

Meaning definitions through lexical (macro) functions: Old English QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK¹

Raquel VEA ESCARZA

Author:

Raquel Vea Escarza
Universidad de La Rioja, Spain
raquel.vea@unirioja.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8306-8710>

Date of reception: 24/11/2022

Date of acceptance: 14/03/2023

Citation:

Vea Escarza, Raquel. 2023. "Meaning definitions through lexical (macro) functions: Old English QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK." *Alicante Journal of English Studies* 39: 7-34.
<https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2023.39.01>

© 2023 Raquel Vea Escarza

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0):
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



The aim of this article is to complete and systematize affixal meaning definitions by examining the Old English derived nominal and adjectival lexicon from a structural-functional framework. The main dictionaries of reference in this language have proven to contribute limited affixal information; besides, one and the same dictionary organizes its affixal entries quite dissimilarly both formally and content-wise. Given this background, the present work offers an insight into the derived lexicon and suggests more accurate definitions based on an approach that explains form and meaning associations in terms of lexical functions and macrofunctions. The data of analysis have been retrieved from the lexical database of Old English *Nerthus*, which has supplied the inventory of affixes and of affixed nouns and adjectives performing a lexical function belonging to the semantic categories QUANTITY, SIZE or RANK, which apply whenever an entity or a property experience an increase or a decrease in quantity, quality or status respectively. Each affix is defined conforming to the different meanings it conveys, the source and target categories involved in the derivation process and the predicates that fit the rule in each case. An approach based on form and meaning associations in the definition of affixal meaning has demonstrated to have major implications not only in the field of lexicology but also of lexicography inasmuch as it permits to revise, complete and enhance dictionary entries and gain systematicity in the manner the information is rendered.

Keywords: affixation; lexical functions and macrofunctions; dictionary entry; Old English; lexicology; lexicography

¹ This work was supported by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness under Grant FFI2017-83360P and by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation under Grant PID2020-119200GB-I00 (MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033).

1. Introduction and state of the art

Research in the field of Old English lexicology and derivational morphology has mostly revolved around formal aspects and the syntagmatics of the process. Although with significant differences, the works published by Kastovsky (1968, 1986, 1989, 1990, 1992, 2006), Trips (2009), Martín Arista (2008, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2012a, 2012b, 2013) and Haselow (2011) conduct analyses of the Old English derivational morphology with an eye to the syntagmatics of word formation. However, studies on meaning associated to word formation processes are less common. The works by Weman (1933) and Penttilä (1956) are taken as reference in the area of Old English semantics, while publications by Martín Arista and Martín de la Rosa (2006), de la Cruz Cabanillas (2007), Guarddon Anelo (2009a, 2009b) and Mateo Mendaza (2013, 2016a, 2016b) have provided deep understanding of semantic primes.

This paper addresses affixal meaning in dictionaries and suggests a proposal of improved entries that offers a solution to a lack of systematicity and meaning coverage limitations. The main Old English dictionaries of reference differ as to whether they include affixal entries and also as to the type of information these entries must contain. The following three dictionaries, authoritative lexicographical sources in Old English, record affixes as individual entries, namely Clark-Hall's *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1896), Bosworth and Toller's *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1898) and the *Dictionary of Old English* (Cameron *et al.*, eds. 2018) (henceforth DOE), although they mainly expound the most representative meaning(s), while other less predominant uses of the affix are frequently disregarded. These definitions have proven to follow neither a formal nor a content-based unified criterion. Sweet's *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1896), in turn, fragments the derived lexicon differentiating the affix and the root, however it does not include any affixal entry on its own.

In order to indicate that a form is a word formation element, dictionaries opt for adding a hyphen either right before or after the form itself. To start with, Clark-Hall bound forms are marked with the label 'prefix' or 'suffix' in first position, followed by a definition, which can be occasionally illustrated by examples containing the bound form. Three instances of Clark-Hall affixal entries are provided in (1)-(3):

(1) entry for *-en* to Clark-Hall:

-en suffix I. *diminutive* (neut.) as in *mægden* (from *mægð*). II. *to form feminines* (a) *with mutation* (*gyden*, from *god*). (b) *without mutation* (*ðeowen* from *ðeow*).

III. *Adjectival, with mutation, denoting material.*

(2) entry for *for-* to Clark-Hall:

for- I. denotes loss or destruction (as in *fordōn*, *forgiefan*), or is intensitive or pejorative, as in *forbærnan*, *forrotian*. It is not connected with the preposition 'for'. Its original form was *fer-* [cp. *Ger. ver-*]. II. *occly* = *fore-*

(3) entry for *sin-* to Clark-Hall:

sin- (*y*) prefix, *perpetual, permanent, lasting, infinite, immense.*

As can be seen in examples (1)-(3), no systematic definitional pattern is obeyed by the entries above. For other entries, only semantic information is provided, yet nothing is said about the nature of the word formation element. As occurs with example (4), there is no indication about whether *sam-* and *sām-* are compositional or affixal in nature:

(4) entry for *sam-* and *sām-* to Clark-Hall:

sam- (= *together*) denotes union, combination, or agreement. [ON. *sam-*]
sām- (= *half-*) denotes a partial or imperfect condition. [L. *semi-*]

The dictionary by Bosworth and Toller (henceforth BT) compiles a substantially higher amount of word-formation elements than the dictionary by Clark-Hall. BT distinguishes between affixes, terminations and elements in composition, although their scope remains undefined and to differentiate, for instance, affixes from terminations is not obvious. The entries in (5)-(7) include an instance of each:

(5) entry for *-icge* to BT:

-icge a suffix of nouns denoting a female agent, v. *ácennicge*, *bar-[r]icge*, *drýicge*, *galdricge*, *hunticge*, *scericge* (*scern- ?*), *sealticge*, *synnicge*.

(6) entry for *-feald* to BT:

-feald the termination of numerals, as *án-feald* *one-fold, single*; *twí-feald* or *twý-feald* *two-fold, double*; *þreó-feald* or *þrý-feald* *three-fold, treble*; *seofon-feald* *seven-fold*; *manig-feald*

(7) entry for *and-* to BT:

and- [*Goth*, *anda-*; *Icel.* *and-*, *önd-*; *Grk.* *ἀντι-*] in composition denotes opposition,
— *Against, without; contra.*

As shown by these examples, the entries to BT dictionary are not organized alike. For some affixes, etymological information is presented in first position; this is the case of *and-* (and also of *arce-*). In other cases, the entry informs about form associations, i.e. what type of bases the bound form is attached to, although there is no hint of the meaning it conveys (e.g. the entry for *-feald*). Most of the affixal entries list a few predicates that are formed by the word-formation element at stake, although this does not always occur (see example (7)). In any case, no entry gives access to the whole inventory of derived or compound predicates containing each element.

In its current state, the DOE is available only for the entries A to I. This dictionary distinguishes between different types of word-formation elements, namely prefixes, suffixes, elements of quasi-compounds and elements in composition. An example of each is provided in (8)-(11):

(8) entry for *arce-* to DOE:

arce- Prefix derived ultimately from Gk. ἀρχι-, ἀρχ- ‘chief’ (alternatively rendered as *hēah*, as in *hēah-bisceop*, *-dīacon*, *-engel*, etc.), borrowed from equivalent Lat. prefix *arch-* and used in the sense ‘chief, principal’, as in *arce-bisceop*, *-dīacon*, etc.

(9) entry for *-feald* to DOE:

-feald A multiplicative suffix appended to adjectives and numerals: *-fold*
See also: *ān-*, *eahta-*, *endleofan-*, *fēower-*, *fēowertig-*, *fif-*, *fiftig-*, *fīper-*, *hund-*, *hundred-*, *hundseofontig-*, *hundseofontigseofon-*, *hundtēontig-*, *nigon-*, *seofon-*, *six-*, *sixtig-*, *twelf-*, *twēntig-*, *twȳ-*, *tȳn-*, *þrȳ-*, *þrȳtig-*, *þūsend-feald*; *fela-*, (ge) *manig-*, *nān-*, *nēah-*, *þic-*, *untwȳ-feald*; (ge) *fealdan*; cf. *fylđ*
MED *-föld*. OED2 *-fold*. Cf. OED2 *fold n.*^{3 sense 6}.

(10) entry for *fore-* to DOE:

fore- In verbal or participial quasi-compounds, usually element-by-element glosses of Latin verbs in *ante-* / *anti-* / *ob-* / *prae-* / *pro-* / *supra-*, where *fore* may be taken as either adverb or prefix (cf. use of *fore-* as a prefix in nouns / adjectives /

adverbs calqued on Lat. nouns / adjectives / adverbs in *ante-* / *anti-* / *ob-* / *prae-* / *pro-*)

(11) entry for *full-* to DOE:

full- In composition, (it) denotes the *fulness*, *completeness* or *perfection* of the meaning of the word with which it is joined.

The entries to the DOE also present certain dissimilarities if the information contained is compared. Except for *arce-*, etymology is not a criterion to be incorporated in the entries. In the case of *fore-*, for instance, the entries only mention their Latin counterparts, while no further reference is made to their meaning. Only in some cases do we know about the source lexical classes involved in the derivative process, as in the entry for *-feald*, but we are not informed on the lexical class to which this suffix gives rise. Another aspect that is not systematically present in all the entries to this dictionary is the list of predicates that are derived with a specific form; in most cases, entries include a small representation of the derived lexicon, although this information is not provided for some others, as is the case of the entries for *fore-* and *full-*.

Against this background, the research question addressed by this article is how the analysis of affixes can contribute to complete and systematize meaning definition. The article, therefore, bears on the more general question of how Lexicology can contribute to the advances of Lexicography in the specific field of Old English.

As opposed to Present Day English, the derived lexicon of Old English is associative by nature, which means that word families hold transparent formal and semantic relationships and productive word formation processes take place in this language. As a consequence of the partial motivation of derived lexical items, generalizations are possible that are harder to find in the underived lexicon. Moreover, Old English shows a marked preference for word formation rather than for borrowing, a fact that supports the feasibility of such a study. In this line, a prior analysis of the Old English derived lexicon can shed light on the type(s) of meanings associated to a particular affix and allow both the completion of affixal entries already available and the suggestion of new ones.

2. Old English nominal and adjectival affixation

Nerthus is a lexical database of Old English that is founded on a set of dictionaries that have contributed its main morphosemantic information, in particular the dictionaries by Bosworth and Toller, Sweet and, above all, Clark-Hall. To date,

the database contains more than 31,000 entries, each of which is provided with information about their alternative spellings, category, translation and inflectional and derivational morphology. This database has thus provided the full inventory of derived nouns and adjectives, which are the lexical categories analysed so far. This lexicon adds up to 7,588 predicates. Divided by category, 4,370 are affixed nouns and 3,218 are affixed adjectives. By word-formation process, 2,001 are prefixed words (802 nouns and 1,199 adjectives), and 5,587 are suffixed (2,010 nouns and 3,577 adjectives).

To recapitulate, the units of analysis are, therefore, derived nouns and adjectives, and the targeted processes are prefixation and suffixation. These word-formation processes are gradually applied, to wit, a maximum of one affix is attached per process. As regards prefixation, it is a category-independent process and, for this reason, no difference is made on categorial grounds in the list provided in example (12). Suffixation, on the contrary, is category-dependent, and suffixes are, as a result, presented by target category. The affixes associated to the macrofunctions QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK (these will be fully addressed in section 3) amount to twenty-seven (excluding spelling variants), which are found in 223 predicates that have been assigned one of the aforementioned semantic categories. Example (12) presents the complete list of affixes:

- (12) prefixes: *and-*, *arce-*, *eall-*, *for-*, *fore-*, *forð-*, *fram-*, *frēa-*, *ful(l)-*, *healf-*, *ofer-*, *sām-*, *sin-*, *sub-*, *twi-*, *ðri-* (*ðry-*), *under-*
 nominal suffixes: *-en*, *-icge*, *-iht* (*-eht*, *-uht*), *-incl*, *-ð* (*-að*, *-oð*), and *-ung*
 adjectival suffixes: *-en*, *-feald*, *-ful*, *-iht* (*-eht*, *-uht*), *-le*, *-welle*

These affixal morphemes are considered bound forms on the basis of Jember *et al.*'s (1975) inventory of Old English affixes. This criterion has not been fully shared by the dictionaries consulted, which have considered some of these forms compositional or quasi-compositional elements, while others are simply free forms. Once the affixal material is identified for each macrofunction, a detailed analysis of each affix will allow for its further contextualization within the corresponding semantic category.

At this point, a terminological clarification, which will be expanded in section 3, must be done with respect to the concept of macrofunction. In this study, macrofunctions are regarded as semantic categories whose definition is couched in terms of the lexical functions that are contained in each one. Section 3 also delves into the theoretical underpinnings of macrofunctions and their

definition in relation to lexical functions. This information will be represented in subsection 4.1. and in the final Appendix in the form of dictionary entries, each of which will be duly described in lexicological terms and assigned the roots these affixes are appended to. Subsection 4.2. discusses the contribution of a linguistic-based analysis to the definition of the affixal material. Finally, the paper summarizes the main findings of the study.

3. Delimiting the scope of analysis: quantity, size and rank macrofunctions

QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK are labels that correspond to semantic categories defined by the lexical functions each macrofunction encompasses. In order to obtain more explanatory conclusions, lexical functions lay the descriptive foundations that permit the definition of more general semantic categories (Vea Escarza 2018, 218). In this sense, Vea Escarza (2018, 222) observes that these categories present certain features that distinguish them from lexical functions. Firstly, the term *semantic*, when used in combination with *categories* and in this context, has no necessarily derivational or syntactic implications, contrary to what lexical functions entail. Additionally, these categories can be considered descriptive primitives as no definition can be assigned to them different from the lexical functions grouped inside. Lastly, and unlike lexical functions, semantic categories transcend lexical-category-based distinctions that may constitute a distinguishing factor in the case of certain lexical functions.

The three categories (QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK) addressed in this study form a coherent whole as they share certain semantic components. In brief, in all three cases there is an entity or a property that experiences an increase or a decrease in quantity, quality or status. Macrofunction QUANTITY comprehends the lexical functions distributive, massive and partitive. SIZE encompasses the functions augmentative and diminutive, and RANK comprises the lexical functions magnifier and minimizer.

The full inventory of functions as well as their organization into macrofunctions is to be found in the works by Vea Escarza (2013, 2016, 2018), where the author devises a complete list of thirty-three lexical functions, which are arranged into nine macrofunctions, for Old English derived nouns and adjectives that account for the form and meaning relationships holding in affixation processes.

In Figure 1 below, semantic macrofunctions are represented together with the lexical functions along with a brief description of them:

NEGATION

priv (privative): absence of a property or entity

opp (oppositive): the opposite of the entity or property expressed by the base

countfact (counterfactual): the equivalent to the oppositive function but applied to verbal bases

CIRCUMSTANCE

loc (locative): concrete location

temp (temporal): temporal reference

com (comitative): company or association

withent (with entity): possession of a concrete entity

withprop (with property): possession of an abstract property

DEGREE

intens (intensifier): intensification of the properties denoted by the base

mit (mitigator): decrease in the characteristics denoted by the base

FIRST PARTICIPANT

ag (agent): agent of the action expressed in the verbal base

eff (effector): predication of the verbal base

fem (feminine): gender change to feminine

pat (patient): patient of a stative verbal base

QUALITY

rel (relative): reference relation to the meaning of the base

ex (origin): the base denotes origin (local, causal, material, etc.)

like (similarity): a characteristic of the base is taken in order to establish a comparison

pej (pejorative): negative evaluation of the base

QUANTITY

part (partitive): reference to a part of a larger amount

mass (massive): pluralization or collectivization of the referent of the

BASE

dist (distributive): scaling of the referent by an amount or number

RANK

magn (magnifier): higher rank than that of the referent

min (minimizer): lower rank than that of the referent

SECOND PARTICIPANT

ent (entity): concrete entity

abst (abstract): abstract meaning

pred (predicative): objective type of deverbal predications

prop (property): abstract property

- sta (stative): property derived from a verbal base
- SIZE
- dim (diminutive): reduced size of the referent
- augm (augmentative): the referent becomes increased

Figure 1. Distribution of lexical functions across semantic categories.

This list of functions draws on structural and functional sources. The structural part is based, on the one hand, on Mel'čuk's Meaning and Text Theory (1989, 1996, 2006) and, on the other, on Pounder's (2000) Process and Paradigm Model, a model that goes beyond semantic relations in order to identify lexical functions between words. Mel'čuk's theory, which provides the foundations of Pounder's model, conceives lexical functions as a group of formal tools that describe any type of lexical relations occurring between lexical units in a systematic way. The full inventory consists of sixty lexical functions that were first applied to Russian and French, although they are intended to be universally valid. One of the functions this vast inventory includes is the rank-related 'magnifier' function, which has been incorporated in this study to describe affixal material designating a higher rank than that of the referent.

Pounder's (2000) Process and Paradigm Model has complemented the structural part. This author's model addressed word-formation meaning processes in German and distinguished between lexical and morphological units that partake in word-formation. Pounder establishes the notion of morphological operation by referring to the modification a stem undergoes and the semantic and syntactic implications it has. The emphasis is then placed on the act of affixing rather than on the affix itself, which lacks intrinsic meaning. Her analytical model, although has given rise to a total of eight lexical functions² that apply to part of the target lexicon, has revealed some limitations related to the fact that certain functions are only relevant for nouns or for adjectives, but not to both at the same time. Additionally, the distinction Pounder makes between primary and secondary functions, according to which the latter "modify word-formation meanings rather than constituting word-formation meaning on their own" (Pounder 2000, 109), has no effect in the Old English lexicon as there are secondary functions that present the same status as primary functions, being both types applicable to derived and doubly derived lexicon. Pounder's model has motivated the quantitative function 'distributive' and the size-related

2 Old English nominal and adjectival affixation has resorted to the following eight lexical functions borrowed from Pounder (2000): 'dim' (diminutive), 'dist' (distributive), 'ex' (origin), 'i' (identity), 'intens' (intensifier), 'like' (similarity), 'pej' (pejorative) and 'rel' (relative).

functions ‘augmentative’ and ‘diminutive’. She has also proposed the ‘minimizer’ function, which complements the rank-related ‘magnifier’ one. As for these size-related functions, ‘diminutive’ is considered primary and ‘augmentative’ secondary by the author; however, this distinction has proved invalid in the Old English derived lexicon as both apply regardless of the derivative complexity of the predicate.

As regards the functional part, this rests on the main functional theories, which include Functional Grammar (Dik 1997a, 1997b), Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) and Role and Reference Grammar (Foley & Van Valin 1984; Van Valin & Lapolla 1997; Van Valin 2005). Starting with Functional Grammar, this linguistic theory is concerned with the grammatical organization of natural languages. In order to understand the underpinnings of this theory, it is paramount to address the clause structure model, which is based on the concept of layering (Foley and Van Valin 1984) and on Lyon’s (1977) semantic categories taxonomy. The notion of layering relates to the stratified structure of clauses consisting of a core (nucleus and arguments) and a periphery. The concept of layering involves the progressive expansion of semantic-syntactic constituents of the clause through the addition of grammatical features and adverbials. After the predication has been expanded into an underlying clause structure, expression rules come into play in order to specify form, order and prosody and convert the underlying clause structure into linguistic expressions. Regarding Lyon’s taxonomy of basic semantic categories, this seminal part of Functional Grammar includes the Individual, State-of-Affairs and Propositional Content, being first-, second- and third-order entities respectively. Dik (1997a, 93) adds to this taxonomy properties or relations, which are zero-order entities, and speech acts, which are fourth-order entities.

Lexical functions are, essentially, tools devised to describe lexical relations that are found in the lexicon of a language in a systematic way. These functions have been further organized into macrofunctions on the basis of a hierarchical and a semantic criterion, which enable more explanatory generalizations relating to affixal meaning. Macrofunctions are, consequently, the result of the combination of lexical functions and a semantic approach.

Being at the core of functional grammars, lexical functions are relations between linguistic units that encapsulate systematic aspects of the language and that allow for generalizations. In the functional tradition framework, Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008) developed the structural-functional language theory known as Functional Discourse Grammar (henceforth FDG), which takes the Discourse Act as the unit of analysis instead of the clause. This theory combines a formal approach to language, by which the knowledge underlying the user is described in terms of the units s/he is familiar with and their encoding into Discourse Acts,

with a functional one, in which the grammatical knowledge is put at the service of interpersonal communication. FDG puts forward an alternative semantic taxonomy that is an enlarged version of Lyons' (1995) and that includes ten semantic categories³, one of which, QUANTITY, has inspired the lexical function 'massive' in this study. In FDG terms, the semantic category Quantity makes reference to both a countable and an uncountable quantity. Based on this category, Pounder has distinguished between singular and plural quantities, giving rise to the lexical functions 'sing' and 'pl'. In this study, as no examples have been found that correspond with an individualizing function that can be defined in terms of singular or plural, the function 'massive' has been preferred to refer to a pluralization or collectivization of the referent.

An extra function was necessary to describe one aspect of nominal derivation that is present when a part of a larger amount is referred to, this is the case of the 'partitive' function.

Below these lines, the three macrofunctions are qualified in terms of the lexical functions that belong to each semantic category, along with a general definition and illustrative examples of each function (the affix is marked in bold type):

QUANTITY

partitive: a part of a larger amount

glæsful 'glassful' < *glæs* 'glass'

healffers 'hemistich' > *fers* 'verse'

massive: a pluralization or collectivization of the referent of the base

(*ge*)*fyrhð* 'wooded country' < *fyrh* 'fir'

scræfen 'place with caves' < (*ge*)*scræf* 'cave'

distributive: the scaling of the referent by an amount or number

twidæglic 'lasting two days' > *dæglic* 'of a day'

ðrilēfe 'three-leaved' < *lēaf* 'leaf'

SIZE

diminutive: a reduced size of the referent

sūlincel 'small furrow' > *sūl* 'furrow'

tūnincel 'small property' < *tūn* 'field'

augmentative: a referent that becomes increased

eallmiht 'omnipotence' < *miht* 'might, power'

3 Functional Discourse Grammar distinguishes the following semantic categories: Property, Individual, State-of-affairs, Propositional Content, Location, Time, Episode, Manner, Reason, Quantity. Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008, 135) remark these are relevant in those languages in which there are grammatical phenomena that refer to these categories.

ofer-slāp ‘too much sleep’ > *slāp* ‘sleep’

RANK

magnifier: a higher rank than that of the referent

arcebiscop ‘archbishop’ > *bisceop* ‘bishop’

ofermæcga ‘very illustrious being’ < *mæcga* ‘man’

minimizer: a lower rank than that of the referent

underfolgōð ‘subordinate officer’ > *folgōð* ‘retinue’

subdīacon ‘subdeacon’ < *dīacon* ‘deacon’

Macrofunction QUANTITY has been associated with fourteen affixes, five of which are prefixes and nine are suffixes. Within this group, the distributive function is performed by prefixes *twi-* and *ðri-/ðry-*, and by suffixes *-feald*, *-ful*, *-le* and *-welle*. The massive function applies to predicates prefixed with *and-* and suffixed with *-en*, *-icge*, *-iht*, *-ð* and *-ung*. The distributive function is realized by prefixes *healf-* and *sām-*. Macrofunction SIZE is performed by five prefixes and one suffix. As for their distribution among lexical functions, *eall-*, *for-*, *full-*, *ofer-* and *sin-* are assigned the augmentative function and suffix *-inced* the diminutive function. Finally, macrofunction RANK is performed by nine prefixes, distributed into *arce-*, *fore-*, *forð-*, *fram-*, *frēa-*, *ofer-* and *sin-* for the magnifier function and *sub-* and *under-* for the minimizer function.

Section 4 and the Appendix present this full list of affixes in the form of dictionary entries.

4. The contribution of a linguistic-based analysis to affixal meaning definition

This section outlines the methodological underpinnings of the study by focusing on how affixal definitions have been elaborated on the basis of the aforementioned theoretical approach and discusses the extent to which a linguistic-based analysis has proved relevant in the definition of affixal elements.

4.1. Preliminary methodological considerations

In light of the lack of a unified methodology evinced in the way the main dictionaries of English compile and define affixal entries, the model of lexical functions and macrofunctions suggested in this study will provide a more profound insight into the scope of affixal meaning and help present it in a more systematic way. The remainder of this section elaborates on how individual entries for each of the twenty-seven affixes that realize any of the three macrofunctions this study attends to have been created and, more importantly, how a linguistic-based analysis can contribute to affixal meaning definition.

The Appendix (The definition of affixal entries) compiles the full list of affixal entries including the different meanings each affix conveys, the source and target categories involved in the derivation process and a list of the predicates that fit the rule in each case. In order to understand how these entries have been elaborated, a number of methodological considerations are needed. In the first place, the analytical framework rests on previous work by the Nerthus research group, particularly on the principles and criteria of morphological and lexical analysis developed in several scientific works⁴. Secondly, the delimitation of the units of analysis relies on the process the derivational morpheme participates in: in the case of Old English, there are cases of prefixes and suffixes that are formally identical. Besides, certain derivational processes may change the category of the base while others cannot: prefixation, at least in Old English, frequently leaves the category of the base of derivation unchanged, whereas suffixation normally involves a change of category⁵. As regards the boundary between affixation and compounding, the status of units must be used as the baseline for their distinction. In this regard, compounding requires free forms, as in *ǣr* ‘early, former, ancient’ and *woruld* ‘world’ in *ǣrworuld* ‘ancient world’, while affixation makes use of a bound form attached to a new form in order to express a new meaning, as in *sinhīwscipe* (< *hīwscipe* ‘family, household’), where prefix *sin-* attaches the meaning ‘perpetuity, constancy’.

The general assumptions about Old English affixation are primarily based on Jember *et al.* (1975), whose inventory of affixes is more detailed than Kastovsky’s (1992).

Once these analytical underpinnings have been defined, the inventory of lexical functions and macrofunctions, which has been presented in section 3, can be applied accordingly. This part of the analysis has permitted to deduce the meanings each affix conveys by delving into the array of lexical functions associated to them.

Below these lines the entries for prefix *for-* and suffix *-en* are instantiated containing the aforementioned information:

- (13) *for-*. Nominal prefix attached to nouns to denote an augmentative value, the referent being increased: *for-scending* ‘confusion’, *-spild*, *-ðahting*, *-ðeahtung*, *-wana*, *-yldu*. It also denotes an increase in intensity in adjectival derivatives: *for-cūð* ‘bad, wicked, infamous’, *-dyslic*, *-fæger*, *-heard*, *-hrēred*, *-lýtél*, *-manig*, *-micel*, *-repen*, *-scyldig*, *-strang*, *-swið*, *-wened*, *-wēned*, *-weorðfullic*, *-werod*, *-wracned*,

4 See <https://www.nerthusproject.com/publications#2>.

5 Lieber (2004, 236) highlights the transpositional character of suffixes, that is, they modify the class of the base but no change of meaning is caused.

-*wundorlic*. It expresses location in some nouns, specifically the idea of ‘being in front of’: *for-hēafod* ‘forehead’, -*ierð*, -*scip*, -*sīð*. It can also designate origin or relation to the nominal referent: *for-gŷmelēasnes* ‘carelessness’, *ligeren*, -*māel*, -*nefe*, -*rāpe*.

(14) *-en*. Adjectival suffix attached to nominal bases to denote origin, which can be local, causal or material: *āc-en* ‘oaken’, *ælr-*, *āer-*, *āesc-*, *āetr-*, *ādeg-*, *bāen-*, *bæst-*, *bēan-*, *bēc-*, *ber-*, *blōd-*, *bræs-*, *bred-*, *brocc-*, *bycc-*, *byx-*, *ceosl-*, *crīst-*, *cwīchēam-*, *cwīcsūsl-*, *cypr-*, *dēor-*, *ealgodwebb-*, *elebēam-*, *elétrēow-*, *elpendbāen-*, *eorð-*, *fæder-*, (*ge*)*fæg-*, *fell-*, *flint-*, *flōd-*, *fŷr-*, *fŷx-*, *gāet-*, *gehamm-*, *gelief-*, *gemēdr-*, *gerāw-*, *gesinhīw-*, *geðrac-*, *gielp-*, *glær-*, *glæs-*, *godwebb-*, *grāscinn-*, *gyld-*, *hæft-*, *hāer-*, *hæsl-*, *hāð-*, *hāw-*, *heort-*, *hol-*, *hrīðer-*, *hund-*, *hwæt-*, *hwīl-*, *hlyst-*, *hynd-*, *hyrn-*, *lām-*, *lēad-*, *lēasbrēd-*, *leðr-*, *līg-*, *lind-*, *līn-*, *luf-*, *lyft-*, *lysw-*, *mēdr-*, *meolc-*, *middangeard-*, *midl-*, *mōddr-*, *pæll-*, *pic-*, *pīntrēow-*, *purpur-*, *rēð-*, *rind-*, *risc-*, *rōs-*, *ryg-*, *sæl-*, *scēap-*, *scēapheord-*, *scierd-*, *scild-*, *scucc-*, *seolc-*, *seolfr-*, *sīd-*, *slīð-*, *smātegyld-*, *smedm-*, *spær-*, *stāen-*, *stocc-*, *stŷl-*, *swefl-*, *swīn-*, *tāen-*, *tigel-*, *tin-*, *trēow-*, *tungl-*, *twīn-*, *tyht-*, *ðēod-*, *ðril-*, *ðrin-*, *ðŷfl-*, *ðŷrn-*, *wāed-*, *weax-*, *will-*, *wylf-*, *wyll-*, *ymbhamm-*, *yppl-*, *yter-*. As a nominal suffix, it can be attached to adjectival bases to express an abstract property derived from the referent: *āwfaest-en* ‘legal or public fast’, *fæst-*, (*ge*)*fæst-*, *frēc-*, *hēahfæst-*, *holdrāed-*, *ield-*, *midl-*, *myrg-*, *swīg-*, *wēst-*. It derives feminine nouns from nominal bases: *ælf-en* ‘nymph’, *ass-*, *bir-*, *byr-*, *gyd-*, *menn-*, *my nec-*, *ðīn-*, *ðyft-*, *wiel-*, *wylf-*. It derives deverbal nouns with an abstract meaning: *begīm-en* ‘attention, observation’, *foreðingrāed-*, *hīw-*, *hīwrāed-*, *sōðseg-*, *til-*, (*ge*)*ðēodrāed-*. It derives adjectives from nominal basis with the meaning ‘similarity’ with respect to the referent: *flāesc-en* ‘of flesh, like flesh’, *hunigtēar-*, *hwæl-*, *wilddēor-*. It can also pluralize or collectivize the referent: *āc-en* ‘a wood of oaks’, *bryð-*, *per-*, *scræf-*.

As observed in examples (13) and (14) above, each affixal definition incorporates, in first place, the meaning the affix contributes once it is attached to the derivational base, also the source and target categories involved in the derivative process and the list of predicates that fit the rule. In case the affix is associated with more than one meaning, which is the norm, meaning definitions are added placing the most representative ones in first position and concluding with the less frequent meanings of the affix in question.

The following subsection examines in greater accuracy the contribution of this approach to the definition of affixal material by taking as a reference the information gathered by the lexicographical sources consulted.

4.2. A lexicological approach to the definition of affixal meaning

The proposal presented in this paper has settled on an analytical approach that addresses meaning change caused by prefixal and suffixal processes in Old English nouns and adjectives on the grounds of lexical (macro)functions and that is conducted prior to defining the entries. The fact that the relations that hold among the derived lexicon of this language are relatively transparent, both formally and semantically speaking, has facilitated the identification of form and meaning associations.

By way of illustration, *fram-* is a prefix that derives nouns and that conveys two meanings: on the one hand, it denotes a figurative locative meaning related to the idea of a starting point, such as in *framcynn* ‘origin, ancestry’ (< *cynn* ‘kind, sort; family, generation’); on the other, it designates higher rank, like in *framrinc* ‘chief, prince’ (< *rinc* ‘man, warrior, hero’). Another example is prefix *frēa-*, a nominal affix that attaches to certain nouns to designate higher position in an organizational (*frēareccere* ‘chief ruler’ < *reccere* ‘teacher, ruler’) or in an intensity hierarchy (*frēamiht* ‘great strength’ < *miht* ‘might, bodily strength; power’); this prefix can be also attached to an adjective to indicate greater intensity (*frēaglēaw* ‘very wise or prudent’ < *glēaw* ‘prudent, wise, skillful’).

Affixal entries in the main dictionaries of reference in this language have revealed some limitations. Among the improvable aspects are the following ones. Firstly, it has been noted that dictionaries are not systematic in the presentation of affixal content and, in some cases, relevant information is absent from the entries, including the whole array of meanings an affix covers, the lexical categories they derive or the predicates that contain that affix. To give an example, BT proposes two entries for suffix *-en* that exclusively contain morphological information, namely that this affix is, on the one hand, an ending of adjectives, and, on the other, that it forms many feminine and only a few masculine nouns. However, we have no insight into the meaning this affix conveys when adjectival and nominal. As observed in example (14), the entry for this suffix has been completed with the six meanings associated with it, specifying whether that meaning applies to derived nouns, derived adjectives or both.

Another aspect that deserves attention is the fact that, for some entries, meaning information proves partial or scarce. This occurs with prefix *and-* in BT; according to this dictionary, this prefix only denotes opposition. By delving into its lexical realizations, we know that, in addition to its privative value, it also has a pluralizer (*andgelōman* ‘tools, utensils, implements’ < (*ge*)*lōma* ‘tool, utensil, article of furniture’) and a locative function, the latter being either literal (*andwlite* ‘forehead’ < *wlita* ‘face, countenance’) or figurative (*andwīg* ‘resistance’ < *wīg* ‘strife, contest, war, battle’). In like manner, BT uniquely assigns prefix

fore- circumstantial meaning, while in the DOE this prefix is described in terms of its Latin counterparts. In neither case, however, is *fore-* associated to rank, a meaning that can be conveyed when attached to nominal bases (*forefrēfrend* ‘proconsul’ < *frēfrend* ‘comforter, consoler’), or to a figurative circumstantial meaning (*foreðanc* ‘consideration’ < (*ge*)*ðanc* ‘thought, consideration’). Another example is prefix *forð-*, categorized by the DOE as a verbal prefix. The entry for *forð-* (see Appendix) proposed in this study reveals this prefix also attaches to nouns (*forðfæder* ‘ancestor’ < *fæder* ‘father’) and adjectives (*forðmære* ‘very glorious’ < *mære* ‘pure’), presenting as well noticeable differences in the meanings conveyed depending on the lexical category involved. The entry in the DOE describes this affix in terms of “element-by-element glosses of Latin verbs in *pro-*”. The definition suggested in this study specifies and considerably expands its semantic value by referring to the intensification undergone by the property designated by the base, its locative and figurative locative nature and the experience of a greater charge or responsibility. Likewise, Clark-Hall concedes exclusively an intensitive value to prefix *frēa-*, but no distinction is drawn between its nominal and adjectival nature and the meaning(s) associated in each case. The entry for this affix (see Appendix) suggested in this study has discerned two related but not identical meanings of *frēa-* when applied to nouns and adjectives, designating a higher position in an organizational or in an intensity hierarchy in nominal predicates and conveying greater intensity in the case of adjectival predicates.

It may be also the case that there is a mismatch between the definition suggested by a dictionary and the definition this study puts forward on the grounds of a lexical-function-based analytical framework. By way of example, according to BT, prefix *sām-* conveys agreement, combination and imperfection, whereas this study resolves that this prefix is related to a decrease in the characteristic(s) denoted in the referent (*sāmmelt* ‘half-digested’ < (*ge*)*meltan* ‘to dissolve, digest’) as well as to a reduction of a whole to a certain degree (*sāmbryce* ‘partial breach or violation’ < (*ge*)*bryce* ‘breach, fracture’). Prefix *and-* experiences a similar situation. Both BT and Clark-Hall’s dictionary make mention of its oppositive value, although the definition proposed in this study prefers to refer to this prefix as a privative one (*andgielēas* ‘foolish, senseless, doltish’ < *andgiete* ‘intellect, understanding, knowledge, perception’).

Another possible scenario is the absence of an entry with an affixal value in these dictionaries for some of the forms considered affixes in this study. This occurs with the forms *eall-*, *ful(l)-*, *healf-*, *-le*, *ofer-*, *sub-*, *-ð*, *ðri-/ðry-*, *-ung*, and *-welle* (see Appendix).

From the perspective adopted here, a study of these characteristics has allowed, in the first place, to complete the definition of word formation elements

as they would appear in a dictionary entry by relying upon previous linguistic analysis. Additionally, this study has provided new entries for those elements that have not been labelled as bound forms by the Old English reference dictionaries. Apart from that, further conclusions can be reached, particularly in what regards the polysemous character of the affixal material under analysis, which means that most of these affixes are associated to more than one meaning. The study indicates that the most polysemous affixes are *-en*, *-for-*, *fore-*, *forð-*, *ofer-*, *sin-*, *-ð* and *-ung*, comprising four or more different meanings. Exceptions to this polysemy are prefixes *arce-*, *ful(l)-*, *sub-*, *twi-*, *ðri-* and *under-*, and suffixes *-feald*, *-in cel*, *-le* and *-welle*, which convey just one meaning.

Finally, a brief reference must be made to the distribution of prefixation and suffixation in the definition of meaning. In this respect, a total of seventeen prefixes and ten suffixes perform a function comprised under the semantic categories QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK, which evinces that a wider range of meanings relating to these categories is expressed through prefixation, being generally more contentful. On the contrary, suffixation is normally more structural. To illustrate this point, the formation of feminine predicates (*-en*, *-icge*) as well as the creation of diminutives (*-in cel*) are realized suffixally. On the other side, the magnifier function, denoting rank, (*arce-*, *fore-*, *forð-*, *fram-*, *frēa-*, *ofer-*) or the partitive distributive function (*healf-*, *sām-*) are eminently prefixal.

5. Conclusion

This paper has adopted a lexicological and lexicographical perspective in order to deal with the affixal material involved in three semantic categories sharing a conceptual proximity, namely QUANTITY, SIZE and RANK, as has been previously classified by Veá Escarza (2013, 2016, 2018). The analytical framework mostly relies on a structural-functional approach to the derived lexicon of Old English based on an inventory of lexical functions that help systematize the description of lexical relations occurring in the derived vocabulary of this language. Their organization into macrofunctions provides a much more exhaustive and coherent description of Old English affixation based on the lexical functions defined within each semantic category.

Of utmost importance to this study has been to obtain a closer approximation to the assortment of meanings the affixes in question convey and to contribute to their systematization. The main Old English dictionaries accredited in the area have proved not to hold a unified criterion as regards the organization of affixal entries and their content.

A number of valuable insights emerge from this paper. In the first place, the contribution of a linguistic-based study to affixal meaning definition has important

implications in the field of lexicography. This can be seen in the fact that new affixal entries have been devised that had no presence in any dictionary. This is the case of affixes *eall-*, *ful(l)-*, *healf-*, *-le*, *ofer-*, *sub-*, *-ð*, *ðri-/ðry-*, *-ung*, and *-welle*. Secondly, a review of the affixal entries that appear in the dictionaries consulted has permitted to identify mismatches between what these dictionaries suggest and what the results of a study based on form and meaning associations have revealed. As referred to in this study, prefix *sām* exemplifies this incompatibility evinced by the information provided by the lexicographical sources and the lexical analysis conducted. Thirdly, the collation of all the possible meanings an affix can express has considerably facilitated the completion of the entries in terms of more detailed and accurate information.

Works Cited

- ADAMSON, Sylvia M., Vivien A. Law, Nigel Vincent and Susan Wright, eds. 1990. *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.65>
- BOSWORTH, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller. 1973 (1898). *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- BUTLER, Christopher and Javier Martín Arista, eds. 2009. *Deconstructing Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.107>
- CAMERON, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al., eds. 2018. *Dictionary of Old English: A to I online*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project.
- CLARK-HALL, John R. 1996 (1896). *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Toronto: U of Toronto P.
- DE LA CRUZ CABANILLAS, Isabel. 2007. "Semantic primes in Old English: a preliminary study of descriptors." *SELIM: Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval Language and Literature* 14: 37-58.
- DIK, Simon. 1997a. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DIK, Simon. 1997b. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Vol. 2: Complex and Derived Constructions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218374>
- FISIAK, Jacek, ed. 1986. *Historical Semantics-Historical Word Formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110850178>
- FOLEY, William and Robert Van Valin. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- GUARDDON ANELO, María del Carmen. 2009a. "The Natural Semantic Metalanguage of Old English Compound Adpositions." *ES-English Studies* 30: 61-83.

- GUARDDON ANELO, María del Carmen. 2009b. "Un análisis de las propiedades combinatorias de los primitivos semánticos a través de las adposiciones complejas en inglés antiguo." *Revista Española de Lingüística* 39(2): 93-122. <https://doi.org/10.31810/rsel.v39i2.65>
- GUERRERO, Pilar, ed. 2011. *Morphosyntactic Alternations in English. Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- HASELOW, Alexander. 2011. *Typological Changes in the Lexicon. Analytic Tendencies in English Noun Formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238211>
- HENGEVELD, Kees and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HOGG, Richard, ed. 1992. *The Cambridge History of the English Language I: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521264747>
- JEMBER, Gregory K., John C. Carrell, Robert P. Lundquist, Barbara. M. Olds and Raymond P. Tripp. 1975. *English-Old English, Old English-English Dictionary*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 1968. *Old English Deverbal Substantives Derived by means of a Zero Morpheme*. PhD diss., Tübingen University. Esslingen/N.: Langer.
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 1986. "Deverbal nouns in Old and Modern English: from stem-formation to word-formation." In Fisiak 1986, 221-261.
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 1989. "Morphophonemic alternations and the history of English: Examples from Old English." In Markus 1989, 112-123.
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 1990. "The typological status of Old English Word Formation." In Adamson, Law, Vincent and Wright 1990, 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.65.14kas>
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 1992. "Semantics and vocabulary." In Hogg 1992, 290-408. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521264747.006>
- KASTOVSKY, Dieter. 2006. "Typological Changes in Derivational Morphology." In van Kemenade and Los 2006, 151-177. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757048.ch7>
- VAN KEMENADE, Ans and Bettelou Los, eds. 2006. *The Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757048>
- LIEBER, Rochelle. 2004. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- LYONS, John. 1995. *Linguistic Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810213>
- MAIRAL, Ricardo, Lilián Guerrero and Carlos González, eds. 2012. *El funcionalismo en la teoría lingüística*. Madrid: Akal Universitaria.
- MARKUS, Manfred, ed. 1989. *Historical English. On the occasion of Karl Brunner's 100th birthday*. Innsbruck: Universität.

- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2008. "Unification and separation in a functional theory of morphology." In Van Valin Jr. 2008, 119-145. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.105.12mar>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2009. "A Typology of Morphological Constructions." In Butler and Martín Arista 2009, 85-115. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.107.06aty>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2010a. "OE strong verbs derived from strong verbs." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 7: 36-56.
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2010b. "Lexical negation in Old English." *NOWELE: North-Western European Language Evolution* 60(61): 89-10. <https://doi.org/10.1075/nowele.60-61.05ari>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2011a. "Morphological relatedness and zero alternation in Old English." In Guerrero 2011, 339-362.
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2011b. "Adjective formation and lexical layers in Old English." *English Studies* 92(3): 323-334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2011.564776>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2011c. "Projections and constructions in functional morphology: the case of HRÊOW." *Language and Linguistics* 12(2): 393-425.
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2012a. "The Old English Prefix Ge-: A Panchronic Reappraisal." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 32(4): 411-433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2012.744264>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2012b. "Morfología flexiva en RRG." In Mairal, Guerrero and González 2012, 43-58.
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier. 2013. "Recursivity, derivational depth and the search for Old English lexical primes." *Studia Neophilologica* 85(1): 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393274.2013.771829>
- MARTÍN ARISTA, Javier and Victoria Martín de la Rosa. 2006. "Old English Semantic Primes: Substantives, Determiners and Quantifiers." *ATLANTIS* 17: 9-28.
- MATEO MENDAZA, Raquel. 2013. "The Old English exponent for the semantic prime TOUCH. Descriptive and methodological questions." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 33(4): 449-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2013.857574>
- MATEO MENDAZA, Raquel. 2016a. "The search for Old English semantic primes: the case of HAPPEN." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 15(1): 71-99. <https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.352>
- MATEO MENDAZA, Raquel. 2016b. "The Old English exponent for the semantic prime MOVE." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 36(4): 542-559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2016.1169976>
- MEL'ČUK, Igor. 1989. "Semantic primitives from the Viewpoint of the Meaning-Text Linguistic Theory." *Quaderni di Semantica* 10(1): 65-102.
- MEL'ČUK, Igor. 1996. "Lexical Functions: A Tool for the Description of Lexical Relations in the Lexicon." In Wanner 1996, 37-102.

- MEL'ČUK, Igor. 2006. *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Edited by D. Beck. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- PENTTILÄ, Erkki. 1956. *The Old English Verbs of Vision. A Semantic Study*. Helsinki: Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique XVII, I.
- POUNDER, Amanda. 2000. *Processes and Paradigms in Word-Formation Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110814378>
- SWEET, Henry. 1976 (1896). *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- TRIPS, Carola. 2009. *Lexical Semantics and Diachronic Morphology. The development of -hood, -dom and -ship in the History of English*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484971318>
- VAN VALIN JR., Robert. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610578.001>
- VAN VALIN JR., Robert, ed. 2008. *Investigations of the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.105>
- VAN VALIN JR., Robert and Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139166799>
- VEA ESCARZA, Raquel. 2013. "Old English Adjectival Affixation. Structure and Function." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 48(1-3): 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.2478/stap-2013-0005>
- VEA ESCARZA, Raquel. 2016. "Old English affixation. A structural-functional analysis." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 15(1):101-119. <https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.353>
- VEA ESCARZA, Raquel. 2018. "Las funciones y categorías de los nombres y adjetivos afijados del inglés antiguo." *Onomázein* 41: 208-226. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.41.07>
- WANNER, Leo, ed. 1996. *Lexical functions in lexicography and natural language processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.31>
- WEMAN, Bertil. 1933. *Old English Semantic Analysis and Theory with Special Reference Denoting Locomotion*. Lund: Lindstedts Univ.-Bokhandel.

Appendix: The definition of affixal entries

and-. As a quantifier prefix, it creates nouns from nominal bases to convey that a single amount of a concrete entity becomes pluralized: *and-lōman* ‘utensils, implements’, *-burge*, *-gelōman*. As a circumstantial prefix, it is associated to certain nouns to denote location: *and-leofa* ‘nourishment, food’, *-leofen*, *-ribb*, *-weorc*, *-wlita*, *-wlite*, and also figurative location: *and-lēan* ‘retribution, retaliation’, *-sæc*, *-slyht*, *-wīg*, *-wist*; *(ge)and-weard* ‘present, actual, existing’. It has a privative value in a few adjectives: *and-feax* ‘bald’, *-gietylēas*.

arce-. Nominal prefix attached to nouns to convey a higher rank than the one the base denotes, normally associated to the meaning ‘chief’: *arce-bisceop* ‘archbishop’, *-biscoprice*, *-biscopstōl*, *-dīacon*, *-rīce*, *-stōl*.

eall-. As a nominal prefix, it is attached to nominal bases to increase the referent in what regards its scope or intensity: *eall-hālgung* ‘consecration; all worship’, *-mægen*, *-miht*, *-offrung*, *-wealdend*, *-wihta*, *-wundor*. As an adjectival prefix, it is attached to adjectival bases and intensifies the property designated in the nominal root: *eall-beorht* ‘all-bright, resplendent’, *-cræftig*, *-eðern*, *-gelēaflic*, *-gōd*, *-grēne*, *-gylden*, *-hālig*, *-hwīt*, *-īren*, *-īsig*, *-nacod*, *-nīwe*, *-seolcen*, *-writen*.

-en. Adjectival suffix attached to nominal bases to denote origin, which can be local, causal or material: *æc-en* ‘oaken’, *ælr-*, *ær-*, *æsc-*, *ætr-*, *āðeg-*, *bæn-*, *bæst-*, *bēan-*, *bēc-*, *ber-*, *blōd-*, *bræs-*, *bred-*, *brocc-*, *bycc-*, *byx-*, *ceosl-*, *crīst-*, *cwīcbēam-*, *cwīcsūsl-*, *cypr-*, *dēor-*, *ealgotwebb-*, *elebēam-*, *eletrēow-*, *elpendbæn-*, *eorð-*, *fæder-*, *(ge)fæg-*, *fell-*, *flint-*, *flōd-*, *fyr-*, *fyx-*, *gæt-*, *gehamm-*, *gelīef-*, *gemēdr-*, *geræw-*, *gesinhīw-*, *geðrac-*, *gielp-*, *glær-*, *glæs-*, *godwebb-*, *grāscinn-*, *gyld-*, *hæft-*, *hær-*, *hæsl-*, *hæð-*, *hæw-*, *heort-*, *hol-*, *hrīðer-*, *hund-*, *hwæt-*, *hwīl-*, *hylst-*, *hynd-*, *hyrn-*, *lām-*, *lēad-*, *lēasbrēd-*, *leðr-*, *līg-*, *lind-*, *līn-*, *luf-*, *lyft-*, *lysw-*, *mēdr-*, *meolc-*, *middangeard-*, *midl-*, *mōddr-*, *pæll-*, *pic-*, *pīntrēow-*, *purpur-*, *rēð-*, *rind-*, *risc-*, *rōs-*, *ryg-*, *sæl-*, *scēap-*, *scēapheord-*, *scierd-*, *scild-*, *scucc-*, *seolc-*, *seolfr-*, *sīd-*, *slīð-*, *smætegyld-*, *smedm-*, *spær-*, *stæn-*, *stocc-*, *stīl-*, *sweft-*, *swīn-*, *tæn-*, *tigel-*, *tin-*, *trēow-*, *tungl-*, *twīn-*, *tyht-*, *ðēod-*, *ðril-*, *ðrin-*, *ðyft-*, *ðyrn-*, *wæd-*, *weax-*, *will-*, *wylf-*, *wyll-*, *ymbhamm-*, *yppl-*, *yter-*. As a nominal suffix, it can be attached to adjectival bases to express an abstract property derived from the referent: *æwfæst-en* ‘legal or public fast’, *fæst-*, *(ge)fæst-*, *frēc-*, *hēahfæst-*, *holdræd-*, *ield-*, *midl-*, *myrg-*, *swīg-*, *wēst-*. It derives feminine nouns from nominal bases: *ælf-en* ‘nymph’, *ass-*, *bir-*, *byr-*, *gyd-*, *menn-*, *my nec-*, *ðīn-*, *ðyft-*, *wiel-*, *wylf-*. It derives deverbal nouns with an abstract meaning: *begīm-en* ‘attention, observation’, *foreðingræd-*, *hīw-*, *hīwræd-*, *sōðseg-*, *til-*, *(ge)ðēodræd-*. It derives adjectives from nominal basis with the meaning ‘similarity’ with

respect to the referent: *flāsc-en* ‘of flesh, like flesh’, *hunigtēar-*, *hwæl-*, *wilddēor-*. It can also pluralize or collectivize the referent: *āc-en* ‘a wood of oaks’, *bryð-*, *per-*, *scræf-*.

-feald. Adjectival suffix attached to numeral bases to denote the property of having as many parts as the ones indicated by the numeral of the base: *ān-feald* ‘single, unmixed, unique’, *eahta-*, *endlyfen-*, *fela-*, *fēower-*, *fif-*, *fiftig-*, *fiðer-*, *hund-*, *hundseofontig-*, *hundseofontigseofon-*, *hundtēontig-*, *manig-*, *nēah-*, *nigon-*, *seofon-*, *siex-*, *sixtig-*, *tīen-*, *twelf-*, *twēntig-*, *ðūsēnd-*.

for-. Nominal prefix attached to nouns to denote an augmentative value, the referent being increased: *for-scending* ‘confusion’, *-spild*, *-ðahting*, *-ðeahung*, *-wana*, *-yldu*. It also denotes an increase in intensity in adjectival derivatives: *for-cūð* ‘bad, wicked, infamous’, *-dyslic*, *-fæger*, *-heard*, *-hrēred*, *-lȳtel*, *-manig*, *-micel*, *-repen*, *-scyldig*, *-strang*, *-swīð*, *-wened*, *-wēned*, *-weorðfullic*, *-werod*, *-wraened*, *-wundorlic*. It expresses location in some nouns, specifically the idea of ‘being in front of’: *for-hēafod* ‘forehead’, *-ierð*, *-scip*, *-sīð*. It can also designate origin or relation to the nominal referent: *for-gȳmelēasnes* ‘carelessness’, *ligeren*, *-mæł*, *-nefe*, *-ræpe*.

fore-. Circumstantial prefix that conveys location and temporal meaning. As a locative prefix, it derives nouns from nominal bases with the meaning ‘being in front of’: *fore-brēost* ‘chest’, *-burh*, *-duru*, *-dyre*, *-fex*, *-hūs*, *-locc*, *-mearcung*, *-munt*, *-rīm*, *-saga*, *-seld*, *-tēð*, *-tīge*, *-timbrigende*, *-weall*. As a temporal prefix, it derives nouns and adjectives from mainly nominal bases conveying that something takes place before: *fore-āð* ‘preliminary oath’, *-cnēowrisn*, *-cnyll*, *-cynn*, *-cynren*, *-gīsl*, *-mearcod*, *-nyme*, *-sæd*, *-tācn*, *-writen*. It also has a figurative circumstantial value, both locative (*fore-dyrstig* ‘presumptuous’, *-geswuteliende*, *-glēaw*, *-feohtend*, *-nama*, *-rynel*, *-weard*) and temporal (*fore-bēacen* ‘sign, portent’, *-bīcnung*, *-bod*, *-gīmnnes*, *-steall*, *-ðanc*, *-weard*, *-word*, *-wyrd*). It derives nouns with a higher rank than the one in the base: *fore-biscop* ‘high-priest’, *-frēfrend*, *-lādtēow*, *-setl*.

forð-. As an adjectival prefix, it is attached to adjectives to intensify the property designated in the base: *forð-ancful* ‘very thankful’, *-gelang*, *-gerīmed*, *-gesȳne*, *-mære*, *-riht*, *-snoter*. It derives adjectives with a locative meaning, related to the idea of forwardness: *forð-āgoten* ‘poured forth’, *-bigfērende*, *-georn*, *-tīge*, *-weard*. It also has a figurative locative meaning in some adjectives and, above all, nouns: *forð-āloten* ‘prone’, *-ātȳdred*, *-āurnnen*, *-dæd*, *-fæder*, *-gegyrd*, *-gyrd*, *-herge*, *-sīð*, *-sige*, *-spell*, *-stefn*, *-weard*. It is prefixed to nouns that undergo a greater charge or responsibility: *forð-man* ‘man of rank’, *-ðegn*, *-wīf*.

fram-. Nominal prefix that conveys a figurative locative meaning related to the idea of a starting point: *fram-bige* ‘backsliding, apostasy’, *-cynn*, *-fær*, *-ierning*, *-lād*, *-sīð*, *-weard*, *-wesende*. It also designates higher rank: *fram-rinc* ‘chief, prince’.

frēa-. As a nominal affix, it attaches to nouns to designate a higher position both in an organizational or in an intensity hierarchy: *frēa-bregd* ‘mighty device’, *-drihten*, *-meaht*, *-miht*, *-reccere*, *-wine*, *-wrāsn*. As an adjectival prefix, it derives adjectives with a greater intensity: *frēa-beorht* ‘glorious’, *-fætt*, *-glēaw*, *-hræd*, *-mære*, *-micel*, *-torht*, *-wlitig*.

-ful. Adjectival suffix attached to mainly nominal bases to designate the abstract property that derives from the meaning of the base: *æfest-ful* ‘full of envy’, *andgiet-*, *andwlite-*, *ār-*, *ārweorð-*, *bealu-*, *bismer-*, *brerd-*, *byrst-*, *car-*, *cēast-*, *(ge) cwild-*, *deorc-*, *dīegol-*, *earm-*, *edwīt-*, *ege-*, *eges-*, *ēst-*, *fācen-*, *fæc-*, *firen-*, *firenlust-*, *(ge)flit-*, *foreðanc-*, *frēcen-*, *frec-*, *frem-*, *fýren-*, *fýrwit-*, *gāl-*, *gecwealm-*, *gehlyst-*, *gelāst-*, *gelust-*, *gemynd-*, *genip-*, *genyht-*, *georn-*, *gestrēon-*, *gesund-*, *getæl-*, *geðanc-*, *gewin-*, *gleng-*, *grim-*, *hearm-*, *hefe-*, *hleahter-*, *hlīs-*, *hoh-*, *hrēoh-*, *hyht-*, *hysp-*, *ield-*, *inwit-*, *(ge)lēaf-*, *leahtor-*, *(ge)limp-*, *lust-*, *lýðer-*, *mæð-*, *mān-*, *miht-*, *mōd-*, *nebwilāt-*, *nēod-*, *nīed-*, *nīð-*, *riht-*, *rūmgi-*, *sac-*, *scam-*, *scand-*, *sceað-*, *scyld-*, *side-*, *slac-*, *sorg-*, *spræc-*, *swic-*, *(ge)swinc-*, *synn-*, *tæł-*, *tēam-*, *tēon-*, *(ge)trēow-*, *tūddor-*, *tung-*, *dēostor-*, *dēaw-*, *ðræc-*, *ðrīst-*, *ðrym-*, *ðrýð-*, *wæter-*, *wam-*, *weorc-*, *weorð-*, *wist-*, *wlite-*, *wōh-*, *word-*, *wræc-*, *wuldor-*, *wundor-*, *yfel-*. As a nominal suffix, it designates a unit of measure with reference to the base: *glæs-ful* ‘a glassful’, *hand-*.

ful(l)-. Adjectival prefix attached to mainly adjectival bases to designate the highest degree of intensity: *ful-beorht* ‘very bright, resplendent’, *-gōd*, *-hār*; *full-æðele* ‘very noble’, *-blīðe*, *-boren*, *-clæne*, *-cūð*, *-fremed*, *-gedrifēn*, *-gewēpned*, *-mannod*, *-medeme*, *-rīpod*, *-ðungen*, *-wearm*, *-welig*, *-wēpnod*, *-wērig*.

healf-. Adjectival prefix attached to adjectival or verbal bases to denote that a specific property becomes diminished: *healf-brocen* ‘half-broken’, *-clæmed*, *-chungen*, *-clypigende*, *-cwic*, *-dēad*, *-eald*, *-fēðe*, *-frēo*, *-gewriten*, *-hār*, *-hrūh*, *-hundisc*, *-hwīt*, *-nacod*, *-rēad*, *-scyldig*, *-sinewealt*, *-slæpende*, *-soden*. As a nominal prefix, it reduces to the half the amount referred to in the base: *healf-fers* ‘hemistich’, *-gemet*, *-hēafod*, *-hunding*, *-hýd*, *-mann*, *-marc*, *-weg*.

-icge. This prefix derives feminine nouns from nominal or verbal bases: *ācenn-icge* ‘mother’, *byrd-*, *drý-* *galdr-*, *hlæfd-* *hunt-*.

-iht (*-eht*, *-uht*). Adjectival suffix attached to nominal bases to designate the

possession of a concrete entity specified in the base: *bog-ih̄t* ‘full of bends’, *b̄yliht*, *cærsiht*, *cinēht*, *dylst-*, *fēðr-*, *flān-*, *h̄æð-*, *h̄æx-*, *h̄eafod-*, *helm-*, *hr̄eod-*, *īf-*, *īs-*, *l̄ir-*, *sand-*, *sciell-*, *sin-*, *ðō-*, *ðorn-*, *wār-*, *wearr-*, *wil-*, *wund-*; *fl̄æsc-eh̄t* ‘fleshly’, *hr̄īs-*, *l̄ir-*. As a quantity suffix, it pluralizes the referent of the base: *ælc-uh̄t* ‘everything’.

-in̄cel. Nominal suffix attached to nominal bases to denote that a concrete entity is decreased in size: *bōg-in̄cel* ‘small bough’, *byrð-*, *cof-*, *ðēow-*, *h̄æft-*, *hūs-*, *lið-*, *rāp-*, *scip-*, *stān-*, *sūl-*, *tūn-*, *win-*.

-le. Adjectival suffix attached to a numeral base to designate the scaling of the referent by the amount indicated in the base: *sesc-le* ‘sixth part’.

ofer-. Nominal prefix attached to nominal bases to increase the intensity of the referent: *ofer-ǣt* ‘gluttony, feasting, excess’, *-biternes*, *-costung*, *-cræft*, *-cwealm*, *-ēaca*, *-fr̄ēcednes*, *-fyr̄r*, *-geðyld*, *-gemet*, *-gēmnes*, *-hige*, *-hygd*, *-lif̄a*, *-lufu*, *-māðum*, *-mēde*, *-mete*, *-nēod*, *-s̄ælð*, *-sceatt*, *-sēocnes*, *-sl̄æp*, *-sm̄eaung*, *-t̄æl*, *-tr̄ūwa*, *-ðearf*, *-ðryccednes*, *-ðrymm*, *-weder*, *-wist*, *-wlencu*, *-ȳð*. As an adjectival prefix, it is attached to mainly adjectival bases to intensify the property designated in the referent: *ofer-bl̄iðe* ‘too light-hearted’, *-ceald*, *-eald*, *-etol*, *-f̄æst*, *-f̄æt*, *-f̄ēðre*, *-full*, *-funden*, *-geswincful*, *-ḡifre*, *-glenged*, *-gr̄ædig*, *-hāt*, *-h̄eah*, *-hebbendlic*, *-hl̄ūd*, *-hr̄ered*, *-lēof*, *-m̄æte*, *-mēde*, *-micel*, *-mōd*, *-mōdig*, *-pr̄ūt*, *-ranc*, *-s̄ælig*, *-welig*, *-wyrðe*, *-ðōht*. As a circumstantial prefix, it is attached to mainly nominal bases to form nouns and adjectives with the meaning ‘above’: *ofer-b̄æc* ‘the upper part of the back’, *-blice*, *-br̄aw*, *-br̄ū*, *-br̄ūwa*, *-cæfed*, *-cierr*, *-clif*, *-dyre*, *-f̄roren*, *-geweorc*, *-gewrit*, *-gylden*, *-gyrd*, *-hacele*, *-hangen*, *-healfh̄eafod*, *-holt*, *-hyrned*, *-l̄æg*, *-lyf̄ilic*, *-mearcung*, *-s̄ælic*, *-s̄eam*, *-segl*, *-steall*, *-weorc*, *-writ*. It also has a temporal value, meaning ‘after’: *ofer-nōn* ‘afternoon’, *-dæg*. It is attached to nouns to denote higher official rank: *ofer-ealdormann* ‘chief officer’, *-mæcga*.

s̄ām-. Adjectival prefix attached to mainly verbal bases to indicate that the characteristics of the referent become diminished: *s̄ām-b̄ærned* ‘half-burned’, *-boren*, *-cwic*, *-gr̄ēne*, *-l̄æred*, *-locen*, *-melt*, *-soden*, *-storfen*, *-sw̄æled*, *-weaxen*, *-wīs*. As a nominal prefix, it derives nouns indicating that the whole referred to in the base is reduced to some extent: *s̄ām-bryce* ‘partial breach (of rule, laws, etc.)’.

sin-. Adjectival prefix that intensifies the property referred to in the base: *sin-byrnende* ‘ever-burning’, *-cald*, *-grim*, *-hwyrfel*, *-hwyrfende*, *-trendende*, *-tryndel*, *-ðyrstende*. As a nominal prefix, it is attached to nouns to convey ‘perpetuity, constancy’: *sin-dr̄eam* ‘everlasting joy’, *-h̄īwscipe*, *-n̄ið*, *-nihte*, *-r̄æden*, *-sorg*, *-wr̄ænnēs*; *(ge)sin-h̄īwan* ‘wedded couple’. As a nominal prefix, it attaches to

nominal bases to convey an increase in size: *sin-here* ‘huge army’, *-snæd*. It also derives nouns from nominal bases denoting a higher rank than the referent: *sin-fræa* ‘overlord’.

sub-. Nominal prefix attached to nominal bases to denote a lower rank than the referent: *sub-dīacon* ‘subdeacon’.

twi-. Nominal and mainly adjectival prefix attached to adjectival, nominal and verbal bases to indicate that the property or amount of the base is doubled: *twi-bēte* ‘subject to double compensation’, *-bill*, *-blēoh*, *-browen*, *-dæglic*, *-dæl*, *-dēagod*, *-ecge*, *-fealdlic*, *-fēre*, *-fēte*, *-fēðerede*, *-fingre*, *-fýrede*, *-gærede*, *-gilde*, *-hæmed*, *-hēafdede*, *-heolor*, *-hīwe*, *-hlidede*, *-hwēole*, *-hwyrft*, *-hynde*, *-lafte*, *-men*, *-mylte*, *-nibbe*, *-nihte*, *-ræde*, *-rædnes*, *-scyldig*, *-seht*, *-sestre*, *-sliht*, *-snæcce*, *-snēse*, *-spunnen*, *-streng*, *-tælged*, *-ðrāwen*, *-wæg*, *-weg*, *-wintre*, *-wyrdig*.

-ð (*-að*, *-oð*). Nominal affix deriving deverbal predications with an abstract meaning: *æbylg-ð* ‘anger’, *gemæg-*, *gescend-*, *geðing-*, *gewilc-*, *hæl-*, *hīen-*, *hīg-*, *ierm-*, *(ge)mæg-*, *mæ-*, *rým-*, *(ge)sæll-*, *(ge)til-*, *(ge)trēow-*, *wæf-*, *wēn-*; *droht-að* ‘mode of living’, *fēog-*, *fyll*, *herg-*, *traht-*; *drüg-oð* ‘drought, dryness’, *hæftn-*, *hunt-*, *sweol-*, *wīgn-*. Attached to adjectives, it expresses an abstract property derived from the referent: *(ge)cýð-ð* ‘familiarity, kinship, relationship’, *dēa-*, *fæg-*, *fæh-*, *frym-*, *gedrīh-*, *hlēow-*, *læð-*, *mær-*, *myrg-*, *slæw-*, *streng-*, *trym-*, *wanhæl-*; *trumn-að* ‘confirmation’; *gēan-oð* ‘complaint’, *lang-*. It derives nouns from verbal bases indicating a concrete entity: *dugu-ð* ‘body of noble retainers’, *nirw-*, *rīp-*; *fōstr-að* ‘food’; *folg-oð* ‘body of retainers’. It pluralizes or collectivizes the referent: *(ge)fyrh-ð* ‘wooded country’, *(ge)mæg-*; *fisc-að* ‘fishing, fishpond’.

ðri- (*ðry-*). Adjectival prefix attached to mainly nominal bases to indicate that the noun or property they refer to is tripled, or that it contains a triple amount of what is denoted in the base: *ðri-beddod* ‘three-bedded’, *-dæglic*, *-dæled*, *-feald*, *-fēte*, *-fingre*, *-flēre*, *-fōtede*, *-fýrede*, *-gærede*, *-gēare*, *-gylde*, *-hæmed*, *-hēafdede*, *-hīwede*, *-hlidede*, *-hyrne*, *-lēfe*, *-rēðre*, *-scýte*, *-slite*, *-streng*, *-tigfeald*, *-wintre*; *ðry-sumer* ‘three years old’.

under-. Nominal prefix attached to nominal bases to denote a lower rank than the referent: *under-cýning* ‘under-king, viceroy’, *-dīacon*, *-folgoð*, *-gerēfa*, *-lāttēow*, *-tōdal*, *-ðēow*.

-ung. Nominal affix deriving deverbal predications with an abstract meaning: *āblig-ung* ‘occupation; trouble’, *āblæc-*, *āblāwn-*, *ablāw-*, *āblys-*, *ācēoc-*, *ācunn-*,

*ādēaf-, æbb-, æfengereord-, æfest-, æfn-, æfterfylg-, ælec-, æswic-, ætsporn-, ætȳw-,
 æwn-, āfand-, āfeorm-, āflieg-, aflī-, āfremð-, āgnett-, āheard-, āmānsum-, andett-,
 and-, andūstr-, an-, ānwun-, āpins-, (ge)āsc-, āsmēag-, āsmor-, āspring-, āstyr-,
 āswārn-, aswind-, āsyndr-, ātēor-, āðen-, āðind-, āðswer-, āweos-, āwyrð-, āwyrig-,
 bāsn-, bebycg-, bebyrg-, beclȳs-, bedelf-, bedryd-, befrīn-, behēafd-, behrēows-,
 behȳr-, belād-, belāw-, (ge)bēot-, bepæc-, besārg-, besceadw-, bescēaw-, bescir-,
 beswīc-, betæc-, (ge)beter-, betȳn-, beð-, bewedd-, bewer-, bewlāt-, (ge)bīcn-, bif-,
 bisceop-, bisg-, (ge)bismer-, blāc-, bladesn-, blāw-, blēts-, bliccett-, bliss-, blōt-, bōc-,
 bod-, boget-, bog-, bōg-, brastl-, breahm-, brec-, brem-, brogdet-, (ge)brosn-, brūc-,
 brytn-, (ge)bytl-, camp-, cancel-, ceahhet-, cēap-, cearcet-, ceor-, cēow-, cīd-, (ge)
 cīg-, citel-, (ge)clāns-, clæppet-, clangett-, clāw-, clēof-, clifr-, (ge)clip-, clȳs-, cnēat-,
 cnēow-, cnys-, cōcn-, cosset-, (ge)cost-, cracel-, crācet-, crēop-, cunn-, curs-, cwac-,
 cwān-, cwecc-, cwidd-, cwīð-, dælnim-, dag-, dēag-, declīn-, delf-, deorc-, der-, dīc-,
 (ge)dihm-, dingi-, dof-, (ge)drecc-, drēf-, drēop-, drēor-, (ge)drohtm-, droppet-, drūg-,
 drūp-, dwol-, dydr-, dysg-, (ge)ēacn-, (ge)eaht-, eald-, earn-, ecg-, edgrōw-, edlæc-,
 (ge)edlēan-, (ge)ednīw-, (ge)edstaðel-, (ge)efenlæc-, efenðrōw-, efenhlēoðr-, efensārg-,
 efest-, efes-, eftbēt-, eftflōw-, eftðing-, eges-, ēht-, elc-, eln-, eldēoð-, (ge)end-, eri-, eð-,
 eðg-, (ge)fad-, (ge)fægn-, (ge)fæstn-, fāget-, fāg-, fand-, feorm-, feorr-, fēo-, (ge)fēow-,
 ferc-, fēð-, fic-, fiht-, fnēos-, foreald-, forebod-, forecost-, foregearw-, forescēaw-,
 fōresmēag-, forestæpp-, forestiht-, foreteohh-, foreðing-, forewīteg-, forgæg-, forgif-,
 forherg-, forhog-, forht-, formolsn-, forsac-, forscam-, forsuw-, forswar-, fortrūw-, forð-,
 forðclip-, forðfrom-, forðsweb-, forðyldeg-, forwand-, (ge)fræt-w-, frās-, frēf-, frem-,
 frēols-, frign-, frihtr-, fugl-, fund-, fyrðr-, gal-, gān-, gealpett-, gearc-, (ge)gearw-,
 gebēacn-, gebēt-, gecwic-, geeard-, geendad-, gehȳr-, gelōg-, gelȳtl-, gemānsum-,
 gemær-, gemeng-, geniw-, genyhtsum-, geocs-, gēomr-, geondlecc-, geonlīc-, georn-,
 geregn-, gerēn-, gerihwīs-, gesibsum-, gesweðr-, geswōg-, geteld-, geteohh-, getī-,
 getrūg-, getrūw-, geðrīstlæc-, geðwær-, giedd-, gin-, gīts-, giw-, glad-, glæter-, glider-,
 glīten-, glīw-, gnorn-, gō-, gorett-, grān-, grāp-, grem-, grenn-, grims-, gristbit-, grorn-,
 grunn-, grymett-, gyl-, gyp-, hæbb-, hæftn-, hæft-, hāð-, hālett-, (ge)hālg-, hāls-,
 handfæstn-, handl-, hat-, hāt-, hāw-, hēap-, heard-, hearp-, hef-, hel-, hēof-, heolor-,
 heorcn-, herg-, her-, hierd-, hīg-, (ge)hīw-, hīw-, hlacer-, hlād-, hlēap-, hlēoðr-, hlēow-,
 hligi-, (ge)hlin-, hloccet-, hlōw-, hlȳttr-, hnæg-, hnapp-, hog-, hrad-, hræc-, hræcet-,
 hredd-, hrēows-, hrep-, hroh-, hrȳsc-, hunt-, hwæstr-, hwel-, hwins-, hwispr-, hwistl-,
 hwoðr-, hwyrft-, hysp-, hȳðeg-, iers-, īeðr-, incēg-, inn-, insegl-, lācn-, lād-, læcc-,
 lang-, lat-, (ge)lād-, lēahr-, lēan-, lēaslīcett-, lēasōlec-, lēastyht-, leorn-, (ge)līc-, licc-,
 līcett-, līð-, līx-, lof-, luf-, (ge)lustfull-, lyffet-, lȳtl-, mac-, mēnsum-, (ge)mārs-, mæss-,
 mæð-, mālet-, mang-, martyr-, mādēl-, mearc-, medem-, meld-, melt-, meng-, (ge)metg-,
 mets-, (ge)miel-, midl-, migg-, (ge)milts-, mins-, misfad-, murc-, murn-, (ge)myneg-,
 myrðr-, nēad-, nēalæc-, nēaw-, (ge)nēos-, ner-, nȳdnim-, nytt-, ofercīd-, oferhlīf-,
 ofermōdg-, oferswīð-, olæc-, olecc-, oleht-, onāscun-, oncīg-, oncnāw-, ondō-, onnett-,*

ongecġg-, ongēot-, onlūt-, onorð-, onsæg-, onsætn-, onsætt-, onscun-, onsetn-, onðrac-, onwrīð-, onwun-, (ge)open-, ortrūw-, orð-, pēc-, pīc-, pīn-, plant-, plat-, prædic-, pric-, prūt-, punget-, ræscet-, ræsw-, rār-, rēad-, rēaf-, (ge)rēon-, (ge)reord-, rīcs-, rīfel-, rīp-, rot-, rōts-, rý-, sætt-, (ge)samn-, sārg-, sāwl-, scam-, sceaðw-, sceaarf-, sceaarp-, sceað-, scēaw-, scend-, scild-, scir-, scot-, scō-, scrēad-, scrūtn-, scun-, scyldig-, scylfr-, segl-, segn-, seof-, (ge)sēð-, sicett-, sid-, sīd-, sierw-, slip-, slīt-, smal-, (ge)smēa-, smeort-, smir-, snīð-, sorg-, spætt-, spātl-, spell-, spend-, sporet-, spræð-, spring-, spyrn-, spyr-, stac-, stal-, (ge)staðol-, stic-, (ge)stiht-, strāc-, (ge)strang-, strūd-, styfic-, styr-, swearc-, swefec-, sweol-, (ge)sweotol-, sweð-, swīc-, (ge)swīg-, swingl-, swins-, swōret-, syng-, (ge)tācn-, tæft-, telg-, tempr-, (ge)tēor-, tīd-, til-, (ge)timbr-, tintreg-, tūtel-, tōberst-, tōgelad-, tōgelað-, tog-, tolcet-, torf-, trahtn-, trifel-, twēon-, twisl-, tȳdr-, tysl-, (ge)ðaf-, ðancmet-, ðanc-, (ge)ðeaht-, ðen-, ðēn-, ðēof-, ðēostr-, (ge)ðing-, ðol-, ðoter-, ðræst-, ðraf-, ðrēag-, ðrēap-, ðreod-, ðrōw-, ðrūt-, ðun-, ðurhwun-, ðynn-, ðyrel-, ufer-, underhlyst-, underwreð-, unwliteg-, ūðwiteg-, wac-, wad-, wædl-, (ge)wæpn-, wæter-, wāfung-, wag-, wandl-, wan-, wān-, wand-, warn-, weall-, weax-, webb-, wedd-, weder-, wellīc-, wend-, wēod-, weof-, wīc-, wicc-, wīcn-, (ge)wīf-, (ge)wīgl-, wīdmærs-, wiern-, (ge)will-, will-, (ge)wiln-, wind-, (ge)wiss-, (ge)wistfull-, wīteg-, wītn-, wīðercwed-, wīðersac-, wīðsac-, wlætt-, wlāt-, woff-, wōg-, wordl-, wōr-, wræstl-, wraxl-, wrēg-, (ge)wrixl-, wrixl-, wud-, wuldr-, wundr-, wun-, wynsumm-, wyrc-, wyr-, yfels-, yfelsac-, yft-, ymbeard-, ymbhȳw-, ymbscēaw-, ymbsetn-, ymbðreod-, ymbwend-, ymbwlāt-, ȳð-. Attached to nominal bases, it creates nouns with an abstract meaning: *ādl-ung* ‘illness’, *ærend-*, *bisceophād-*, *cilds-*, *clatr-*, *eorðtil-*, *forescȳw-*, *forscap-*, *fox-*, *fregn-*, *gamen-*, *geard-*, *geheord-*, *gīf-*, *glōf-*, *gristl-*, *hād-*, *hafoc-*, *hrīst-*, *hūsl-*, *hwat-*, *hwearf-*, *lēasspell-*, *mægsibb-*, (ge)*mearc-*, *mōt-*, *nihtfeorm-*, *niðer-*, *palm-*, *rihtlæc-*, *setl-*, *strēw-*, *tōhop-*, *tōsōcn-*, *ðrēat-*, *unrihtwīf-*, *weorð-*, *woruldbig-*, *woruldðēn-*, *wucðēn-*, *wyr-*. Attached to adjectives, it expresses an abstract property derived from the referent: *ælfremed-ung* ‘alienation’, *ārweorð-*, *bearnēac-*, *crīstn-*, *edles-*, *fæcn-*, (ge)*gader-*, *gemæn-*, *gemetlic-*, *hār-*, *heolstr-*, *lēas-*, *lēf-*, *nīw-*, *smeart-*, *staðolfæstn-*, *stealc-*, *swæs-*, *sweart-*, *swīgl-*, *wætt-*, *wearg-*, *wīðer-*, *wordsnoter-*. This prefix can also pluralize or collectivize the referent: *gestrēag-ung* ‘vegetation’, *mæssedēn-*.

-welle. Adjectival suffix attached to a nominal base to designate the scaling of the referent by the amount indicated in the base: *hund-welle* ‘a hundred-fold’.