

***Determining the criteria that are useful to identify the derivational and/or
compositional capabilities of lexical items in Old English.***

ANA IBÁÑEZ MORENO AND ELISA GONZÁLEZ TORRES

UNIVERSITY OF LA RIOJA (SPAIN)

The issue of word formation in Old English has attracted the attention of many authors, but it is still unresolved in many aspects, due to its complexity. This is due, no doubt, to the enormous productive potential of the language under study, which grants it with a rich and varied amount of lexically derived items, out of which just some of them are totally transparent. Kastovsky himself (1992) states that there is yet a lot to investigate. In fact, the basic premises that would serve to describe and explain the derivational morphology in Old English are still unclear. That is, there is not, at the moment, a consensus as regards the primary methodological distinction between derivation and composition. In order to establish this distinction in a clear way, we need to define a number of criteria that permit us to identify which lexical items should be considered *affixes* and which should be categorized as *non affixes*. In this sense, De la Cruz (1975), Hiltunen (1983) and Kastovsky (1992: 362-364) mention some of them, but they do not provide a fully clear and systematic classification.

For this, this paper deals with the establishment of the principles that should be applied in order to identify certain word segments as affixal. Such principles have been designed by taking into account both external and internal criteria; external, in the sense that some of them are universal, and internal, in the sense that others are only applicable to the language under study, that is, Old English. Some of these criteria are adopted from Martín Arista (forthcoming). Taking these principles as a starting point, we obtain a classification of words in Old English that is based on the distinction between derivation and composition.

Such criteria are formulated in the form of principles: 1) *Principle of Morphological Dependency*, related, as Martín Arista (forthcoming) points out, to the distinction between lexical and grammatical features of words, and to the meaning of each of these features; 2) *Principle of Morphological Hierarchy*, elaborated from the fact that in Old English there do not exist predicates that are composed out of two bound predicates; 3) *Principle of Syllabic Structure*, defined in accord with the frequency with which free or bound predicates are monosyllabic or polysyllabic; 4) *Principle of Secondary Accent*, established departing from the accentuation rules in Old English.

In this piece of work, however, we just apply these criteria to post-field affixes, that is, to suffixes, in spite of the fact that the criteria are applicable to the pre-field of the word too. The reason for this is the necessity to limit our field of research, in order to grant our study with exhaustiveness. For us, suffixes are those segments of complex words, dependent on a lexical base, that do not grant it with any semantic content. Thus, taking the lists of suffixes that are available in the literature (Jember 1975, Quirk and Wrenn 1955) we carry out a revision of them by applying the criteria mentioned above.

1. INTRODUCTION

Word formation in Old English –hereafter OE- is an issue that, despite having called the attention of many authors, such as Jespersen (1972), who grants great importance to this language field, or Cathey (2000), who acknowledges the relevance of the study of productive affixes from a historical perspective, has still many unresolved questions, due to its complexity. This is due, no doubt, to the great productivity of the language in question, which makes it possess a rich and varied lexical derivation, and

relatively transparent. Kastovsky (1992) himself remarks that there is still a lot of work to be done. Going further, the basic premises to describe and explain the derivational morphology of Old English have not yet been clarified; in this sense, there does not exist nowadays a consensus regarding the distinction between derivation and composition.

In order to establish this distinction in a clear way, we need to define a series of criteria that allow us to distinguish which lexical elements must be considered affixes and which must be categorized as non-affixes. In this line, Kastovsky (1992: 362-364) mentions some possible criteria, but he does not establish a clear and systematized classification of them.

For this, in this piece of research we propose a number of principles that may be applied to solve this issue. We only focus on post-field affixes –that is, on suffixes- in order to restrict our field of study so as to carry out an exhaustive analysis of each of them. Then, departing from the inventories of suffixes that are presently available in the literature, we carry out a revision of each of them by applying a series of criteria that permit to distinguish which are derivative and which are compositive.

In other words, we have analyzed each of these items in order to determine whether they can be considered as suffixes or not. We have also analyzed all the words that derive from them, either compositively or derivatively. This process has been carried out through *Nerthus*¹, a morpho-lexical computerized database of OE. This database has been created departing from the information available in the OE dictionary *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Clark Hall –hereafter CH- 1996). This database permits to make concrete queries of a specific segment, and/or of all the predicates that occur within that segment.

2. SOME PREVIOUS METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

At this point, it is necessary to point out some previous terminological issues: suffixes are the segments of a complex word that depend on the lexical base and that do not grant such base with a purely semantic meaning. Thus, a suffix can give categorial information, among other things, but it does not influence the denotative meaning of the

¹ *Nerthus* is a database elaborated within the research project HUM 2005-07651-C02-02/FILO, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Sciences and Education (MEC).

base to which it is attached. For instance, the suffix *-en* is used in order to obtain adjectives out of nouns. As such, it adds the meaning ‘quality of’ to the base. However, such base (a noun) does not lose its original semantic force when *-en* is added to it. The meaning of *-en* is purely grammatical: it is related to a concrete word category, that is, to adjectives, but it itself does not contain a denotative sense, that is, it does not make reference to anything in the real world. Thus, we have *stæ:nen* ‘of stone’, derived from *stæ:n* ‘stone’.

Little has been written on all this, and the lists of suffixes we have date from the last century. It is true that Hiltunen (1983) pays attention to affixal predicates, but he focuses on pre-field verbal affixes, that is, on verbal prefixes. More specifically, he deals with inseparable prefixes. After a revision of the literature related to OE suffixes, the inventory selected as a starting point here is the one that comes out by combining the list that Jember (1975) provides with the one given in Quirk & Wrenn (1994). Both are complementary. On one side, Jember (1975) provides a more exhaustive list, in the sense that he includes more suffixes. Nonetheless, there is also a suffix in Quirk & Wrenn (1994) that is not present in Jember (1975): *-en*. The complete list of suffixes that results from joining both of them is seen in (1). The suffixes that are only in Jember (1975) are in bold type:

(1)

-að (=oð), -bær:e, -bora, -cund, -do:m, **-e (= -lice)**, -ed(e), -el (= -ol, -ul, **-od, -er, -or**), -els, -en, -end (= **nd**), -ere, **-erian (= -orian)**, -erne, -estre, -et(t), -ettan, fæst, -feald, -ful(l), -ha:d, -ig, -iht, -incel, -ing (= -ung), -isc, -la:c, -læ:can, -le:as, -lic, -ling, **-mæst (= -mest)**, -nes(s) (= -nis, -nys), **-nian, -noð (= -oð)**, -ræ:den, **-sæte (= -ware)**, -scipe, -(e)sian, **-stafas**, -sum, -ð(o) (=ð(u)), **-u (-o), -unga, (= -inga)**, -weard, -wende, **-wist**

There is one drawback to directly selecting Jember’s (1975) list: this author ignores a feature of vowels that is very important in OE: their quantity. That is, whether they are long or short. This information, which we have maintained from Quirk & Wrenn (1994), is essential. Going further, it constitutes in some cases a primary differentiating element, since one same lexical item may belong to one category or another, or vary in its meaning, depending on the length of any of its vowels; in the same way, it can be the case that a predicate X does not exist with the vowel Y long or short. We have an example of this in (2):

(2)

-bæ:re (Q & W) vs. *-bære* (J)

-ha:d (Q & W) vs. *-had* (J)

-la:c (Q & W) vs. *-lac* (J)

-lice (J)

In Jember's (1975) list, the predicate *(-)bæ:re/(-)bære* is with short *æ*. However, such predicate does not exist in OE, neither as a free nor as a bound predicate. It only exists *(-)bæ:re*. Therefore, it is wrong to include *-bære* as a valid OE predicate. This also occurs with *(-)ha:d/(-)had*. *(-)had* does not exist in OE, neither as an independent form nor as a suffix. The case of *(-)la:c/(-)lac* is slightly different, since in OE it existed *lac*. *Lac* is a free predicate from which others, such as *lacan* or *lacu*, are derived. *Lac* only functions as a basic segment from which other words derive, but it does not function as a compositive predicate. This means that there does not exist any composed word that is formed by a specific base plus *-lac*.

Finally, Jember (1975) adds the predicate *(-)lice* to Quirk & Wrenn's list (1994). However, since he does not distinguish whether it is with long or with short *i* we must investigate that. After searching in *Nerthus*, we obtain that *(-)lice* only exists with long *i*, as *(-)li:ce*.

Besides this, we have also found cases in which one of the predicates of the list exists both with long vowel, as found in Quirk & Wrenn (1994), and with short vowel, as present in Jember (1975). In such case, it can be the case that there are two different predicates with a different meaning, as in the case we have just seen of *(-)la:c/(-)lac*, or it be one same segment that can occur with a short and with a long vowel. As an example of a segment that has the same meaning both with long and with short vowel we have suffix *(-)dom*, which in Quirk & Wrenn (1994) is registered with long *o*, *-do:m*. In CH (1996) *-do:m* only appears as a suffix, in the same way as in Quirk & Wrenn (1994). But, after making some queries in *Nerthus*, we find that there are quite a lot of derivatives with *-dom* in OE. That is, *-do:m* is included in CH (1996) as a suffix, but not *-dom*. Besides, *-do:m* also exists as a free predicate. In (3) we have the semantic information that CH (1996) provides regarding *(-)do:m*:

(3)

do:m m. ‘doom’, judgement, ordeal, sentence, decree, law, ordinance, custom, justice, equity, opinion, advice, choice, option, free-will, condition, authority, supremacy, majesty, power, might, reputation, dignity, glory, honour, splendour, court, tribunal, assembly, meaning, interpretation.

-do:m masc. abstract suffix = *state, condition, power*, etc. as in *fre:odo:m*

In spite of these data, we have items such as *ga:stedom* ‘spirituality’, related to *ga:st* ‘soul, spirit’, or *ca:serdom* ‘imperial sway’, coming from *Ca:sere*, ‘Caesar, emperor’. They are some of the derived predicates that take the suffix *-dom*, and, as can be observed, such a suffix seems to give the same information as *-do:m*. Thus, we see that there does not exist any important difference between *-do:m* and *-dom* when they take place in compositional processes, since both segments indicate ‘state of’. In this case, it may be that CH (1996) himself mistakenly ignored the detail of vocalic quantity.

On the other hand, we have the case of *-lic/-li:c*. This case is different, since in Quirk & Wrenn (1994) *-li:c* is not present. As a result, in both lists, Quirk & Wrenn’s (1994) and Jember’s (1975), *-lic* appears only with short vowel. However, if we look for *li:c* in Nerthus, we obtain that it is a free predicate that works both as a noun and as an adjective and that it additionally forms composed words, such as *unge:li:c* ‘unlike, different’ or *Swi:nli:c* ‘Swinnish’. In a nutshell, and bearing in mind the criteria we present here in order to distinguish compositive and derivative suffixal predicates, vowel quantity is a distinctive feature that permits to classify and to distinguish them in terms of semantic, morphological and/or grammatical features.

3. CRITERIA TO DISTINGUISH THE TYPES OF AFFIXAL PREDICATES OF OLD ENGLISH

Regarding the issue that interests us, that is, the criteria that serve to determine in a theoretical and practical way which of the predicates included in (1) are pure suffixes, non suffixes or pseudo-suffixes², we have proceeded in the following way: after observing the lexicographical data available in the synchrony (in *Nerthus* and CH 1996) and after consulting various bibliographical sources (Kastovsky 1968, 1992; Campbell 1977, etc.) we have applied a number of criteria to the items in (1). These criteria have been developed in order to explain and group such items in three types:

² By pseudo suffixes we refer to those that are polysemic, in the sense that they exist both as suffixes and as non-suffixes.

pure suffixes, pseudo-suffixes and non suffixes. They are four criteria, out of which the first two are the main ones. These have been adopted from Martín Arista (forthcoming). The innovation of our piece of work lies on the fact that we have applied them to real data, which has allowed us to establish their scope and applicability.

All these criteria have been formulated in the form of principles. We present them below: 1) *Principle of Morphological Dependency*, related, as Martín Arista (forthcoming) remarks, to the strict separation of the lexical and the grammatical features of words, and to the meaning of each of these features; 2) *Principle of Morphological Hierarchy*, elaborated departing from the fact that in OE there do not exist predicates derived from two bound predicates; 3) *Principle of Syllabic Structure*, defined in terms of the frequency with which free or bound predicates are monosyllabic or polysyllabic; 4) *Principle of Secondary Accent*, established departing from accentuation norms in OE.

Of these four, the first two ones always work. Nonetheless, the four criteria are in some cases necessary. We must bear in mind that we depart from the data obtained through a lexicographical source (CH 1996) that starts by collecting the data of real texts that have survived until now. Thus, we are before a relatively limited corpus. That is, it could be the case that we lack the minimal data necessary to classify a specific the predicate in terms of the information required by a certain principle. For that, it is important complement the *Principle of Morphological Dependency* with the *Principle of Morphological Hierarchy*, both essential, and not to work with them in isolation, since each them are based on different lexicographical evidences. Regarding the *Principle of Syllabic Structure* and the *Principle of Secondary Accent*, they serve to show more tendencies than regularities, so they can only be applied in order to corroborate the information provided by the other two.

3.1. *Principle of Morphological Dependency*

In the first place, we have the criterion that Martín Arista (forthcoming) has named *Principle of Morphological Dependency*. This criterion takes into account two issues, which serve as a basis to separate derivation from composition, and which are interrelated: first, we have the issue of whether a given segment is separable or not. That is, whether it exists as a free predicate and at the same time it exists as an affixal predicate or not. According to this criterion, and after having made the appropriate

searches in CH (1996) and in *Nerthus*, we find that the following suffixes do not exist as independent forms, that is, as free predicates; therefore, they can be considered pure suffixes:

(4)

-ed(e), -el (= -ol, -ul, **-or**, **-er**, **-od**), -els, -en, -end (= **-nd**), -ere, -erne, -estre, -incel, -isc, -lic, -ling, **-nian**, (e)sian, **-unga**, (= **-inga**).

We have in (5) a series of examples that show the functioning of these suffixes:

(5)

hu:sian v. 'to 'house', receive into one's house' < *hu:s* n. 'house, temple, tabernacle, dwelling-place, inn, household, family, race'

wriðels n. 'band, fillet, bandage' < *wrið* n. 'strap, thong'

The suffixes *-sian* (in this case the final *s* of *hu:s* and the initial one of *-sian* merge) and *-els* do not exist as free forms. They are, therefore, bound predicates. This stage of the Principle of Morphological Dependency is essential to establish an adequate distinction between pure and non-pure suffixes or suffixes that can also work as non suffixes –to which we have called pseudo-suffixes-. However, it must be noted that in OE the separation of words was not conventionalized as we find it nowadays in PDE. That is, there did not exist, in written language, a systematized convention regarding the way of separating segments orthographically. Thus, we find texts where there are several words together, without a regular physical separation of these. Therefore, this part of the criterion is more recent than the language we are analyzing itself, and it is not totally reliable on its own. Thus, in the case we find a pure suffix after applying this criterion, we must also apply the Principle of Morphological Hierarchy, with the aim of corroborating its status as a pure suffix. Such principle is presented later on.

Going on with the Principle of Morphological Dependency, the next step is: when for the segment in question it exists a homonymous independent form, we must see whether they are etymologically related or not, and whether there is some formal variation or not between them. The term etymologically related has been adopted from De la Cruz (1975), who applies it to those forms which are historically related and which share some meaning. Therefore, it refers to the fact that the free and the bound form maintain some semantic similitude in terms of contents. By formal modification

we understand those processes in which the segment under discussion has undergone weakening and/or diachronic modification. According to this, processes of allomorphy, such as the one of *eorðe*, which becomes *eorð* when it forms composed words, are not considered formal modification. Also, paradigmatic forms of the segment under analysis, such as *(-)iht*, which is an inflected form of the verb *i:ecan*, and which is the one used to form composed words, are neither included under the idea of formal modification.

From our list, all those predicates except those in (4) must be subjected to such stage of the criterion. When the independent form is not etymologically related to the bound form, or, even when it is, it suffers some formal modification, we are before a *pseudo-suffix*. A pseudo-suffix is, according to our view, the item that shows polysemy at the semantic and/or categorical level. That is, the same segment has various senses. If the form works as bound, the sense corresponds to the function of derived and/or composed suffixes. If the form is free, it then corresponds to the function of basic predicate, and its meaning will be different. An example of this is in (6):

(6)

a. *ettan* vb. ‘to graze, pasture land’

b. *-ettan*: (verbs < ...). Ex: *sporetan* vb. ‘to kick’ < *spor* n. ‘spoor, track, trail, footprint, trace, vestige’.

As can be seen, *(-)ettan* can function as an independent verb with a specific meaning and at the same time as a derived suffix in the process of forming verbs from other lexical elements, such as in (6.b), where a verb is formed departing from a noun. In this case, *-ettan* does not provide a meaning related to the verb *ettan*, and thus we can state that both segments are not etymologically related.

When a free form exists, and this form is etymologically related to the bound form, and there is not any formal modification between the two, we have a non suffix. A non suffix is then a free predicate which forms a composed word when it is added to another free predicate. Let us see some examples of this in (7):

(7)

ga:stcund adj. ‘spiritual’ < *ga:st* ‘soul, life’

godcund adj. ‘religious, sacred, divine, spiritual, heaven-sent’ < *god* ‘god’

cund: 1. n = *cynd* n. ‘origin, generation, birth, race, species, place by nature, nature, kind (‘i-cunde’), property, quality, character, offspring, gender, ‘genitalia’

2. 'adjectival suffix denoting derivation or likeness (-kind) as in *god-cund*'

As can be observed, both forms of *cund* (as free predicate and as affixal predicate) are etymologically related. Besides, there does not exist a formal variation between them. As a result, we should consider it as a non-affixal compositive element, which when added to a specific base results in a composed item. That is, *cund* is not a suffix.

Until the moment, the criterion applied has served to distinguish pure suffixes from other segments on one hand, and composition from derivation on the other. The list we obtain, after applying such criterion, is the following:

| Suffixes | Pseudo-suffixes | Non suffixes |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------|
| -ed(e) | -að, -noð, -oð | -bære |
| -el, -ol, -ul | -e, | -bora |
| -els | -end | -cund |
| -en | -erian, -orian | -do:m |
| -ere | -et(t) | -fæ:st |
| -erne | -ettan | -feald |
| -estre | -ig | -ful(l) |
| -incel | -iht | -ha:d |
| -isc | -ing | -la:c |
| -lic | -nes(s), -nis, -nys | -læ:can |
| -ling | -ðo, ðu | -le:as |
| -nian | -o, -u | -li:c |
| -(e)sian | | -li:ce |
| -unga, -inga | | -mæst, -mest |
| | | -ræ:den |
| | | -sæste, -ware |
| | | -scipe |
| | | -stafas |
| | | -sum |
| | | -weard |
| | | -wist |
| | | -wende |

Table 1: suffixal and non suffixal predicates

Before going on with the issue that concerns us here, it is convenient to note the fact that the segment *-e/-li:ce*, included in Jember (1975) as two variants of the same

predicate, has been separated here into two different items. The reason is that they respond to the principles presented here in a different way. Therefore, they are two different predicates. As regards *-e*, it complies with the features of a pseudo-suffix, since it has two meanings which are not etymologically related, one as a free predicate and another as a bound predicate. As regards *-lice*, it is a non affix, since it is a free predicate which brings about a composed word when it is combined with a free predicate, and both in its free and in its complex forms it keeps the same meaning.

The elements on the left column are pure suffixes, and they form derived predicates. Those of the column in the centre, which can work both as suffixes and as independent free forms with a different meaning, are derivational and/or compositional predicates. The predicates on the right are always non affixal, that is, they are not suffixes in the light of this semantic criterion, and, thus, when they occur in any word accompanying the base they bring about composed words. We can then talk of composition. They are compositive non affixal predicates. Those non suffixes are free predicates. Therefore, this column can only be justified because these segments have been previously proposed in the literature as suffixes.

3.2. Principle of Hierarchical Morphology

The second criterion, which complements the first, and which is equally essential to identify and classify affixal and non affixal forms, is the one that Martín Arista (forthcoming) calls *Principle of Morphological Dependency*. Such criterion, which has a 100% reliability, says: “if there are two bound forms, at least one of them must necessarily be a free predicate”. Therefore, this criterion serves to discard affixation more than to identify non affixation. Thus, if we find a word that complies with this criterion, we have at least one non suffix or pseudo-suffix. In the case of pure suffixes, since they are never free predicates, in order for them to fit this criterion we should not find a word in which they behave as free forms. Let us see this in (8):

(8)

- a. *-els* > **elsian*
- b. *-unga* > **ungaǎ*
- c. *-end* > *endian*
- d. *-noǎ* > **noǎian*

Suffixes in (8.a) and (8.b) are pure, and therefore there does not exist any element in which they are the base or free form of a derivative. Segments in (8.c) and (8.d) are pseudo-suffixes. In this case, it can be the case that there exist attested forms in which they behave as the base of a derived form, such as in (8.c), or it may be that there are not empirical evidences, as happens to *-noð*. In such case, we will need to apply more criteria in order to prove the validity of such suffix as a pure one.

This criterion is not inter-linguistically universal. Nevertheless, it is valid for OE, where there did not exist predicates derived from two bound forms, as happens in PDE. An example of this PDE phenomenon is *biology*, where neither *bio-* nor *-logy* are free forms. We must not be confused by the appearance of some lexical elements of OE, such as *cynelic*, where *cyne* is not a bound form, but an allomorph of *cyning*, and therefore a free form that takes the derivative suffix *-lic*. However, this criterion is in disadvantage with respect to the first in the sense that there is not evidence in the synchrony of all the existent free elements. That is, it can happen that there are not derivatives of a specific free form that demonstrate that such free form complies with this criterion, as happens above in (8.d). Another example: from *-weard* we have *weardian*, but from *-cund* we do not have any derivative such as **cundian*, which demonstrates that it is a non affix. In this case, the criterion of meaning is the only definite one. Therefore, this criterion can be limited by the lack of data in the synchrony. In (9) we have examples of how this criterion works:

(9)

weard 1. fm. ‘watching, ward’ > *weardian* ‘to watch’

wist ‘being, existence, feast’ > *wistian* ‘to feast’

-estre = *f. agent, as in wi:tegestre*, ‘prophetess’ > **estrian*, **estrig*....

According to it, for the suffix *-estre* there are not predicates that are composed of two bound forms, and therefore we do not find any example in which *-estre* is the base of a word, either simple, derived or composed. With respect to *-weard* and *-wist* we have two non suffixes, according to the Principle of Morphological Dependency. Now, we apply this second criterion so as to corroborate such classification. After revising all the items in which such predicates occur, we obtain that many of them are composed forms, that is, examples in which both the base and the adjunct are free predicates, as

wi:tegestre. Besides, they bring about derivatives, as is observed in (9) when the pure suffix *-ian*³ is added to *weard* or *wist*.

3.3. Principle of Syllabic Structure and Principle of Secondary Accent

Besides the two criteria presented above, which are essential, as can be seen by their degree of applicability, we have other two criteria. Such criteria can also be applied to this classification and, although they are not explicative on their own, they serve to corroborate the classification that we have just carried out. Both are related to the phonological features of the predicates dealt with here. Thus, the third criterion is the *Principle of Syllabic Structure* of words. Such criterion states that suffixes are prototypically monosyllabic, while non-suffixes tend to be bi-syllabic. Following this criterion, we check table 1, and we can observe that from 14 pure suffixes there are only four that are monosyllabic: *-erne*, *-estre*, *-incel*, and *-unga*. In the column of non suffixes we have 13 monosyllabic elements out of 19. With respect to the segments that are both suffixes and non suffixes, out of 12 we have 10 monosyllabic ones. In the light of these data, this criterion is not applicable to all segments, but it shows a certain tendency of suffixes to be monosyllabic. We can say that it serves to identify suffixes rather than non suffixes, among which there seems to be a more equal distribution of the type of syllabic structure.

Finally, the fourth principle that we have applied is the *Principle of Secondary Accent*. Before, other authors have already noted the importance of the accent in OE. In this sense, Hiltunen (1986: 26), with respect to separable and non separable prefixes, remarks: “A supposed difference in the stress and intonation patterns of the separable and the inseparable types is perhaps the criterion most often resorted to when distinguishing between them”. In the same fashion, accent is also important to distinguish compositives from derivative elements.

Campbell (1977: 30-37) accounts for the accentuation system in OE. In fact, we have extracted this criterion from the information he provides. Such criterion is mainly based on the secondary accent of words. In OE many words have an accented syllable with a primary accent and another syllable with a secondary accent. This tendency has

³ This suffix has traditionally been considered as inflectional, and as such it is not included in table 1 of derivational suffixes. Nonetheless, evidence shows that on some occasions it works as a derived suffix, as is the case of the example mentioned in (9).

survived until the present days. This secondary accent always falls on the second element of a composed word when such element maintains all its semantic force. In the case that such segment does not wholly keep its complete semantic force (which is what happens to our non suffixes), it keeps its secondary accent if it is bi-syllabic or, in case of being monosyllabic, if it has an added inflectional syllable. The segments, according to Campbell (1977), which fulfill these requisites are:

(10)

a. bi-syllabic: *-bæ:re*, *-ræ:den*, *-scipe*, *-wende*

b. monosyllabic which add inflectional syllables: *-do:m*, *-cund*, *-fæst*, *-feald*, *-full*, *-ha:d*, *-la:c*, *-le:as*, *-li:c*, *-sum*, *-weard*, *-wist*.

Out of the segments in (10), all of them are included in our list as purely compositional segments –in our terminology, non suffixes-. Therefore, given the available evidence, we can define this criterion in the following way: “those complex words that have a syllable with secondary accent in its second element are composed, and therefore, such second element is a non suffix.” Campbell (1977) calls the items in (10) suffixes, but, according to our terminology and to the criteria exposed in this piece of research, they are not suffixes, since they bring about the formation of composed words, not derived, among other things.

It is important to distinguish, nonetheless, between non suffixes –in general terms non affixes- and free predicates. Non suffixes are those segments that take part in the process of composition and that totally maintain their semantic force. Any free predicate can bring about a composed word, but it can be the case that it does not fit the requirements to be a non affix. Thus, all non affixes are free predicates, but not all free predicates are non affixes. Until now, it seems that they is not apparent different between the two. Let us see an example of this:

(11)

bora > *cæ:gbora* ‘key bearer, jailor’; *candelbora* ‘acolyte’, *ce:ac**bora*** ‘voke for buckets’, etc

ga:st > *ga:stcund* ‘spiritual, holly’, *ga:stha:lig* ‘holly’, *arendga:st* ‘angel’, *ellorga:st* ‘alien spirit’

-bora is a non suffix, which brings about 21 composed words. Note that it always occurs as the secondary element, never as the base. Nonetheless, it is important to remark, at this point, that we are talking of secondary elements in phonetic terms, in the

sense that they are elements that are always located on the right side of the word. Thus, in the semantic side, in these examples *bora* ‘ruler’ is the base, and *cæ:g* ‘key’, *candel* ‘candel’ and *ce:ac* ‘basic’ are its adjuncts and they modify it. On the other side we have *ga:st* ‘ghost’, which is a free predicate, since out of the 29 words in which it occurs it works as a secondary element just in some of them. Besides, it also appears on the left side of the word, and it can either function as the base of a composed word or as its adjunct. Going further, it brings about lexicalized composed words, such as *arendga:st* ‘angel’, where the original semantic force of *ga:st* has become difused within the overall meaning of the word *arendga:st*

The criterion of accent, nonetheless, is not definite, nor has a 100% applicability, since it does not seem to affect five non suffixes in our list: the bi-syllables *-bora*, *-læ:can*, *-mæst*, *-sæte* and *-stafas* (including their variants). However, we can take it into account as a tendency, as happens with the Principle of Syllabic Structure. In any case, the criterion of accent is useful to distinguish a composed form from a derivative element: the derivative segment –that is, affixal- as a general rule does not get an accent, since the norm in OE, given that it is a Germanic language, is accenting words on the first item. The composed item –that is, non affixal-, contains a secondary accent.

4. FINAL REMARKS

To end up, in this piece of work we have aimed at showing the applicability of a series of criteria that are useful to identify affixal and non affixal items (more concretely, suffixal items, although such criteria are applicable to any type of lexical item), with the aim of being able to establish a clear distinction between the processes of composition and derivation in OE, given that there does not exist a systematic and coherent separation of them at present. We believe that, despite the fact that until the moment not much attention has been devoted to this topic, such distinction constitutes the essential starting point to study derivational morphology in OE.

REFERENCES

- Campbell, A. 1977. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Claredon Press.
- Cathey, James E. 2000. *Old Saxon*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Clark Hall, J. R. 1996. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Toronto: University Toronto Press.
- De la Cruz, J. 1975. "Old English Pure Prefixes: Structure and Function". *Linguistics* 145. 47-81.
- Hiltunen, R. 1983. *The Decline of the Prefixes and the Beginnings of the English Phrasal Verb*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.
- Jember, G. K (ed.) 1975. *English-Old English, Old-English-English Dictionary*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Jespersen, O. 1972. *Growth and structure of the English language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kastovksy, D. 1968. *Old English deverbal substantives derived by means of a zero morpheme*. Tübingen: Bruno Lang Verlag Esslingen/n.
- Kastovsky, D. 1992. Semantics and vocabulary. In Hogg, R. (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. I: The Beginning to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 290-408.
- Martín Arista, F. J. Forthcoming. "Argumentos y operadores en la derivación léxica del inglés antiguo"
- Martín Arista, F. J., Caballero González, L., González Torres, E., Ibáñez Moreno, A. y Torre Alonso, R. 2005. *Nerthus: An Online Lexical Database of Old English*. HUM 2005-07651-C02-02/FILO.
- Quirk, R. y Wrenn, C. L. 1994 (1955). *An Old English Grammar*. London: Nethuen.