarly, some suffixes which were quite probably no longer felt as such even in late Old English are not treated as productive elements of the suffix inventory. These latter, although they had in fact been the direct progenitors of many of the lexical items inherited by Middle English, were considered to have expired as active formative elements of the language.

Table III, p.25, lists all the suffixes found in four samples of 13th-Century literature. The corpus, of which approximately one-fourth is prose, consists of some 15,800 words. Table IV, p. 28, shows in similar format the suffix list from five late 14th-Century tests. These 13,650 words have similar proportions of prose and verse. The design of the tables permits comparison of the suffix systems of the two periods with respect to item identities, frequencies of occurrence, the proportion of suffixed words to total word count, and number of suffixes of each functional type in general use.

When the proportion of suffixed words to total words was calculated for each of the two periods, it was demonstrated that a one hundred percent increase had occurred by the middle of the fourteenth century, the respective ratios for each period being 3.1 and 6.2 derivative suffixes per 100 words.

TABLE III
EARLY XIIIITH-CENTURY SUFFIXES

Sample	Word Count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio ^a (suffixed/total)
<u>1</u> (verse)	<u>3,000</u> (noun-forming)	<u>19+4^b</u>	<u>126+11</u>	<u>.046</u>
		-th	(16)	
		-ness	(12)	
		-ish	(10)	
		-dom	(4)	
		-end	(3)	
		-er	(3)	
		-lec	(1)	
		-ment	(1) = 50	
		(adj-forming)	-y	
	-ish		(10)	
	-en		(9)	
	-ly		(5)	
	-ful		(2)	
	-les		(1)	
	-end		(1)	
	-th		(1) = 54	
	(adv-forming)	-ly	(11)	
		-sum	(9)	
		-ward	(2) = 22	
	(compounds)	-endom	(4)	
-iness		(3)		
-wardly		(2)		
-ishen		(2) = 11		
<u>2</u> (verse)	<u>4,400</u> (noun-forming)	<u>19+2</u>	<u>81+2</u>	<u>.018</u>
		-th	(26)	
		-ing	(11)	
		-ness	(7)	
		-rich	(3)	
		-ling	(2)	
		-er	(2)	
		-dom	(2)	
		-y	(1)	
		-cund	(1) = 55	

^aRatios are based on proportions of substantive and adjunctive suffixes to total number of nouns and adjectives per sample. Ratios were not calculated for compounds and adverbial suffixes.

^bSimple and compound suffixes are counted separately.

TABLE III (continued)

Sample	Word count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio (suffixed/total)
	(adj-forming)	-ly -ind -feald -y -wise -ful -en	(8) (2) (2) (2) (1) (1) (1) = 17	.051
	(adv-forming)	-ly -ward -wise	(7) (1) (1) = 9	
	(compound)	-wiseness -cundness	(1) (1) = 2	
<u>3</u> (prose)	<u>3,400</u> (noun-forming)	<u>19+3</u> -ing -th -ness -end -ion -er -ship -dom -y	<u>140+4</u> (16) (12) (10) (7) (5) (4) (2) (1) (1) = 58	<u>.041</u>
	(adj-forming)	-y -ly -en -les -sum -ful -feald -fish	(28) (18) (8) (4) (4) (3) (2) (1) = 70	.331
	(adv-forming)	-ly -ward	(11) (3) = 14	
	(compound)	-lessness -sumly -sunness	(2) (1) (1) = 4	

TABLE III (continued)

Sample	Word count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio (suffixed/total)
<u>4</u> (verse)	<u>5,000</u> (noun-forming)	<u>20</u> -ing -th -ness -hood -y -ure -ard -ling -ery -aille -er -ess	<u>97</u> (23) (22) (7) (5) (5) (4) (4) (3) (2) (2) (2) (1) = 80	<u>.019</u>
	(adj-forming)	-en -y -th -ly -ish	(6) (3) (2) (2) (1) = 14	.112
	(adv-forming)	-ly -ward -y	(1) (1) (1) = 3	.040

TABLE IV
MID & LATE XIVTH-CENTURY SUFFIXES

Sample	Word count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio (suffixed/total)	
<u>1</u> (verse)	<u>2,448</u> (noun-forming)	<u>18+1</u>	<u>66+2</u>	<u>.029</u>	
		-ing	(8)		
		-ayl	(8)		
		-our	(6)		
		-er	(4)		
		-oun	(4)		
		-th	(3)		
		-ship	(2)		
		-ness	(2)		
		-ant	(2)		
		-y	(1)		
		-dom	(1) = 41	.147	
		(adj-forming)	-y	(4)	
			-en	(4)	
-th	(3)				
-and	(2)				
-ly	(2)				
-ish	(1) = 16		.084		
(adv-forming)	-ly	(9) = 9			
(compounds)	-enisse	(1)			
	-iness	(1)			
	-endom	(1) = 3			
<u>2</u> (verse)	<u>3,810</u> (noun-forming)	<u>29+5</u>	<u>208+11</u>	<u>.055</u>	
		-or	(18)		
		-th	(6)		
		-ing	(5)		
		-ness	(3)		
		-y	(2)		
		-oun	(2)		
		-ure	(2)		
		-ment	(2)		
		-ancy	(2)		
		-ayl	(1)		
		-ship	(1)		
		-dom	(1)		
		-hed	(1)		
-ant	(1)				
-tec	(1) = 50	.088			

TABLE IV (continued)

Sample	Word count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio (suffixed/total)
	(adj-forming)	-ly	(23)	
		-ous	(9)	
		-ful	(7)	
		-y	(7)	
		-ish	(4)	
		-ed	(3)	
		-th	(2)	
		-able	(2)	
		-sum	(1)	
		-en	(1)	
		-less	(1) = 60	.189
	(adv-forming)	-ly	(96)	
		-ward	(2) = 98	
	(compounds)	-eously	(6)	
		-fully	(2)	
		-shipful	(1)	
		-ily	(1)	
		-sumly	(1) = 11	
<u>3</u>	<u>1,386</u>	<u>23+1</u>	<u>103+1</u>	<u>.075</u>
(prose)	(noun-forming)	-ing	(16)	
		-ion	(16)	
		-nes	(9)	
		-ity	(6)	
		-ayl	(3)	
		-th	(2)	
		-ance	(2)	
		-our	(2)	
		-ment	(2)	
		-ary	(1)	
		-ish	(1)	
		-hed	(1) = 61	.203
	(adj-forming)	-ive	(8)	
		-ly	(6)	
		-y	(6)	
		-ful	(4)	
		-and	(3)	
		-ial	(1)	
		-ary	(1)	
		-en	(1)	
		-abl	(1) = 31	.344

TABLE IV (continued)

Sample	Word count	Suffixes	Occurrences	Ratio (suffixed/total)
		-hed	(4)	
		-ity	(3)	
		-dam	(2)	
		-ery	(2)	
		-our	(2)	
		-ure	(1) = 82	.216
	(adj-forming)	-ful	(12)	
		-y	(9)	
		-al	(7)	
		-ible	(3)	
		-fous	(3)	
		-ly	(2)	
		-ent	(1) = 37	.154
	(adv-forming)	-ly	(11)	
		-ward	(3)	
		-wise	(1) = 15	
	(compounds)	-fully	(1)	
		-shipful	(1)	
		-fally	(1) = 3	

Substantive suffixes accounted for a major part of the increase. Even more indicative of the change that had occurred was the general exchange of frequency ranks that took place between native and borrowed suffixes. The practice of compounding suffixes, itself a significant index of change, displayed a similar but less pronounced increase.

In the early thirteenth century -th and -ing were the two most frequent substantive suffixes; -nes had ranked just below them. Before the end of the following century, the gerund form, despite its high productivity, was scarcely more frequent than two of the French imports used to form agentive and deverbal substantives. These were -er- or -ion.³ Native -nes, which had ranked just below -th and -ing, had by the same time been degraded to sixth place. The three OE suffixes -dom, -had, and -end had fallen from frequency ranks 6, 4, and 5 to 12, 12, and 9, respectively. During the same interval, the borrowed forms -ion, -ayl (later -el- or -al), and -er, all of which had appeared in earlier loans, but with low frequencies, were now within the upper six ranks. This latter change, considered together with the increasing prevalence of words ending in -a(u)nce, -ity, -ment, and -ery, all from among the early Norman French loan words, evidenced the nature of the transformation in the system of suffixing.

A further comparison made between suffix identities and frequency ranks of the late fourteenth century and those of the present day made the scope of substitution of borrowed forms for native items still more apparent. This contrast is illustrated in List C, Appendix B. Of the six leading

substantive suffixes, native -ing has in modern English dropped from second to sixth place, surrendering part of its functional load to -ance. The very early borrowing -ment no longer appears among the six leading forms, but has dropped to tenth place. Among the adjunctive suffixes, the two forms -ly and -ful have fallen to eighth and tenth places respectively. The English weak preterite, dental, inflectional suffix -ed, however, has acquired a new functional load through its employment in innumerable adjunctive suffixes, among which it occupies second place. Mutually reinforcing borrowings from French and Latin have placed -al and -ous in first and third places respectively.

The foregoing examples typify the change processes noted throughout the Middle English period. They do not pretend to summarize all the details that comprised the change. Examination of later periods, e.g., Early Modern English, would disclose the fact that the language has maintained its propensity for borrowing not only formal elements, but also syntagmatic concepts from French and Latin.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Hans Marchand, The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-diachronic Approach. Alabama Philological and Linguistic Series #13 (Wiesbaden: Harfassowitz, 1960), (repr. University of Alabama Press, 1966).
2. O. Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1902-1949), vol. VI, (1942).
3. Walter W. Skeat, Principles of English Etymology, 2d Series Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1891).
4. Jespersen, op. cit.
5. Albert C. Baugh, A History of the English Language, 2d ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 201-209;
H. C. Wyld, The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue, An Introduction to Philological Method (London: John Murray, 1907);
Albert H. Marckwardt, Introduction to the English Language (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942);
Morton W. Bloomfield and Leonard Newmark, A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963).
6. Randolph Quirk and C. L. Wrenn, An Old English Grammar, 2d ed. (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1925), pp. 111-119.
7. Although not all of these have survived, they suffice to illustrate the point: 'abandon11' (Barber's Bruce-1375), 'asperliche' (Guy of Warwick-1314), 'clerliche' (Ayenbite of Inwit-1340), also 'clernesse' (from same source), and 'falsnesse' (mid-14th C.).

8. These are few in number. Among adjunctives, there are examples like 'æbrucol,' which yielded to 'sacrilegious' as the old term for religious law (æ) faded into obscurity. A similar course was followed by 'ædelu' when it gave way to 'nobility.'

9. An example from Old French is -ant, which formed agent substantives from present participles of verbs. This corresponded to the Germanic use of -and or -ond. The agentive suffixes formed from an unstressed vowel plus 'r' were also common in both the Romance and Germanic families.

CHAPTER II

1. Joseph and Elizabeth M. Wright, Old English Grammar, 3d ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), pp. 314-333; Quirk and Wrenn, An Old English Grammar, pp. 111-119.

2. Baugh, A History of the English Language, pp. 201-209; Skeat, Principles of English Etymology, pp. 76-125.

3. Marchand denies suffix status to the form -ion (and by implication, to the entire group of morphophonemic variants: -ation, -asion, and -acion) on the grounds of their primary membership in a non-English structural system, i.e., Neo-Latin. Since the feature in question has been adopted by English and employed with the same freedom as are native suffixing devices, Marchand's exclusion of the form from consideration as a suffix does not seem applicable in the present discussion.

APPENDIX A

THE CORPUS

The written material consulted in order to obtain a representative sample of the English language of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries comprised a variety of literary forms. Of some fifty edited texts based on manuscripts of the period, thirty-nine were selected for study. Ten of these were subsequently excluded from further consideration as having provenience outside the geographical or chronological areas of interest. Although an initial effort was made to balance the proportions of prose and verse included in the samples, it proved impossible to do so. There were simply too few English prose manuscripts dating from the early part of the era examined for which good edited texts were available. And, during the latter half of the thirteenth century and the first two thirds of the fourteenth, comparable quantities of prose and verse belonging to a particular decade or quarter-century were unobtainable. The resultant preponderance of verse included in the sampling raises some question of the accuracy of the language image reflected. To a certain extent, however, the question is answered when it is recognized that the diction of poetry does represent the capability of language to function effectively despite limitations imposed by the demands of metre, rhyme and style. Thus, the effect of poetic artificiality is held to be no more serious an impediment to recognizing the actual language of the period under study than are such factors as individual scribal errors and idiolectal peculiarities. These latter were as common to written as they were to spoken expression during the ages antedating the fixing of English orthographic practices.

The corpus consists of 87,179 words selected from the sources listed below. Texts of less than 5,000 words in length were exhaustively inventoried for their derivative suffixes; samples of varying length were taken from the longer texts. The provenience and pertinent descriptive remarks given for each source are drawn from J. E. Wells' A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050 - 1400. Compositions are listed in the closest approximation possible to the chronological order of their manuscripts. Authorship and details of publication appear in the bibliography.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Words</u>	<u>Description</u>
The Ormulun	verse	3,000	Composed <u>ca.</u> 1200 in NE Midlands. Text based on MS. Oxf. Bod. Jun. 1, a holograph. Ed. Mätzner. Latin-ate meter, unrhymed, homiletic.
A Moral Ode	verse	4,400	Composed <u>ca.</u> 1150 in So. Midlands. Text based on MS. Trin. Col. Cbg. B 14. 52 f2. Ed. Morris Rhymed couplets, monitory.
Trinity College Homilies	prose	3,400	Composed in 12th C. in SE Midlands. Text based on MS. trin. Col. Cbg. B, 14. 52 f.1. Ed. R. Morris. Four sermons: "Dominicum Palmarum," "In die Pasche," "Dominica i and iv post Pasche."
King Horn	verse	5,000	Composed in late 12th C. in S. Midlands. Text based on MS. Cbg. 4.27.2, <u>ca.</u> 1225. Ed. J. R. Lumby. Short rhymed couplets, alliterative romance.
An Bispe1	prose	2,000	Composed before 1150 in SE. Midlands. Text based on MS. Cot. Vesp. A.22 in a SW dialect of first half of 13th C. Ed. R. Morris, Homily.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Words</u>	<u>Description</u>
Sawles Warde	prose	4,300	Composed in first Q., 13th C. in SW. Midlands. Text based on MS. Oxf. Bod. 34, ca. 1230. Ed. R. Morris. Homily
A Lutel Soth Sermun	verse	500	Composed ca. 1230 in S. Midlands. Text based on MS. Cot. Calif. A ix, ca. 1250. Ed. R. Morris. Homily in alliterative short verses.
Ancren Riwle	prose	4,400	Composed during first Q., 13th C. in S. dialect area. Text from collation of MSS. Cot. Nero A XIV, Cot. Cleopatra C VI, and Cot. Tit. D XVIII, dated from 1230-1250. Ed. R. Morris. Monitory.
Dane Siriz	verse	2,200	Composed in SE Midlands or S. dialect area before 1272. Text based on unique MS. Digby 86 f. 165. Copies from an earlier E. Midland MS. by a scribe of the Southwest. Ed. G. H. McKnight. A fabliau in tail-rhymed aabccb. Dialogue predominates.
Layamon's Brut	verse	4,500	Composed in N. Worcestershire near beginning of 13th C. Text based on MS. Cot. Otho. C. XIII, ca. 1250 by a South-Western scribe. Ed. G. L. Brooks and R. F. Leslie. Alliterative verse with sporadic rhyme. Trans. from French, but with few words of Romance origin.
A Bestiary	verse	5,500	Composed in E. Midlands during first half of 13th C. Text based on MS. Arundel 292, F. 4 of the late 13th C. Ed. R. Morris. Expository and hortatory.
Floriz and Blauncheflur	verse	5,000	Composed in E. Midlands ca. 1250. Text based on MS. Cbg. Gg. 4.27.2, third Q., 13th C. Romance in three and four-stress couplets.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Words</u>	<u>Description</u>
The Harrowing of Hell	verse	1,500	Composed not later than 1250. Text based on MS. Brit. Mus. Harl. 2253, ca. 1300 in a dialect marked by southern features. Ed. W. H. Hulme. Homiletic legend in four-stress couplets.
Genesis	verse	4,500	Composed in SE. Midland dialect ca. 1250. Text based on MS. Corp. Chr. Col. Cbg. 444 f.1 in same dialect of about 1300. Ed. R. Morris. Biblical paraphrase in alliterative, four-stress couplets.
The Lay of Havelok The Dane	verse	4,500	Composed in the NE. Midlands at an unknown early date, (10th C. ?). Text based on MS. Laud Misc. 108 between 1300-1320, which although based on a NE. Midland original, shows a dialect mixture. Ed. W. Skeat. Romantic legend in four-stress couplets.
Handlyng Synne	verse	2,600	Composed in 1303 by Robt. Mannyng of Brunne. Text based on MS. Harl. 1701, an E. Midland writing of about 1360. Ed. R. Morris and W. W. Skeat. Hortatory tales in four-stress couplets.
Amis and Auiloun	verse	3,800	Composed in NE. Midlands in late 13th C. Text based on MS. Auchinleck (1330-1340). Ed. H. Weber. Romance in twelve-line, tail-rhymed aabaabccbddb.
Sir Tristrem	verse	1,920	Composed in N. Midlands near end of 13th C. Text based on MS. Auchinleck. Ed. A. Brandl and O. Zippel. Eleven-line, rhymed stanzas in ababababcbc.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Words</u>	<u>Description</u>
Lai le Freine	verse	2,400	Composed in SE. Midlands in early 14th C. Text based on MS. Auchinleck (1330-1340). Ed. E. H. Weber. Breton lay. Short couplets.
Horn Childe and Maiden Raimilde	verse	3,000	Composed ca. 1300-1325 in N. Midland dialect. Text based on MS. Auchinleck f. 317v. Ed. J. Ritson. Romantic legend in twelve-line-tail-rhymed stanzas in abaabccbdb.
Guy of Warwick	verse	2,448	Composed in N. Midland dialect not earlier than 1300. Text based on MS. Auchinleck. Ed. J. Zupitza. Romantic legend in twelve-line, tail-rhymed stanzas.
William of Palerne	verse	3,810	Composed in W. Midlands ca. 1350. Text based on MS. King's Col. Cbg. (1350). Ed. Morris and Skeat. Romantic legend.
The Form of Perfect Living	prose	1,386	Composed by Richard Rolle in a northern dialect in second Q., 14th C. Text based on MS. Cbg. Dd V. 64 (late 14th C.) Ed. C. Horstman. Hortatory.
The King of Tars and The Soudan of Dammas	verse	4,200	Composed in a Midland dialect ca. 1325. Text based on MSS. Auch (1330-1340), Vern (1370-1380), Brit. Mus. Add. 22283 (1380-1400). Ed. Ritson, Didactic Romance in 12-line tail-rhyme.
Petition from The Folk of Mercerye	prose	1,500	Composed in London dialect in 1386. Text based on MS. 5550, London Pub. Rec. O., dated 1386. Ed. Morsbach. Expository.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Words</u>	<u>Description</u>
The Guild of St. Leonard	prose	565	Composed in London dialect <u>ca.</u> 1389. Text from MS. in London Pub. Rec. O. (Misc. Rolls, Tower Records). Ed. Toulmin Smith.
The Nativity	prose	2,250	Composed by Wycliffe in E. Midland dialect <u>ca.</u> 1350. Text based on MS. Oxf. Bod. 788 (end of 14th C.). Ed. Arnold. Sermon.
A Treatise against Miracle Plays	prose	2,500	Composed in NW part of E. Midlands late in 14th C. Text based on MS. Brit. Mu. Add. 24.202 (Wycliffite Tracts in English), from end of 14th C. Ed. Cook. Sermon.
A Medieval Will	prose	600	Written 1399. Text based on MS. Oxf. Coll. 97, <u>ca.</u> 1400. Ed. Horstman. No pronounced dialectal features.

APPENDIX B
SUFFIX INVENTORIES

The following lists are appended in order to present a comprehensive account of the raw data obtained by inventorying the various portions of the corpus. Lists are ordered as follows:

- A. All suffixes found in the corpus, together with their orthographic variants.
- B. Suffix identities and recurrence counts for each Middle English text sample.
- C. Suffix identities and ranks based on recurrence counts in contemporary English text samples.

LIST A

SUMMARY OF SUFFIXES IN CORPUS

Type	Suffix	Variant Forms
Substantive	-age	ege, uage, eche,
	-ail	ayl, eyle, aile, eyl, ayle, ell, eil, eyll, eille, aille,
	-ard	art, ert,
	-aunt	ant, an, aunte, and, faunde, aun, aunde,
	-del	
	-dom	dome, dam,
	-ed	
	-ence	ance, aunce, ouns, aunicy,
	-en	ene,
	-th	ede,
	-ess	es, esse,
	-ity	yte, te, iti, ete, te, ite, itee, tie, ytee, ytye, etee,
	-y	efe, fe, ye, eis, e, i, ee, sy, e, ey,
	-hed	hede, hod, ode,
	-ine	
	-ist	
	-ise	ice, yse, ys, sye, ysy, cye,
	-ery	ere, erie, rie, ry, arie, rye, re,
	-ion	iun, faun, oun, ioun, eioun, ioune,
	-kin	kyn, kine,
	-lac	lec, le ₃₃ c,
	-lich	liche,
	-les	
	-ment	mente, men, mynt, minnt,
	-able	
	-ness	nesse, nisse, nes,
	-our	oure, owre, eour, four, your, ur, or, orre, for, ure, eure,
	-er	re, ir, yr, err, ar, are, ur, ure, ri, ere, eere, yrre, urre,
	-ship	scipe, sipe, schipe, schip, shippe, shipe, chep,
	-riche	rice, ryke,
	-ife	
-ing	unge, ong, ingge, inge, eng, end, ennde, ende, inde, ent,	
-ure	ur,	
-ward	wurde,	
Adjunct	-able	abil, abul, abel, eble, fble,
	-al	fal, el, ual, yal, all, fall, uall,
	-ate	
	-del	
	-ed	ede, fd, et, ete,

LIST A (continued)

Type	Suffix	Variant Forms
	-en	ene, enn, yn,
	-ele	
	-ous	eis, eys, ese, ise, es, ius, ious, yos, vous, ouse, eous, fouse,
	-er	
	-ful	fule, folle, fulle,
	-y	ie, i, eie, ige, in, i ₃ , zhe, z, i ₃ i,
	-ient	inde, ende, ennd, ande, and, aünt,
	-isshe	issce, isse, isske, is, ysch, yse,
	-les	lese, lees, leas, lease,
	-ly	lic, lich, liche, lice, luk, like, li ₃ ,
	-oise	us,
	-ary	ri, aire, aye, are,
	-sum	som, xum, um,
	-ure	
	-worde	wurde, werpe,
	-ife	yve, yfe, iff,
Adverb	-aunche	
	-del	deyl,
	-ed	
	-ing	inde, ande,
	-lese	
	-ly	lye, le, like, lice, liche, leche, lic, li ₃ ,
	-ful	fule,
	-ward	wart, warde,
	-wise	
	-sum	
	-lunge	
Verb	-ate	
	-ifi	

LIST B
SUFFIX FREQUENCIES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH TEXT SAMPLES

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			1st Q. 13th C.	
1	3,000	(subst)	-th	16
			-ness	12
			-ish	10
			-dom	4
			-end	3
			-er	3
			-lec	1
			-ment	1
		(adj)	-y	25
			-ish	10
			-en	9
			-ly	5
			-ful	2
			-les	1
			-end	1
			-th	1
		(adv)	-ly	11
			-sum	9
			-ward	2
		(comb)	-endom	4
			-iness	3
			-wardly	2
			-ishen	2
2	4,400	(subst)	-th	26
			-ing	11
			-ness	7
			-rich	3
			-ling	2
			-er	2
			-dom	2
			-y	1
			-cund	1
		(adj)	-ly	8
			-ind	2
			-feald	2
			-y	2
			-wise	1
			-ful	1
			-en	1
		(adv)	-ly	7
			-ward	1

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
		(comb)	-wise	1
			-wisness	1
			-cundness	1
3	3,400	(subst)	-ing	16
			-th	12
			-ness	10
			-end	7
			-ion	5
			-er	4
			-ship	2
			-dom	1
			-y	1
		(adj)	-y	26
			-ly	18
			-en	8
			-les	4
			-sum	4
			-ful	3
			-feald	2
			-ish	1
		(adv)	-ly	11
			-ward	3
		(comb)	-lessness	2
			-sunly	1
			-sunness	1
4	5,000	(subst)	-ing	23
			-th	22
			-ness	7
			-hood	5
			-y	5
			-ure	4
			-ard	4
			-ling	3
			-ery	2
			-aille	2
			-er	2
			-ess	1
		(adj)	-en	6
			-y	3
			-th	2
			-ly	2
			-ish	1
		(adv)	-ly	1
			-ward	1
			-y	1

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
2d Q. 13th C.				
5	2,000	(subst)	-ness	16
			-end	13
			-er	7
			-th	7
			-ment	2
			-ship	1
			-en	1
			-te	1
			-ling	1
			-y	1
		(adj)	-ly	1
			-y	21
			-ly	3
			-wise	2
			-ed	2
		(adv)	-en	1
			-ly	7
			-wise	1
			-ward	1
6	4,300	(subst)	-ing	42
			-th	38
			-ship	23
			-ness	18
			-lec	11
			-er	4
			-able	2
			-ure	2
			-ly	1
			-ling	1
		(adj)	-ly	25
			-y	13
			-ed	12
			-ful	8
			-del	3
			-wise	3
			-less	2
		(adv)	-ly	28
			-ward	7
			-less	1
			-ling	1
			-del	1
7	500	(subst)	-er	5
			-ing	2

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
		{adj}	-y	1
		{adv}	-ly	1
			-ful	1
			3d Q. 13th C.	
8	4,400	(subst)	-er	31
			-ing	19
			-ness	9
			-th	7
			-ance	5
			-ur	4
			-y	3
			-ed	2
			-ment	2
			-aunt	2
			-ship	2
			-fun	1
			-ful	1
			-ling	1
		(adj)	-ly	10
			-ful	10
			-y	8
			-ed	8
			-ende	5
			-ius	1
			-del	1
			-oise	1
			-sum	1
			-en	1
		(adv)	-ly	28
			-ward	11
			-y	2
			-ende	1
			-ful	1
9	2,200	(subst)	-kin	10
			-y	8
			-ing	6
			-er	3
			-th	2
			-dom	1
			-ed	1
			-ness	1
			-ment	1
		(adj)	-y	10
			-en	3
			-eis	3
			-ly	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
		(adv)	-ed	1
			-ly	4
			-ed	2
			-ward	2
			4th Q. 13th C.	
10	4,500	(subst)	-dom	5
			-ing	4
			-th	4
			-rich	4
			-ship	3
			-ant	1
			-ness	1
		(adj)	-ele	5
			-y	4
			-ish	3
			-ly	3
			-ed	2
			-sum	1
			-del	1
		(adv)	-en	1
			-ly	5
			-y	1
			-ward	1
11	5,500	(subst)	-ing	24
			-er	6
			-ship	4
			-hede	3
			-th	3
			-ness	3
			-rich	2
		(adj)	-y	11
			-ed	5
			-ful	5
			-ly	3
			-en	2
			-ande	2
			-les	1
			-riche	1
		(adv)	-ly	18
			-ward	8
			-ande	2
		(comb)	-ily	2
12	5,000	(subst)	-er	19
			-ing	12
			-th	10

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-ure	9
			-eis	6
			-ment	6
			-ard	5
			-ant	4
			-age	4
			-y	4
			-ness	2
			-hede	2
			-fon	2
			-ise	1
			-ly	1
			-dom	1
			-ance	1
		(adj)	-eis	6
			-th	5
			-ous	4
			-y	3
			-ful	2
			-ly	1
			-en	1
		(adv)	-ly	10
			-ward	1
			-wise	1
13	1,500	(subst)	-ness	3
			-oun	2
			-ing	2
			-ist	1
			-ard	1
			-rich	1
			-er	1
			-dom	1
			-ice	1
		(adj)	-y	5
			-ful	1
		(comb)	-erdom	1
14	4,500	(subst)	-ing	17
			-hed	12
			-ness	8
			-th	7
			-er	4
			-y	3
			-ment	2
			-ise	1
			-lac	1
			-ship	1
		(adj)	-y	19
			-ful	7

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-en	3
			-ly	3
			-ed	3
			-sum	2
			-ish	1
			-al	1
			-ery	1
		(adv)	-ly	3
			-del	3
			-wise	3
			-y	2
		(comb)	-fulhed	2
			-sumhed	2
			-lihed	1
			1st Q. 14th C.	
15	4,500	(subst)	-er	8
			-ing	7
			-y	4
			-ure	3
			-rich	2
			-ise	1
			-an	1
			-th	1
			-ison	1
			-ery	1
			-del	1
			-ward	1
			-ness	1
			-dom	1
		(adj)	-y	6
			-ed	1
			-ly	1
			-les	1
		(adv)	-ly	10
			-del	2
			-fule	1
			-y	1
			-warde	1
16	2,600	(subst)	-er	13
			-ing	11
			-y	9
			-aunce	8
			-ness	5
			-oun	4
			-aille	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-and	2
			-ment	1
			-th	1
		(adj)	-ise	1
			-y	6
			-ly	4
			-ful	3
			-ous	3
			-en	1
			-fal	1
			-ure	1
		(adv)	-able	1
			-ly	10
			-ward	3
		(comb)	-del	1
			-andy	1
			-ily	1
			-ering	1
			2d Q. 14th C.	
17	3,800	(subst)	-ing	32
			-th	26
			-our	13
			-y	10
			-oun	7
			-ity	6
			-er	6
			-ise	4
			-ment	1
			-ery	1
			-hed	1
			-ant	1
		(adj)	-y	21
			-ly	18
			-ful	3
			-eis	2
			-and	2
			-en	2
			-wise	1
		(adv)	-ly	11
			-warde	3
18	1,920	(subst)	-er	5
			-ing	5
			-oun	4
			-ment	4
			-th	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-our	2
			-ayl	2
		(adj)	-aunt	1
			-ly	2
			-y	2
		(adv)	-ful	1
		(adv)	-ly	7
		(comb)	-ily	1
19	2,400	(subst)	-ing	7
			-er	6
			-y	5
			-our	4
			-and	4
			-ayl	4
			-oun	4
			-age	3
			-aunce	2
			-th	2
			-kin	2
			-hed	1
			-ment	1
			-ness	1
		(adj)	-y	6
			-ful	3
			-ous	2
			-ly	1
			-ing	1
			-ment	1
			-sum	1
		(adv)	-ly	7
			-ande	2
20	3,000	(subst)	-ing	18
			-our	7
			-hed	5
			-ayl	4
			-and	4
			-ment	3
			-y	2
			-ed	1
			-er	1
			-aunce	1
			-kin	1
		(adj)	-y	3
			-ly	2
			-ful	1
			-ish	1
			-les	1

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
		(adv)	-ed	1
			-ly	7
			-ward	1
21	2,450	(subst)	-ing	8
			-ayl	8
			-our	6
			-er	4
			-oun	4
			-th	3
			-ship	2
			-ness	2
			-ant	2
			-y	1
			-dom	1
		(adj)	-y	4
			-en	4
			-th	3
			-and	2
			-ly	2
			-ish	1
		(adv)	-ly	9
		(comb)	-iness	2
			-endom	1
			3d Q. 14th C.	
22	3,810	(subst)	-or	18
			-th	6
			-ing	5
			-ness	3
			-y	2
			-oun	2
			-ure	2
			-ment	2
			-ancy	2
			-ayl	1
			-ship	1
			-dom	1
			-hed	1
			-lec	1
		(adj)	-ly	23
			-ous	9
			-ful	7
			-y	7
			-ish	4
			-ed	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-abul	2
			-th	2
			-en	1
			-les	1
			-sum	1
		(adv)	-ly	96
			-ward	2
		(comb)	-eously	6
			-fully	2
			-schipful	1
			-ily	1
			-sonly	1
			4th Q. 14th C.	
23	1,386	(subst)	-ion	16
			-ing	16
			-ness	9
			-ity	6
			-ayl	3
			-ance	2
			-ment	2
			-our	2
			-th	2
			-ary	1
			-hed	1
			-ish	1
		(adj)	-ive	8
			-ly	6
			-y	5
			-ful	4
			-and	3
			-abil	1
			-ary	1
			-en	1
			-ial	1
		(adv)	-ly	7
			-ward	4
		(comb)	-liness	1
24	4,200	(subst)	-yng	15
			-er	12
			-ayl	12
			-ment	9
			-re	8
			-th	5
			-en	4
			-ity	4
			-aunt	3
			-our	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-oun	2
			-et	2
			-ery	2
			-age	1
			-aunce	1
			-hede	1
			-ye	1
		(adj)	-en	17
			-ly	6
			-ful	3
			-th	1
			-y	1
		(adv)	-ly	5
		(comb)	-thful	1
25	1,500	(subst)	-ion	13
			-er	8
			-ing	7
			-ment	7
			-ance	7
			-y	6
			-ayl	6
			-ship	6
			-hede	4
			-ness	4
			-th	4
			-ity	3
			-dam	2
			-ery	2
			-our	2
			-ure	1
		(adj)	-ful	12
			-y	9
			-ial	7
			-ible	3
			-ous	3
			-ly	2
			-ent	1
		(adv)	-ly	11
			-ward	3
			-wise	1
		(comb)	-fully	1
			-shipful	1
			-ially	1
26	565	(subst)	-chep	4
			-con	4
			-age	4
			-y	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-ere	2
			-ity	2
			-ment	1
			-our	1
		(adj)	-y	4
			-ial	2
		(adv)	-ly	3
27	2,250	(subst)	-our	13
			-ing	9
			-ity	9
			-ance	5
			-oun	5
			-ship	5
			-th	5
			-ayl	4
			-er	4
			-hede	4
			-ness	4
			-ant	2
			-ment	2
			-y	2
			-dom	1
			-ise	1
			-ery	1
		(adj)	-ly	6
			-ible	4
			-ful	2
			-ing	2
			-y	1
			-id	1
			-ous	1
		(adv)	-ly	3
28	2,500	(subst)	-ing	61
			-oun	28
			-y	11
			-ity	10
			-ship	10
			-th	10
			-ness	9
			-ment	8
			-er	6
			-our	6
			-ery	4
			-ise	4
			-age	3
			-ounce	3

LIST B (continued)

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Suffix</u>	<u>Count</u>
			-aunt	3
			-ayl	1
		(adj)	-hod	1
			-ly	19
			-ful	13
			-ous	8
			-able	6
			-en	5
			-ing	4
			-al	3
			-v	3
			-ish	2
			-and	1
		(adv)	-er	1
			-ly	14
			-ward	2
			-y	1
			-wise	1
29	600	(subst)	-oun	7
			-ment	4
			-our	4
			-er	3
			-ant	2
			-aunce	1
			-ure	1
			-ness	1
			-hod	1
			-ship	1
		(adj)	-y	1
			-able	3
			-ful	2
			-y	2
			-en	1
			-less	1
			-ing	1
		(adv)	-ed	1
			-y	2
			-ly	1

LIST CPRINCIPAL SUFFIXES OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH^a

<u>Substantive</u> ^b	(form)	<u>Adjective</u>	(form)	<u>Predicative</u>	(form)
-er	VC	-al	VC	-ate	VC
-ion	CVC	-ed	VC	-ify	
-y		-ous	VC	-ize	VC
-ist		-ic	VC	-en	VC
-ance		-able			
-ing	VC	-y			
-et	VC	-ish	VC		
-ty		-ian	CVC		
-ness	CVC	-ant			
-ery		-ly			
-ment		-ing	VC		
-ism		-ary			
-ite	VC	-ate	VC		
-ant		-full	CVC		
-ure	VC	-ive	VC		
-al	VC	-less	CVC		
-ship	CVC	-oid	VC		
-ine	VC	-ar	VC		
-age	VC	-ard			
-ess	VC	-ile	VC		
-ian	CVC				
-hood	CVC				
-ling	CVC				
-cide	CVC				
-ate	VC				
-ette	VC				
-ics					
-eus	VC				
-ster					
-dom	CVC				
-oid	VC				
-ard					
-tude	CVC				
-ice	VC				

^aThe list is based on random samples from the writings of ten contemporary English and American authors. A lexicon inventory from a dictionary showed 60% to 100% coincidence between list and lexicon frequencies.

^bSuffixes are listed in order of descending frequency.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dictionaries

- Guralnik, David B. and Joseph Friend. (eds.). Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. (College ed.), New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962.
- Murray, James A. H. et al. (eds.). The Oxford English Dictionary. 13 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Stratmann, Frans H. A Middle-English Dictionary. Revised and edited by Henry Bradley. London: Oxford University Press, 1891.

Historical Studies

- Baugh, Albert C. A History of the English Language. (2d ed.), New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Clark, John W. Early English. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1957.
- Jespersen, Otto. Growth and Structure of the English Language. (9th ed.), Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Anchor Company, Inc., 1956.
- Moore, Samuel, and Thomas A. Knott. Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Morphology. (2d ed.), Ann Arbor, Mich: George Wahr, Publisher, 1907.
- Wylde, Henry C. The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue. London: John Murray, 1907.

Grammars

- Fries, Charles C. The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1952.
- Jespersen, Otto. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Vol. VI. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1942.
- Mossé, Fernand. A Handbook of Middle English. Trans. James A. Walker. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1952.
- Quirk, Randolph and C. L. Wrenn. An Old English Grammar. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1955.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth M. Wright. Old English Grammar. (3d ed.).
London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Linguistics

Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.). Universals of Language. (2d ed.).
Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Herdan, Gustav. The Advanced Theory of Language as Choice and Chance.
New York: Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc., 1966.

Marchand, Hans. The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-
Formation. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1966.

Skeat, Walter W. Principles of English Etymology. (2d ed.) Clarendon
Press Series, (First Series), Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1892.

Bibliography

Wells, John E. A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050 - 1400.
New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1926.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TEXT SOURCES

Middle English

- Brandl, A. and O. Zippel, eds. Middle English Literature. 2d ed., New York: Chelsea Publishing Co., 1949.
- Brooks, G. L. and R. F. Leslie, eds. Lamon: Brut. vol. 1, E.E.T.S. Orig. Ser. 250, London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Cook, A. S. ed. Literary Middle English Reader. Boston: Athenum Press, Ginn & Co., 1915.
- Horstman, C. ed. Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and His Followers. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1895.
- Hulme, W. H. ed. The Harrowing of Hell and the Gospel of Nicodemus. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1891.
- Lumby, J. R. ed. King Horn: with Fragments of Floriz and Blanchflur, and of the Assumption of Our Lady. E.E.T.S. Orig. Ser. 14, London: Trübner & Co., 1866.
- McKnight, G. H. ed. Middle English Humorous Tales in Verse. Belles Lettres Ser., Sec. II, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, 1913.
- Morris, R. ed. An Old English Miscellany. E.E.T.S. Orig. Ser. 49 London: Oxford University Press, 1872. (repr. 1927).
- _____. ed. Old English Homilies. 2d Ser., E.E.T.S. Orig. Ser. 53, 2 vols. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1873.
- _____. ed. Specimens of Early English, Part I, A.D. 1150 - A.D. 1300. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- _____. ed. The Story of Genesis and Exodus. 2d ed. E.E.T.S. Orig. Ser. 7, London: N. Trübner & Co., 1874.
- _____. and W. W. Skeat, eds. Specimens of Early English: Part II, A.D. 1298 - 1393. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Ritson, J. ed. Ancient English Romances. 3 vols. London: Bulmer & Co., 1802.
- Skeat, W. W. ed. The Lay of Havelok the Dane. E.E.T.S. Extra Ser. 4, London: N. Trübner & Co., 1868. (repr. 1889).

- _____. ed. William of Palerne. E.E.T.S. Extra Ser. 1, London: N. Trubner & Co., 1897.
- Weber, H. ed. Metrical Romances of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1810.
- Wright, Thomas and L. Halliwell. eds. Reliquiae Antiquae. London: William Pickering, 1843. (repr. 2 vols. New York: Ams Press, Inc., 1966).
- Zupitza, J. ed. The Romance of Guy of Warwick. E.E.T.S. Extra Ser. 59, London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1891.

Contemporary English

- Lowell, Robert. Lord Heary's Castle and The Mills of the Kavanaughs. New York: The World Publishing Corp., 1961.
- Maller, Norman. The Deer Park. New York: New American Library, 1962.
- Maugham, W. Somerset. The Summing Up. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Doran & Co., Inc., 1938.
- Moorehead, Alan. The Blue Nile. London: H. Hamilton, 1962.
- Orwell, George. Down and Out in London and Paris. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1933.
- Robinson, John A. T. Honest to God. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- Russell, Bertrand. Wisdom of the West. ed. Paul Faulkes. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Doran & Co., Inc., 1959.
- Tuchman, Barbara. The Guns of August. New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.
- van Loon, Hendrik W. The Story of Mankind. New York: Boni and Liveright, Inc., 1921.
- Ustinov, Peter. Add a Dash of Pity. Boston: Little Brown, Inc., 1959.

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS
OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DERIVATIVE SUFFIXING IN ENGLISH

by

KENNETH RUSSELL REID

B. A., Kansas State University, 1967

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to account for the change in the process of word formation by derivation in English. The problem consists in describing the dissimilar suffix inventories of early Middle English and present-day English, and identifying the factors that caused the loss of former derivative suffixes and gain of new ones.

Material for study was provided by edited texts of selected 13th and 14th-century manuscripts and randomly chosen prose and verse passages by 20th-century English and American authors. Text passages were inventoried in order to obtain lists of suffixes and counts of their occurrence frequencies. Differences in suffix identities and frequencies pertaining to the beginning and end of the Middle English era, as well as to the present, were studied in order to determine what patterns of change were evident.

It was established that the most significant changes occurred during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when English borrowed extensively both words and suffix morphemes from Norman French. The chief factors that enabled foreign suffixes to become established in English were identified as pressures resulting from the social and political dominance of England by the Normans, the reinforcing effect of reiterated borrowing of words and morphemes from French and Latin, coupled with the phonetic similarity of some of them to forms already existent in English, and, finally, a phonotactic "set" or tendency of English speakers to prefer certain vowel-consonant patterns in suffixes.