

SOME LATINATE DEVERBAL SUFFIXES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH: THEIR  
INTEGRATION, PRODUCTIVITY AND SEMANTIC COHERENCE

By Cynthia Lloyd

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of PhD

University of Leeds, School of English

June 2005

05

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to my supervisor, Professor Katie Wales, for her excellent guidance and friendly encouragement; to Dr Bethan Davies for valuable help with statistics; and to my husband, Stephen Lloyd, for his patience, as well as for proof reading the Bibliography and checking the references in Chapter 9.

# SOME LATINATE DEVERBAL SUFFIXES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH: THEIR INTEGRATION, PRODUCTIVITY AND SEMANTIC COHERENCE

By Cynthia Lloyd

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of PhD  
University of Leeds, School of English  
June 2005

## ABSTRACT

The meanings of deverbal nouns have been classified by various linguists in terms of case, such as instrument or result of action. However, there is some debate as to whether meaning can attach to the derivational suffixes such as *-ation*, *-ment*, etc., which form these nouns. For some the meanings of the suffixes themselves are unspecified, apart from the grammatical recategorisation involved in changing a verb to a noun. Others see an affix as interacting with the base to affect the semantics of the derivative. Earlier historical linguists described deverbal suffixes as attracting a 'nexus' of meanings which are common to all of them, and which cluster round a central semantic notion such as 'action/fact'. Furthermore, it has been suggested that each suffix develops through time a unique combination of such meanings in a hierarchy of its own. This is the question I am concerned with here.

My interest is in the French nominal suffixes *-ment*, *-ance/-ence*, *-ation*, *-age* and *-al*, which entered Middle English (ME) via borrowings from French, and which now form abstract nouns in English by attaching themselves mainly to verbs. I shall argue that from their earliest appearance in English these suffixes began to select characteristically from the nexus of common meanings, in terms both of the kinds of bases to which each suffix was characteristically attached, and also of the kinds of contexts in which words formed in it tended to appear. I further conclude that each one may specialise in a distinct aspect of the central meaning 'action/fact', such as specific instance or quality.

My method has been to examine the integration into English of each suffix, then to take samples of about 200 words in each, in order to determine the semantic categories in which they were used in their earliest recorded citations in the *MED* and *OED*. Some of these contexts will be analysed in detail. I will then compare these findings with those from an examination of the same suffixes in five plays by Shakespeare. By comparing the earlier semantic profiles for ME words with those for the same words in Shakespeare, as well as with those for words of later origin in the same suffixes, I hope to touch on some ways in which suffix use might develop over time, in the selection both of bases and semantic contexts.

## CONTENTS

	page
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	
1.1. Word formation: the theoretical background	1
1.1.1. Generative morphology: transformations	1
1.1.2. Rule or rote?	3
1.2. Productivity	6
1.2.1. Determining factors	6
1.2.2. Analysability	9
1.3. Semantics	10
1.3.1. Form and meaning	10
1.3.2. Case	14
1.3.3. Distinctions between suffixes	16
1.3.4. Semantic categories	19
1.4. The present study	21
1.4.1. Purpose	21
1.4.2. The sample	22
1.4.3. Method	26
<b>Chapter 2: English and French in Medieval England</b>	29
2.1. Language contact	29
2.1.1. The status of French	27
2.1.2. Domains	31
2.1.3. French lexis in Middle English	38
2.1.4. Codeswitching	42
<b>Chapter 3: The suffix <i>-ment</i> in Middle English</b>	49
3.1. History and Morphology	49
3.1.1. History	49
3.1.2. Morphological types	49
3.1.3. Co-occurrences	50
3.1.4. Transparency	50
3.2. Phonology	50
3.2.1. Stress	50
3.2.2. Phonetics	51
3.3. Integration	52
3.3.1. Productivity	52
3.3.2. Analysability	53
3.3.3. The sample in <i>-ment</i>	56
3.4. Semantics	61
3.4.1. Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Result/state	62
3.4.2. Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Action	64
3.4.3. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	65
3.4.4. 1150-1300: analysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	68
3.4.5. 14th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	71
3.4.6. 14th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	73
3.4.7. 15th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	84

3.4.8. 15th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ment</i>	86
3.4.9. Conclusions	97
<b>Chapter 4: The suffix <i>-ance/-ence</i> in Middle English</b>	101
4.1. History and Morphology	101
4.1.1. History	101
4.1.2. Morphological types	102
4.1.3. Co-occurrences	102
4.1.4. Transparency	103
4.2. Phonology	103
4.2.1. Stress	103
4.2.2. Phonetics	103
4.3. Integration	104
4.3.1. Productivity	104
4.3.2. Analysability	106
4.3.3. The sample in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	107
4.4. Semantics	113
4.4.1. Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Result/state	114
4.4.2. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	116
4.4.3. 1150-1300: analysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	119
4.4.4. 14th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	121
4.4.5. 14th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	126
4.4.6. 15th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	132
4.4.7. 15th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i>	135
4.4.8. Conclusions	140
<b>Chapter 5: The suffix <i>-ation</i> in Middle English</b>	146
5.1. History and Morphology	146
5.1.1. History	146
5.1.2. Morphological types	146
5.1.3. Co-occurrences	147
5.1.4. Transparency	147
5.2. Phonology	148
5.2.1. Stress	148
5.2.2. Phonetics	148
5.3. Integration	148
5.3.1. Productivity	148
5.3.2. Analysability	150
5.3.3. The sample in <i>-ation</i>	151
5.4. Semantics	156
5.4.1. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	156
5.4.2. 1150-1300: analysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	157
5.4.3. 14th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	158
5.4.4. 14th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	163
5.4.5. 15th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	169
5.4.6. 15th century: analysable nouns in <i>-ation</i>	172
5.4.7. Conclusions	178

<b>Chapter 6: The suffix <i>-age</i> in Middle English</b>	181
6.1. History and Morphology	181
6.1.1. History	181
6.1.2. Morphological types	181
6.1.3. Co-occurrences	182
6.1.4. Transparency	182
6.2. Phonology	183
6.2.1. Stress	183
6.2.2. Phonetics	183
6.3. Integration	184
6.3.1. Productivity	184
6.3.2. Analysability	185
6.3.3. The sample in <i>-age</i>	185
6.4. Semantics	189
6.4.1. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns in <i>-age</i>	190
6.4.2. 1150-1300: analysable nouns in <i>-age</i>	192
6.4.3. 14th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-age</i>	193
6.4.4. 14th century: analysable nouns in <i>-age</i>	195
6.4.5. 15th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-age</i>	198
6.4.6. 15th century: analysable nouns in <i>--age</i>	200
6.4.7. Conclusions	206
<b>Chapter 7: The suffix <i>-al</i> in Middle English</b>	209
7.1. History and Morphology	209
7.1.1. History	209
7.1.2. Morphological types	209
7.1.3. Co-occurrences	211
7.1.4. Transparency	211
7.2. Phonology	211
7.2.1. Stress	211
7.2.2. Phonetics	212
7.3. Integration	212
7.3.1. Productivity	213
7.3.2. Analysability	215
7.3.3. The sample in <i>--al</i>	215
7.4. Semantics	220
7.4.1. Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Attributive nouns	220
7.4.2. Intensive nouns	220
7.4.3. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns in <i>--al</i>	220
7.4.4. 1150-1300: analysable nouns in <i>-al</i>	222
7.4.5. 14th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-al</i>	223
7.4.6. 14th century: analysable nouns in <i>-al</i>	225
7.4.7. 15th century: unanalysable nouns in <i>-al</i>	231
7.4.8. 15th century: analysable nouns in <i>-al</i>	232
7.4.9. Conclusions	236
<b>Chapter 8: Comparison of 5 latinate suffixes across 3 periods of ME</b>	240
8.1. Morphology	240
8.1.1. Co-occurrences	240

8.2. Integration	241
8.2.1. Productivity	241
8.2.2. Analysability	243
8.2.3. Summary	244
8.3. Semantics	245
8.3.1. Comparison of suffixes	245
8.3.2. Summary	250
<b>Tables 13-22</b>	253-262
<b>Chapter 9: Comparison of 5 latinate suffixes across 5 plays by Shakespeare</b>	263
9.1. Data for comparison	263
9.2. Semantics of <i>-ment</i>	264
9.2.1. Nouns in <i>-ment</i> of ME origin	264
9.2.2. Nouns in <i>-ment</i> of post-ME origin	265
9.2.3. Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity	269
9.2.4. Summary	272
9.3. Semantics of <i>-ance/-ence</i>	273
9.3.1. Nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i> of ME origin	273
9.3.2. Nouns in <i>-ance/-ence</i> of post-ME origin	274
9.3.3. Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity	277
9.3.4. Summary	281
9.4. Semantics of <i>-ation</i>	283
9.4.1. Nouns in <i>-ation</i> of ME origin	283
9.4.2. Nouns in <i>-ation</i> of post-ME origin	283
9.4.3. Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity	285
9.4.4. Summary	287
9.5. Semantics of <i>-age</i>	288
9.5.1. Nouns in <i>-age</i> of ME origin	288
9.5.2. Nouns in <i>-age</i> of post-ME origin	290
9.5.3. Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity	292
9.5.4. Summary	293
9.6. Semantics of <i>-al</i>	295
9.6.1. Nouns in <i>-al</i> of ME origin	295
9.6.2. Nouns in <i>-al</i> of post-ME origin	296
9.6.3. Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity	297
9.6.4. Summary	298
9.7. Conclusions	299
9.7.1. Productivity	299
9.7.2. Semantics	300
<b>Tables 44-48</b>	306-309
<b>Chapter 10: Conclusion</b>	310
10.1. Purpose	310
10.2. Morphophonological restrictions	310
10.2.1. Category	310
10.2.2. Morphology	311
10.2.3. Phonology	311

10.3. Productivity	312
10.4. Semantics	315
10.4.1. Middle English	315
10.4.2. Alternative forms	315
10.4.3. The 16th century	317
10.4.4. Description of semantics	318
10.5. Summary	321

<b>Bibliography</b>	323
---------------------	-----

Appendix 1: Alternatives to earlier or simultaneous forms in other suffixes	332
Appendix 2: The relation of suffix usage to textual genre	336
Appendix 3: Nouns in <i>-acioun</i> translated from Latin	337
Appendix 5: Some neologisms in the suffix <i>-al</i> in the 16th & 17th centuries	339

### **Key to abbreviations**

OE = Old English	MED = Middle English Dictionary
ME = Middle English	OED = Oxford English Dictionary
AN = Anglo-Norman	SOED = Shorter Oxford English Dictionary
OF = Old French [continental]	AND = Anglo-Norman Dictionary
ML = Medieval Latin	
EmodE = Early Modern English	
modE = Modern English	
WFR = Word Formation Rule	

### **Numbering**

Numbers under 10 have been given in words where they occur in the text. Those in double digits or more appear in figures.



## Chapter 1

**INTRODUCTION****1.1. Word formation: the theoretical background**

This thesis will examine some aspects of the semantics, and integration into Middle English, of the five nominal suffixes *-ment*, *-ance/-ence*, *-ation*, *-age* and *-al*, which entered the language via borrowings from French, and which now form abstract nouns in English by attaching themselves to verbs. My main interest here is in the semantics of derived words and in particular the question of affixes, the degree of semantic content that can be attributed to them, and how their semantic content, if any, should be defined.

Before discussing my project in detail, I will summarise some recent and current debates in morphological theory, touching on transformational and lexicalist theories of word formation and going on to discuss the relation of semantics to productivity, with a brief account of methods of assessing productivity. In the last section I will introduce the aims and methodology of my present project in relation to my own theoretical position, and to previous work in this field in Middle English.

**1.1.1. *Generative morphology: transformations***

In recent decades, theories of morphology have been concerned with the question of whether words are formed by systematic, generalised rules or by idiosyncratic ‘lexical’ rules (which are stored in and accessed from a ‘lexicon’ by memory).

Chomsky's first Standard Theory of Syntax, as developed in *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965), presupposes that words were generated in the same way as sentences, that is by ‘transformations’. The theory

of transformational grammar suggests that there exists a 'deep structure' of meaning which underlies every utterance, and which is converted or 'transformed' into varying forms of linguistic surface structure. Within Chomsky's theory it was held at first that not only the order of words but the words themselves were the products of transformations. In this way the word *kill* would be the surface form of the deep structure *cause become not alive*. Similarly, a complex noun such as REFUSAL was thought to reflect the syntactic transformation involved in deriving a noun REFUSAL from a verb *refuse*.

However, consideration of the behaviour of complex words revealed problems with this extension of the theory. In his paper 'Remarks on Nominalisation' (1970) Chomsky noted that such words are subject to syntactic constraints which do not apply to their bases: for example, we cannot derive *\*John's difficulty to please* from *John is difficult to please* (Chomsky, 1970: 199ff, discussed in Button, 1990: 9-11). This suggests that words which have changed their category as a result of word formation may have to be accounted for differently from those inflected according to their category, such as *please: please-s*, which can be used in identical positions. Similarly if we compare the syntactic use of the gerund, or verbal noun (verb[V]+-ing, e.g. *refusing*) with that of derived nominals formed by adding a suffix, such as REFUSAL, several such differences may be found: for example, we cannot derive *\*refusal this* from *the refusal of this*. Furthermore, gerunds are formed regularly on any verb by adding *-ing*, while morphological derivations are irregular, often involving an apparently arbitrary choice between a number of different affixes (*-al, -ment, -ation*) or changes to the stem, as in *receive receptive*. Chomsky concluded from his examples that only the gerunds could be derived transformationally, while derived nominals were not derived at all, but listed in the lexicon.

This means that words such as REFUSAL are not processed by the speaker in the same way as inflected words with a grammatical function, such as *walking*, *walk-s* or *walk-ed*. Instead they have to be retrieved from the speaker's memory, or personal 'lexicon', where they are stored. Chomsky's Lexicalist Hypothesis thus excludes category-changing transformational rules from the grammar. However, it does not appear to be possible to exclude word formation altogether from syntactic theory. Halle in 'Prolegomena' (1973) required a more detailed theory of word formation, involving Word Formation Rules (WFRs) which would explain existing words, their order of morphemes (e.g. root and affix) and their idiosyncrasies (why ARRIVAL and not \*ARRIVATION)? This challenge was taken up notably by Aronoff (1976), and later by Beard (1983), Jackendoff (1981), and Selkirk (1982).

### 1.1.2. *Rule or rote?*

Selkirk devised a version of non-transformational 'phrase structure grammar', a variant of X-bar syntax, which would also apply to word formation. Here word formation is once again an analogy of syntactic processes, in which the parts of a word are ordered like those of a phrase, including a 'head' (as the head of a noun phrase is the noun). According to this model, in Spencer's paraphrase 'The affix is the head, and its syntactic features percolate to the top of the word tree' (1992: 199). However, the notion of 'head' in word formation has been criticised by Bauer in his article 'Be-heading the Word' on various grounds, notably that some of the criteria for 'head' in syntax do not apply to affixes, that different criteria identify different elements as 'head' in word formation, and that if the affix is the head, percolation of features is not consistent (1990: 1-30).

These notions followed the mainstream of morphological theory in perceiving the word in terms of meaningful elements, or 'morphemes' such as root and affix. The

morpheme had been defined as the minimum meaningful unit by Hockett in 1958. Aronoff (1976), however, argues that meaning gravitates to the level of the word (1976: 14). He points out that a morpheme such as the prefix *re-* in REFUSAL or the component *cran-* in *cranberry* has no meaning in itself, and that even a compound such as *blackberry* overrides any meaning which its components may have separately (1976:10). For him it is not the components but the composition which conveys meaning. If the relationship between parts (such as adjective + *ness*) occurs regularly over a number of words, a particular composition (such as *blackness*) will be interpretable as meaning 'quality of being black'. It will become semantically coherent and will tend to be repeated, or 'productive'. Moreover, for Aronoff only words which are not yet or no longer productive are stored in the lexicon. If a word belongs to a productive class there is no need for it to be stored in the lexicon: it can be retrieved generatively by a word formation rule (1976: 18).

Bybee, however, believes we should abandon a 'yes/no model of lexical storage' (1985: 114). She points out that evidence from psycholinguistic tests suggests that even some regular inflected forms (not necessarily all) 'may have lexical representation' (1985: 114). She quotes Peters' (1983) findings that complex strings are not necessarily purged from the lexicon after they are analysed (Bybee, 1985:129), and concludes that there is evidence of interaction between rule and rote processing even in the case of productive words (1985: 207). Her evidence mainly concerns inflected forms, but she has argued that the difference between inflected and derivational forms is only one of degree of semantic content, and varies between languages. She places the derivational on a semantic continuum between the inflectional (where the meaning is 'often so general as to be redundant in context') to the fully lexicalised or autonomous word (an example might be *blackboard*), which

‘reflects the greatest semantic distinction’ and needs to be learned independently (1985: 85).

Bybee introduces the notion of ‘lexical strength’, a further continuum along which words form a higher or lower degree of ‘lexical connections’. This means that certain inflected or derived words are more likely than others to be connected with their bases in speakers’ minds. These lexical connections are in inverse ratio to lexical strength, the lowest degree of lexical connection being closest to autonomy (1995:117ff). Lexically strong or autonomous words may be recalled from lexical storage, while those which have to be recalled by lexical connections will be subject to a word formation rule.

This appears to have some relevance to the situation of Middle English, in which words were borrowed from a donor language over a period of time, during which period certain components of some word classes could have become productive. We might expect lexical strength to be reflected in a word’s productive status, according to whether it was originally borrowed as a unit or formed analytically on an existing pattern. An example of the former would be **COMMANDEMENT**, borrowed from French into Middle English. Such a word would have lexical strength: it would be adopted holistically into the lexicon and not compared with other words or analysed into its component parts. However, when enough of such words have been borrowed to form a recognisable class it is possible to recombine the component parts and to form other words with the same suffix: at this stage the pattern has become productive. It would be predicted by both Bybee’s and Aronoff’s models that words formed later on the productive pattern would have lower lexical strength: that is, they would have to be recalled via their lexical connections and their formation would be subject to a word formation rule. However, such words in ME cannot always be identified; many latinate

nouns which could have been formed on earlier bases could also be holistic borrowings, as they have counterparts in French (see 1.2.2. below).

Booij (1986) and Plag (1999) have both commented on the relation between productivity and semantics. Booij points out that the tendency of certain affixes to take on multiple meanings appears more systematic ‘once we distinguish between productive and unproductive interpretations’ (1986: 515). Before turning to the question of semantics, and in particular the semantics of derived words, I will therefore briefly discuss some of the methods of identifying and assessing productivity.

## **1.2. Productivity**

### **1.2.1. *Determining factors***

According to Bybee, psycholinguistic tests have shown that frequency plays some part in determining productivity. The most productive forms appear to be those with high type but low token frequency, that is those with many class members, infrequently used (1985: 134). Words of a high token frequency have greater lexical strength: that is, they ‘undergo less analysis, are less dependent on their related base forms than those with lower token frequencies’ (1985: 119). The degree of type frequency necessary for productivity is of course difficult to determine. Dalton-Puffer suggests that a ‘critical mass’ may operate for major derivational categories (1996: 224-5).

Various mathematical approaches, based on counting occurrences of a given affix in a corpus, are discussed in Plag (1999: 23ff). Aronoff (1976) ‘suggests a productivity index which is the ratio of actual to possible words’ (quoted in Plag 1999: 23), a suggestion later criticised by Aronoff himself on the grounds that where an affix is productive, possibility could in theory be infinite (Ansshen and Aronoff, 1981: 64, quoted in Plag, 1999: 23). Baayen and Lieber (1991, also quoted in Plag 1999: 26)

propose a productivity measure  $P$  which would be the quotient of the number of hapax legomena (words occurring once in a corpus) for a given affix, and the total number of tokens of all words with that affix. The number of hapaxes has been found to reflect the number of neologisms in a corpus (Baayen and Renouf, 1996: 76) and according to Plag ‘there are strong psycholinguistic arguments for the assumption that the proportion of neologisms among attested types increases with decreasing type frequency’ (1999: 27). I have found some evidence for this in examining Shakespeare’s use of the five French nominal suffixes of my study (see 9.7.1.). Plag comments that ‘in spite of some remaining methodological problems, the different [mathematical] measures ... have the great advantage that they make certain intuitive aspects of morphological productivity explicit and calculable’ (1999: 33).

Dressler in a series of articles (1981, 1982, 1985, 1986) has developed a theory of Natural Morphology, in which the productivity of a formative depends on the degree of morphotactic and morphosemantic transparency of its derivatives. The highest levels of transparency occur where an affix is attached to a base which remains unchanged (as in *excite#ment* > *excitement*), while the lowest is represented by suppletion (as in *child* > *children*). For Dalton-Puffer, the measure of productivity in Romance suffixes would be the appearance of hybrid forms with English bases (such as ONEMENT) which could only arise in her view from a necessary degree of ‘naturalness’, that is of morphosemantic and morphotactic ‘transparency’ in possible derivatives (Dalton-Puffer 1992; see also Dressler 1985: 97-112). By these criteria she doubts whether most Romance suffixes became productive at all. ‘Of the Romance suffixes only the transparent *-ment* has formed a marginal number of hybrids.’ Miller, however, lists many more hybrids from the late 14th century in *-ment* and *-age* than are available in Dalton-Puffer’s database, the Helsinki Corpus (1997: 243-5), pointing out that ‘This

implies that some French affixes were already developing productively in ME' (1997: 253). Dalton-Puffer herself admits that transparency should in the case of *-ment* have produced a higher score, since the highest degree of transparency available to a derivative is that of an affix added directly to a base without modification of the stem, as with consonant-initial suffixes (for example, *excite* > *excite+ment* rather than *conclude* > *conclus+ion*). However, she admits elsewhere that 'There are ... several things that naturalness alone cannot explain or which even contradict it ... the semantic level also plays an important role and may counterbalance the naturalness position of a given suffix' (1996: 215). Bybee has also pointed out that the perceived 'naturalness' of transparency is not in fact borne out by natural languages, in which suppletion and allomorphy, placed by Dressler at the bottom of the naturalness scale (Dressler 1985: 98-9), are more common than regularity (Bybee 1985: 208).

In subsequent chapters I comment briefly on the transparency measure in respect of each of the suffixes discussed here. However, its application appears limited. Plag reminds us of the part played by fashion and extra-linguistic aspects in linguistic matters (1999: 39; this again seems demonstrable from Shakespeare); while Clark distinguishes 'structural' from 'natural' productivity in terms of pragmatics, natural productivity being simply 'the current patterns and word formation options favoured by speakers of a language on a day-to day basis' (1984: 571). Dalton-Puffer refers to 'system adequacy', whereby a less 'natural' process (such as ablaut) may be adequate within a language because it is typical (1996: 224).

Dalton-Puffer quotes Bauer's suggestion of 'generalisedness' (a combination of frequency and analysability) as an indication of productivity (Bauer 1998: 61, quoted in Dalton-Puffer 1993: 185, 1996: 216), but concludes that there is no single principle behind the productivity of French forms in ME (1996: 221ff). Kastovsky (1985) has



pointed out that in the case of corpus languages such as ME, accessible only from texts, the establishment of synchronic productivity is ‘somewhat problematic, since the major criteria for the establishment of productivity, viz., introspection, elicitation and acceptability judgements of neologisms, are not available’ (1985:228 ). I share his preference for discussing corpus languages in terms of ‘analysability’: that is, a situation in which paradigms appear and it becomes possible for contemporary users to distinguish base from affix.

### 1.2.2. *Analysability*

The conditions for ‘analysability’, however, are somewhat fluid in definition. To Dalton-Puffer, analysability can mean the mere existence of related forms, however much later they appear (1992: 476-7;1996: 99). Zbierska-Sawala takes the same view, defining analysability as ‘the co-occurrence of wholesale borrowings with simplex forms on the same stem or with other derivatives on the same stem’ (1989: 93-4). The appearance of later forms would of course render a complex noun analysable or rather ‘transparent’ in retrospect, but would in theory rule out derivation from the later form.

In assessing analysability I have therefore adopted the view of Pattison (1975), who makes a distinction between words which appear before any related simplex form is recorded in the language (e.g. ME *COMMANDEMENT*) and those which follow an earlier simplex form (e.g. ME *AVAUNCEMENT*, the first attestation of which follows that for a verb *avancen*). In the first case the noun might be assumed to have been borrowed holistically, without analysis, while in the second case it is ‘analysable’ and could have been formed independently on the earlier verb. Pattison takes the view that a notable increase in such analysability may be seen as a sign of productivity, so that by dating and counting pairs on the same stem in a given affix, we may arrive at an estimate of when the affix became productive (1975: 159, 210). Dalton-Puffer also in

fact recognises this distinction, pointing out that by the end of the ME period in her sample ‘we can say that all derivatives which look analysable really are analysable’ and that though it is of course still possible that a derived noun was borrowed from French rather than derived in ME, ‘What is crucial ... is that ... after a certain point, it could have been [i.e. derived in ME]’ (1996: 210). Zbierska-Sawala remarks on a high number of derivatives pointing to ‘at least passive productivity, i.e. the analysability of the pattern’, and suggests high transparency and new coinage as additional signs (1992: 30). I have taken analysability and new coinage as my own chief indicators in assessing productivity, though mindful of their limitations for the purpose. It is not always easy even to assess analysability in ME, where many chronologically analysable words have counterparts in French and could therefore be borrowings; and although there exist Romance forms in all suffixes which are not attested in French, this may simply be due to defective records.

### **1.3. Semantics**

#### **1.3.1. *Form and meaning***

Aronoff has said that in affixed forms, ‘productivity goes hand in hand with semantic coherence’ (1976: 45). In other words, productivity is only possible if the composition is also semantically coherent and the affix is recognisable as performing a specific function. Sturtevant (1942) had earlier given semantic conditions for productive analogy which are summarised below.

- (1) The prior member of the compound must keep its identity;
- (2) The final member must have the same meaning in several compounds,  
or appear in one common or important enough to establish the type;
- (3) the meaning of the final member must be general enough to be used  
in other words (Sturtevant, 1942:114).

Although the term ‘compound’ is used, Pattison has quoted this as applicable to suffixation (1975: 6). On the question of the semantics of suffixed nominalisations there is, however, much disagreement. Such nominalisations are generally seen as a class of abstract nouns in which a set of semantic categories overlap: Jespersen, for example, calls them ‘nexus-substantives’ (1942: VI, 244, 15.6). A deverbal noun such as GOVERNMENT can mean the act of governing, the quality of good government, or a body of people who govern. How are these different meanings to be accounted for, and what have they to do with the affix? Is it indeed possible to ascribe meaning to an affix at all, beyond the specific category change (for instance, as here, from a verb to a noun) which it may perform?

We have seen already that for Aronoff (1976) only the final composition of [base+affix = word] has meaning (see 1.2. above). Dalton-Puffer (1996), however, is willing to ascribe meaning to the affixes themselves: ‘As far as I can see at the moment, derivational suffixes ... move on a cline between operational (inflectional) and denotational (lexical) meaning’ (1996:68). She remarks that ‘an approach such as Selkirk's ... which gives affixes their own lexical entries’ is in this respect ‘preferable to one which made them a part of the rule apparatus such as Aronoff's’ (1996: 40). However, she also points out that Selkirk ‘is, of course, not interested in the semantics of word formation’ and that it can be ‘extremely difficult’ to ‘ascribe meanings to derivational affixes in a principled way’ (Dalton-Puffer 1996: 41).

If we can ascribe meanings to affixes, however, it appears that one affix can bear several meanings, while, conversely, one meaning can be shared by several affixes. This inconvenient fact has persuaded some linguists that there can be no connection between morphology and semantics: in other words, that the affix chosen is a formal sign with no semantic content. Beard proposes two layers of operation in word

formation : (1) formal ('affixation...located near the surface and directly related to phonology') and (2) functional/semantic ('derivation ... an absolutely deep-structure process operating most probably in the lexicon' (Beard, 1983: 220). The argument is that if form and meaning were connected, all English agent nouns, for example, would end in the suffix *-er* (as in *teacher*), and the suffix *-er* would always indicate an agent noun. In practice, however, some nouns with action suffixes can bear agentive meanings (such as GOVERNMENT or APPURTENANCE), even though most of them do not. Conversely, the suffix *-er* can also signify something quite different, such as comparison.

For these linguists of the 'separationist' persuasion, the affix has a category-changing function only. This means that there can be no semantic differences between rival suffixes which perform the same function, such as changing a verb to a noun. Zwanenburg (1980, 1984, quoted in Booij, 1986: 504) proposed the following word formation rule for 'the English deverbal action noun':

$$[x]v \rightarrow [x]v \begin{cases} al \\ ion \\ ment \end{cases}$$

while Jakobson (1936[1962]) proposed a 'very general and vague meaning' (quoted in Booij, 1986: 505) for competing affixes, the interpretation of which would then be determined by context. This is also Bauer's (1983) position. Deverbal nominalisations may lend themselves to various meanings such as Act, Process or Manner, but these meanings are specified not by the suffix itself but by context:

(1) A. His condemnation of the government lasted for hours. (Act).

(2) B. His condemnation of the government was verbose. (Manner).

(1983: 186).

For Bauer, in the deep structure ‘only the grammatical relationship of verb-nominalisation is specified’ (1983: 80). Dalton-Puffer similarly finds that ‘establishing a whole array of seemingly equal semantic categories seems rather like descriptive overkill’ and suggests a default reading: ‘act or process of doing X’ and alternative reading: ‘an entity (abstract or concrete) in connection with the action expressed by the verb’ (1996: 93).

Both Booij (1992) and Plag (1999), however, have argued that the link between form and meaning ‘is the essence of any linguistic system’ (Booij, 1992: 505). Plag points out that Beard (1983) had to devise ‘correspondence rules’ to relate his separate formal and semantic levels, the necessity for which according to Plag invalidates the ‘separationist assumption’ (Plag, 1999: 239). Booij has criticised Zwanenburg’s formulation for deverbal action nouns on two counts: that it does not account for blocking, in which certain words take only one suffix, and that ‘competing affixes may differ in respect to their productivity and distribution’ (1986: 505). Both Booij and Plag have sought formulae to capture and simplify the fact of ‘morphological assymetry’, i.e. shared meanings in affix groups and multiple meanings in individual members of a group. Booij (1986: 505) suggests ‘one core or prototypical meaning’ for competing affixes, which may then develop other meanings by extension rules (so that, for example, an agent may be seen as an instrument, or an action as its result). This seems an adequate description of the situation with the deverbal suffixes under consideration. However, the further question is raised as to whether the extension meanings may be differently distributed among them. My own research has suggested to me that affixes do have meaning, in that a set of competing suffixes may share a core meaning such as ‘verbal action’ and extension meanings such as agent and instrument, but that each suffix will tend to drift towards certain extension meanings more

frequently than towards others, and that these preferred meanings will vary between suffixes. I will discuss this further below in 1.3.3.

### 1.3.2. *Case*

Marchand has in fact suggested that a suffix might cover various categories of meaning but that ‘each one suffix has a different totality of semantic features’ and that ‘any one sign is determined by the totality of combinations in which it may occur and which cannot be the same as that of any other sign’ (1969: 227-8). Kastovsky has discussed these combinations in terms of the case of the noun in relation to its base (e.g. ‘object of V-ing’), suggesting a ‘hierarchy of productivity’ for the available meanings in relation to a given suffix, an example being ‘agent - instrument - experiencer - patient - locative - action’ in relation to ‘the morphological pattern V-er’ (1986: 597). He had previously suggested that ‘the possible major semantic-syntactic categories of deverbal nouns are predetermined by the number of possible cases and head nouns of complement clauses ... it seems that only a limited subset of these tends to figure in deverbal derivations, which have proved fairly stable during the history of English’ (1985: 253).

Beard has argued that ‘the meanings of lexical derivations and primary Indo-European case functions are persistently parallel’, giving as examples the prepositionless cases in Latin, Greek and Sanscrit (1983: 220). Szymanek (1988) has claimed that derivational categories are ‘ultimately grounded in cognitive concepts’, most of which ‘look remarkably like the case labels we have met several times in several contexts’ (Dalton-Puffer, 1996: 70). Dalton-Puffer finds Szymanek's categories ‘both intuitively appealing and descriptively adequate’ (1996: 71) and asks: ‘Is this a case where traditional terms are intuitively right about, for instance, cognitive categories, or is cognitive linguistics rediscovering traditional grammar?’ (1996: 72).

She further points out that these 'thematic roles' (also proposed by Olsen, 1982, quoted in Dalton-Puffer, 1996: 41) in fact have correspondences with the 'paraphrases' such as 'place connected with' by which Marchand defines the meanings of nominal suffixes (Marchand 1969: 1221-352).

Zbierska-Sawala (1992) also uses case labels as a tool of analysis for suffixed nouns. She remarks that any case is 'just one (albeit usually most significant) facet' of a 'more complex category which results from the intersection of several basic ones', quoting Schlesinger (1989) on separate cases as variants of 'the same deep case node' (Zbierska-Sawala, 1992: 23-24). However, she suggests an 'implicational scale' for case categories in derived nouns, according to their correspondences with 'the level of generality in cognitive categories'. The scale is initially taken from Panagi (1987: 136), who places action, agent, instrument and location in descending order of generality. In Zbierska-Sawala's version an additional category, state, is said to have the 'same degree of generality' as action (Zbierska-Sawala, 1992: 19-20). I have made use of these and Kastovsky's categories in my own analysis.

Booij suggests a 'thematic grid', defined as the specification of the semantic roles the verb imposes on its arguments (i.e. complement or subject). He maintains, however, that while 'subject' is a syntactic notion, 'agent' (for example) 'is a derived semantic category, *resulting from the interaction of the grammatical qualification of deverbal -er nouns with other, semantic properties of the verbal bases*' (1992: 507: my italics). This raises the question of selection of bases, as well as of contexts, as a possible factor in distinguishing the operation of affixes.

I hope to show that as a suffix becomes productive a characteristic 'hierarchy' of meanings such as that suggested by Kastovsky may indeed be established for each suffix. In fact I suspect that, far from displaying overkill, as

Dalton-Puffer suggests, Kastovsky's categories do not go far enough. It seems to me that suffixes may differ not only in the hierarchy of such meanings but in the aspects of them which they activate. If this turns out to be true then some of Kastovsky's classifications might bear further refinement, an example being his single concept of action/fact. Firstly, action and fact are two categories which should perhaps be separated in the semantics of derived nominals. 'Fact' could well be seen as a generalised concept susceptible of figurative use, and in certain suffixes may express abstractions such as 'right, ability or quality connected with V-ing'. Secondly, Kastovsky has in fact pointed out distinctions between aspects of action, such as specific instance, process or completion. As he says, 'These global categories may of course contain various semantic subgroups; thus, Action nouns occur in the basic variants of Fact nouns on the one hand and Action, Process, State, Act, etc., nouns on the other ... Such distinctions depend partly on the underlying verb, partly on the immediate syntactic context, and partly they are due to various degrees of lexicalisation. They are disregarded here' (1985: 226). However, work on ME suffixes so far has suggested to me that certain groups of deverbal nouns with the action meaning will tend to express one of these aspects more than others, and that the aspect favoured will often depend on the suffix in which they are formed.

### 1.3.3. *Distinctions between suffixes*

As Dalton-Puffer points out, Marchand's unique combination for each suffix 'presupposes that derivational suffixes do have a denotational meaning all by themselves and not just operational meanings similar to inflection' (1996: 68). If this is so, we must assume that the various suffixes which form deverbal abstract nouns such as *-ment*, *-ation*, *-al*, etc., can individually affect the meanings of their derivatives.



Bauer has said that to establish this it must be shown that ‘some suffixes invariably exclude or demand a specific subset of possible readings’ (1983: 189). His examples show that a deverbal suffix is likely to appear in a range of contexts, as Jakobson and others have noted. (See above, 1.3.1.). Yet it is possible to show that certain suffixes favour one kind of context over another. Such a case has been convincingly argued by Riddle (1985) in respect of the distinction between *-ness* and *-ity*. Riddle's claim is that *-ness* is now attached only with the meaning ‘specific characteristic or trait’ and *-ity* with the meaning ‘generic quality’. Having traced historically the loss and replacement of *-ness* by *-ity* as an abstract suffix, she shows by context analysis that in a majority of cases it is not now possible to use both *-ity* and *-ness* with the same meaning, and that the appropriate choice is clear. She further points out distinctions between *-ness* and its OE precursors *-dom* and *-head*, as well as between *-dom* and *-head* themselves (1985: 559). The invariability stipulation is violated, but I think she has shown the violations to be unimportant, arising in most instances for historical reasons (1985: 437ff).

Similarly Malkiel (1977) has found semantic distinctions between the adjectival suffixes *-ish* and *-y*, while Plag has found systematic differentiation between the verbal suffix *-ate* on the one hand, which in modE attaches to chemical bases, and the more general verbal formatives *-ize* and *-ify*, which he claims to be phonologically conditioned allomorphs, on the other (1999: 240). Adams points out that the suffixes *-ster* and *-eer*, though ‘closely comparable in certain cases ... nevertheless retain strongly individual flavours’ and comments that suffixes tend to be ‘influenced by features of the stem they are attached to’ (1973: 205-6).

The Domain Hypothesis of van Marle (1986) suggests that there are systematic (though not exceptionless) restrictions governing the choice of alternative affixes.

These restrictions may be formal, as in Dutch plurals (van Marle 1986), or semantic, as in the case of the Dutch feminine nouns discussed by van Marle (1985, 1986), or both, as in the verbal suffixes *-ate*, *-ize* and *-ify* (Plag, 1999: 240ff). Miller argues that French denominal suffixes in English acquired domains distinct from those of their OE competitors (1997: 241, 253), noting the number of learned and technical terms coined in these suffixes on Latin bases which in fact had native equivalents, and pointing out that Romance suffixes in literature avoided native bases ‘for abstract nouns and those of higher register’ (1997: 245).

Bybee remarks that suffix choice in deverbal nouns is not wholly predictable on morphological grounds and must in some cases be lexically determined. However, if the lexicalisation applies to the whole word, ‘then we are claiming that affixes have no existence or representation independently of the particular words to which they attach. For extremely productive affixes this may not be correct’ (1985: 127). In other words, though affix choice may in part be lexically inherited along with certain words, with productivity it could also become in part predictable in relation to other words. In the case of a foreign element in a language, such as French deverbal nouns in Middle English, there would of course also be the question of previous productivity, and therefore predictability, in the donor language.

As Plag has said, ‘many different kinds of properties together may be responsible for the choice of a particular affix’ (1999: 241). Adams remarks that artificial languages such as Ido cause problems in suffix choice: ‘It seems likely that the very “indefiniteness” which the Idists were trying to eliminate plays a necessary part in our ability to derive words’ (1973: 204). But if suffix choice is not wholly predictable from the morphology of the base or the lexicalisation of derivatives, we might tentatively conclude that it must depend at least in part on the semantics of the suffixes

themselves. In Marchand's terms, the question might be formulated as whether each suffix specialises in certain of the categories that are available to all.

#### 1.3.4. *Semantic categories*

The semantic categories I have found most applicable to ME deverbal suffixes are the core meaning 'action', with the aspects quality, general fact and specific instance, and the cases object, agent and instrument. Kastovsky also names a 'factitive' case (1985: 223, 226) expressing result, which I have replaced by a complex category combining result with state. I will comment briefly on these semantic categories below.

##### 1.3.4.1. *Object, agent and instrument*

Objective case ('thing or person V'ed') appears with all suffixes, but is less frequent than any category except agent. On Panagi's scale of generality (1987: 136) nouns marked by the agentive suffix *-er* are second only to action. Probably because they are otherwise marked, however, agent senses appear to be rare for deverbal derivative nouns, and appear only with the suffixes *-ment*, *-ance* and *-al*. Booij suggests that the semantic category 'instrument' develops from that of 'agent' via extension, i.e. personal agent > impersonal agent > instrument (1986: 509). He quotes Clark and Hecht's finding (1982) that children acquire the sense 'personal agent' before 'instrument' in their acquisition of ambiguous English *-er* nouns such as *typewriter*. Instrument is a major category for all the deverbal noun classes I have yet studied.

##### 1.3.4.2. *Result/ state*

Zbierska-Sawala has pointed out that the categories of action and state are intrinsically related (1992: 20), and in certain contexts deverbal nouns can be seen as expressing states which result from action. This places them in Kastovsky's 'factitive' class, which I shall call 'resultative'. A result noun might express a mental or physical state (REPENTANCE, TORMENT) or simply a state of affairs (ABBREVIATION).

‘State’ nouns, i.e. nouns of ‘being’, are sometimes held to derive from adjectives (see Dalton-Puffer 1996:102ff, 120 ff, Szymanek 1988:63 on ‘Nomina essendi’). Szymanek remarks that ‘the English categories of NA [Nomina Actionis] and NE [Nomina Essendi] display considerable fuzziness’ (1988: 66). He considers that where both adjective and verb exist in the paradigm (as in the case of *persist persistent: PERSISTENCE*), ‘The resultant nominalization may, in principle, be motivated by both and will be glossed, respectively, as (1) “the act of persisting” and (2) “the state/quality of being persistent” ’ (1988:66). For Dalton-Puffer also the meaning of de-verbal *-ance* is not always ‘action of V-ing’, but ‘depends mostly on the meaning of the underlying verb. If it is a real action verb such as “persevere, deliver, attend” an action N reading is more likely, if it is a stative verb such as “semblen, excellen” we get a nomen essendi’ (Dalton-Puffer, 1996: 102). Furthermore, it seems to me that if the ‘action’ involved is stative or experiential the state may equally be the result of an active verb (as in REPENTANCE, a state resulting from having repented) as of a passive one (as in ASSURANCE, a state of having been assured). I shall discuss this more fully in Chapter 4 in respect of *-ance/-ence*.

#### 1.3.4.3. *Action*

It seems inevitable that words denoting verbal action may be used in abstract and generalised senses to refer to the non-specific fact of the action denoted by the verb base. Where the base naturally extends to the semantic area of ‘moral quality’, an action noun may also be extended metaphorically to sum up the quality of the action. Goatly has said that suffixed forms give a high proportion of metaphorical meanings, with the highest proportion occurring among nouns, and that the more productive the form, the more active the interpretation: ‘The basic theory of proper nominalization is that a nominalized form represents qualities and processes abstracted from things and

time respectively' (1997: 101). An example from ME would be **CONTENEMENT**.

Around the beginning of the 13th century this word was used in the plural in *Ancrene Riwle* to mean specific instances of behaviour:

Bihald hire *contenemenz*...and tu maht demen hire wel ut of hire witte  
 Ancr. Corp. 50a MED  
 'Look at the things they do ... and you might think them right out of their  
 minds'.

But by c1400 **CONTENEMENT** was being used in the singular to refer to a generalised quality of behaviour: 'be *ze* of faire *conteinement*' (Femina 88, *MED*).

Equally, nouns expressing actions which are always specific in practice may be used in general contexts in order to name the action. In distinguishing general from specific action I have been guided by both context and syntax.

This is a brief survey only and these categories will be discussed in more detail in the chapters dealing separately with each suffix.

## **1.4. The present study**

### **1.4.1. *Purpose***

In this study I will consider the five latinate deverbal nominal suffixes *ment*, *-ence/-ance*, *-ation*, *-age* and *-al* in Middle English, with a view to establishing more precise semantic distinctions than those hitherto available for ME. The findings for the ME sample will then be compared with those for the same suffixes in five plays by Shakespeare, written approximately a century after the end of the ME period.

My indebtedness to Marchand (1969), Kastovsky (1985) and Dalton-Puffer (1992, 1993, 1996) will be obvious throughout. However, none of these demonstrates semantic conclusions by detailed contextual analysis; indeed I know of no study of ME suffixes which does so apart from Riddle (1985), whose contextual examples are all from the use of *-ness* and *-ity* in modE. Marchand and Kastovsky, like Riddle, discuss

the semantics of deverbal suffixes from the starting point of modE, as does Malkiel on *-ish* and *-y* (1977); while Malkiel on *-al* (1944) and Merk on *-ance*, *-tion*, *-age* and *-ment* (1970) have treated the medieval suffixes only in Old French. Dalton-Puffer (1994) quotes some contexts from Shakespeare in her paper comparing Shakespeare's agent nouns to Chaucer's, but she does not quote from Chaucer, and I have not found contextual examples elsewhere in her work on suffixes in ME. Furthermore, among the many useful studies of Shakespeare's language (e.g. Brook 1976, Hussey 1982, Blake 1983; see my Chapter 9), I have seen only two examples of contextual analysis comparing the use of these latinate suffixes in the plays. These are in Salmon (1987) and Nevalainen (2001), both in short sections of articles dealing with Shakespeare's word formation and neologisms in general.

In her study in the field of Middle English affixation, *The French Influence on Middle English Morphology* (1996), Dalton-Puffer remarks in the concluding pages that her account needs expanding 'not only in breadth but also in depth ... digging deeper into the ... stylistic distribution of the phenomena under discussion' (1996: 228). I have tried to make a start on this, in depth rather than breadth. One limitation of my study will be obvious: due to constraints of time and space I have omitted any detailed consideration of the native suffixes which the Romance suffixes compete with or replace. This aspect has been dealt with extensively in the works cited by Marchand, Kastovsky, Riddle and Dalton-Puffer.

#### 1.4.2. *The sample*

The sample is not quite equally divided between suffixes. The *MED* lists total entries of 354 words ending in *-ment*, 282 for *-ance/-ence*, 599 for *-ation*, 251 for *-age*, and 524 for *-al* (including *-aille*). Not all the *MED* entries for each ending are of the same grammatical category, and many are spelling variants of the same word. I

originally aimed at an approximate representative figure of 200 nouns per suffix, but for *-age* and *-al* respectively I found only 175 and 151 usable entries. The figures for *-ment*, *-ance/-ence* and *-ation* have been rounded up to 210 each, and the total number of words in the ME sample is 956.

The sample was taken in the first instance from my own selection of ME texts, chosen to represent in approximately equal volume three periods of ME: 1150-1300, the 14th century and the 15th century. The texts for the early period were selections from *Ancrene Riwe* (Hall 1920) and from a variety of prose texts in Bennett and Smithers (1966); for the 14th century Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* (Benson 1987), Gower's *Confessio Amantis* Books 1-4 (Weinberg 1983) and selections from Sisam (1959); for the 15th century, Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* Book VIII (Spisak 1983) and selections from the *Paston Letters* (Davis 1983), the *Book of Margery Kempe* and the works of Julian of Norwich (Barratt 1992). This sample obviously needed broadening. Dalton-Puffer's study (1996) uses the *Penn-Helsinki Corpus of Middle English* as a database for all French affixes in ME. This corpus includes a wide range of text types, but seems to have limitations as a source of suffixed words: for example, Dalton-Puffer found in it only two examples of the suffix *-aille* (precursor of *-al*). The corpus includes only 55 text samples and was designed chiefly for research into historical syntax. Miller is severely critical of the exclusive reliance on corpora, which he claims in Dalton-Puffer's case has led to a 'misguided' denial of the productivity of French abstract suffixes even though she appears to be aware of counter-examples outside the corpus (Miller 1997: 252). There seems room therefore for a different kind of sample. In addition, I wanted to construct a semantic profile for each suffix from the earliest known occurrence of each word in my database. I therefore turned to the *Middle English Dictionary (MED)*, which provides dates for first attributions across many

more texts than the 55 of the *Helsinki Corpus*. The 438 from which I have quoted include *Ancrene Wisse*, the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the *Kentish Sermons*, the *Katherine Group*, the *Gloucester Chronicle* and many romances from the early period; Mannyng, Rolle, Wyclif and many saints' lives, the *Rolls of Parliament*, guild documents, Mandeville, romances, the *Gawain* poet and much of Chaucer and Gower from the 14th century; and from the 15th century Hoccleve, Lydgate, the *Rolls of Parliament*, *Proclamations of the Privy Council*, many other administrative and court documents, Chauliac's medical treatise *Chirurgia Magna* and other practical and scientific treatises such as Palladius on gardening, as well as Trevisa and Caxton. A complete list of *MED* title stencils for the texts quoted throughout the study is available on request, but for reasons of space cannot be included here.

Taking account of the widely varying total entries for each suffix in the dictionary, I have added words from the *MED* to bring the sample up to approximately one third of usable items appearing in the dictionary under each letter throughout the alphabet for *-ment* and *-ance*, and one sixth for *-ation* (which has approximately twice as many entries as either of the other two). I have included all the additional usable items in *-age* and *-al*. All items, together with forms on the same stem, have been dated from the *MED*, except those which appear only in the *OED*. This includes words taken from my own initial selection of texts: as only first attributions are given, quotations are from the *MED* or *OED* where these pre-date the texts. Where the *MED* gives different dates for a MS and its original text, I have also given both dates, that for the MS appearing first. The origin of words has been checked in the dictionaries of Anglo-Norman, Old French and Medieval Latin which appear in the bibliography. References for dictionary citations can be checked in the Plan and Bibliography of the *MED* and the Introduction to the *OED*.



Following the example of Biber and Finegan (1987), I have differentiated text types broadly according to subject matter rather than genre such as play, poem or letter. However, categories such as ‘popular lore’ and ‘fiction’ are in fact characterised as ‘genre’ in Biber and Finegan (1987: 25), and I have used this term in Appendix 2. Stubbs uses the terms ‘text type’ and ‘genre’ interchangeably, remarking that ‘The concept of text type is clear enough in general, but although many categorizations have been proposed, none is comprehensive or generally accepted ... There is no implication that such genres are categories with neatly defined boundaries, although the focal members of genres are usually easy to identify’ (1996: 12). Classifications for ME texts are even less clear-cut and necessarily fewer than those appropriate for modern English. I have divided them into ‘fictional’, ‘religious’, ‘administrative’ and ‘scholarly’, as well as a broad ‘general’ category including history and topical commentary, usually but not always in prose. Not all verse is fictional in ME, and within the ‘religious’ category, for example, I have not made distinctions between religious verse, saints’ lives, the Bible and spiritual handbooks

Constraints of time and space forbade a comparison of my ME sample with a similarly wide and varied sample from a later date. Nunnally has in any case claimed that heterogenous data (such as mine for ME) can lead to misleadingly homogenised results, since ‘the facts of variation are blended into standardized numbers’ (1991: 26). He believes that ‘general conclusions must be enriched by differently conceived, more narrowly confined studies’ (1991: 34), which in his view ‘present a less distorted picture’ (1991: 31). I decided for all these reasons to compare my ME sample with a later cross-section of work by a single author, though possibly the most versatile and varied writer of the period following the Middle Ages, Shakespeare. The plays by Shakespeare are *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*, *Twelfth Night* and *Henry V*.

chosen partly for their high incidence of neologisms in the suffixes under consideration, and partly as being representative of a range of dramatic genres. In addition the choice of Shakespeare makes possible a comparison between ME usage of earlier lexis across a range of genres and texts, and the highly conscious use of the same and similar lexis by a literary artist.

### 1.4.3. *Method*

#### 1.4.3.1. *Productivity*

I shall discuss my sample chronologically across the three periods of ME given above: 1150-1300, the 14th century and the 15th century. The sample has been divided between unanalysable and analysable nouns, that is between those which were borrowed holistically, before any related forms had entered the language, and those which entered the language later than simplex forms on the same stem, from which they could in theory derive. (See Pattison's definition in 1.2.2. above.) Analysable and unanalysable data will be considered separately throughout. Plag has suggested that to include unanalysable data in a corpus might 'blur the effect of productivity on semantics' (1999: 28), but I have found it useful to consider both the similarities and differences of unanalysable and analysable nouns.

As indicated in 1.2.2., however, there are problems in assessing analysability in ME. The fact that it relies on textual dating, which may be uncertain or incomplete, has, I think, to be accepted as an occupational hazard. It must also be constantly borne in mind that the situation between French and English in medieval England seems to have been closer to bilingualism than to contact between two foreign languages, at least in circles where much of this lexis was used, so that the distinction between words which might be English derivatives and words which should be holistic borrowings is not always clear. This question will be discussed in the next chapter. However, I have

also used additional criteria to estimate productivity, such as the existence of latinate forms unattested in Old French or Anglo-Norman and of 'hybrid' forms in which French suffixes appear on English bases. By taking all these criteria together, I shall attempt to estimate the beginning of productivity for each suffix.

#### 1.4.3.2. *Semantics*

Each ME noun in the sample has been placed in a semantic category according to its meaning in the earliest context in which it appears. By charting the meanings of first attributions I have arrived at a profile of the semantic preferences of each suffix (in terms of aspects and extensions of the core meaning, and the bases to which each most typically attaches) as the suffix first became established in the language. I then compare these findings with those from an examination of these suffixes in the five selected plays by Shakespeare. By comparing the earlier semantic profiles for ME words with those for many of the same words in Shakespeare, as well as with those for words of later origin in the same suffixes, I finally suggest some ways in which suffix use might develop over time, in the selection both of bases and semantic contexts.

Tabulated figures representing the distribution of the suffixes across semantic categories have where possible been validated for statistical significance according to the chi<sup>2</sup> test. Tables suitable for testing include those representing the total figures for first attributions of the five suffixes across the three periods of ME (Table 11), the total figures for occurrences of the five suffixes across the five Shakespeare plays (Table 43), and the sum of these totals (Table 50). Each table has been tested in respect of the total distribution, the distribution of each suffix across semantic categories, and the distribution of certain categories across suffixes. Bearing in mind the reservations of Dunning's article (1993: 71) on the skewing effect on the chi<sup>2</sup> test of zero cells and cells under 5% of expected distribution, each of these tables has been tested twice:

once in total, including semantic categories for denominal as well as deverbal nouns, and once excluding the denominal categories, which apply in quantity to only two of the five suffixes.

In addition to these tables, I have throughout Chapter 9 given  $\chi^2$  distributions for two-column tables comparing results for each suffix in ME and Shakespeare. The total distribution of suffixes across genres in ME has also been validated in Table 61.

In discussing semantic categories it seems most useful to start from the case system of Kastovsky and others, with the adjustments suggested in 1.3.2. and 1.3.4. above. For denominal nouns in *-age* and *-al* it has been necessary to add the categories ‘collective’ and ‘attributive’ (the latter applicable only to forms in *-al* derived ultimately from Latin adjectives). I shall comment further on the categories used in the chapters dealing with separate suffixes.

First, however, I will turn in the next chapter to the question of French borrowings and the relationship of ME with its main donor language.

## Chapter 2

**ENGLISH AND FRENCH IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND****2.1. Language contact****2.1.1. *The status of French***

Although the introduction of latinate vocabulary into English began before the Norman Conquest, most of it is known to have entered the language through contact with French after 1066. I will attempt here to summarise some recent discussion of the nature and extent of this contact.

The question of who spoke French in medieval England, and what kind of French it was, has been much debated in recent years. The consensus used to be that Anglo-Norman French (AN) was the dominant language in all sections of the population for two hundred years after the Conquest. This view was put forward by Vising, 1923 (discussed in Short, 1979-80 and in Rothwell, 1975-6); also by Orr, 1943, Legge, 1950 and Suggett, 1968 (cited in Rothwell 1975-6: 449). However, textbooks and treatises on French appeared in England around the middle of the 13th century, suggesting that by then it was regarded as a foreign language, and by the end of that century the author of the *Cursor Mundi* was explaining that he wrote in English, not French, because

Lewede men cune Ffrench non  
Among an hondryd vnneþis on;

that is, scarcely one per cent of ordinary people knew French (quoted in Baugh 1978: 138). After about 1250, therefore, AN was presumed to have fallen into disuse and to have been replaced by the more prestigious Continental French (OF), which was understood mainly by the upper and middle classes, leaving English to the uneducated.

In the last twenty-five years this general picture has been modified on both counts. By the 1970s it was considered unlikely that at the lower levels of society English was ever abandoned in favour of French. As early as the 12th century the chronicler Richard of Devizes claimed that no one spoke French in Durham, Norwich or Lincoln (Wilson 1943: 59ff, quoted in Short 1978-80: 478). Short cites Wilson's comment that 'such a remark, however exaggerated, would be entirely pointless if it did not contain some element of truth', and he backs it up with evidence from three contemporary saints' lives, in which a parish priest and a baker as far apart as Yorkshire and Somerset acquire a knowledge of French only by miraculous intervention (Short 1978-80: 475-6). On the other hand, it certainly appears that Anglo-Norman was spoken to some extent by the upper classes in the 13th century. Short cites several comments on AN made by 13th-century writers, especially criticisms of its inelegance. Continental French, by contrast, had such cultural prestige that even Italians used it (Baugh 1978: 133-4). Short and Rothwell both make particular reference to Giraldus Cambrensis, who reproved a nephew in 1208-9 by comparing his poor French with that of an acquaintance who had studied Continental French, and therefore spoke with no trace of Anglo-Norman accent or locutions (Short 1978-80; Rothwell 1975-6: 459). Both Short and Rothwell suggest that at least some of the textbooks and treatises in French which appeared in England from around 1250 existed in order to 'teach correct, continental French (as opposed to Anglo-Norman) to advanced students who had learned their Latin in the Schools [which would have been required by much of the exposition] and who knew insular French' (Rothwell 1968: 43). Walter of Bibbesworth, writing a handbook for a noble lady to teach French to her children, remarks in his preface that 'there is no need to go over the French that everyone can speak' (quoted in Rothwell 1975-6: 459), and Rothwell points out that

the 13th-century French grammars *Tractatus Orthographiae* and *Orthographica Gallica* would have been unusable by anyone who did not already know some French (1968: 41-2). Salter, indeed, concludes that in the 12th and 13th centuries 'French and English must have been virtually interchangeable' (1980: 25), at least in the upper classes, judging by the amount of literature available in both.

### 2.1.2. *Domains*

More recent scholars deny consistently, however, that the languages were ever simply interchangeable. Lodge suggests that 'the use of French varied according to situational contexts' (1992: 79), and that by the mid-13th century it had become 'a serious rival to Latin in certain domains of use' (1992: 78). Rothwell's position is that in 13th-century England, Continental French became the language of high culture as it did throughout Europe, while English was used at all social levels for practical and domestic purposes and for popular entertainment. Anglo-Norman meanwhile was the language of record, taking over from Latin as early as 1150, and by the early years of the next century moving into the spheres of religion and learning (1975-6: 454-5; 1994: 57ff). Rothwell has also shown that proficiency in French depended partly on geographical location: the distribution of languages used in records of guild regulations suggests that 'even at the height of Anglo-Norman influence as a vernacular, the dominance of French did not extend beyond ... what we would call today roughly the south east of England and the Home Counties' (1983: 259), a geographical divide also mentioned by Kibbee (1991: 40). This would explain the miracles that were thought necessary even in the 12th century for French to be spoken in the north, as recounted by Short (1978-80) above.

Lodge points out that by the 13th century French had to be learned, suggesting that by this time it was a second language 'for virtually everybody who spoke it' (1992:

80). Rothwell's survey of the teaching materials had led him also to conclude that in the 13th century even the upper classes in the south east were probably far from completely bilingual (1968: 38). He points out that at least part of the lexis being taught in Bibbesworth's *Tretiz de langage*, and some of that in the *Nominale* ( a glossary partly based on the *Tretiz*), was in fact Anglo-Norman (1968: 39-40). French was the language of urban life, so the 'French that everyone could speak' would relate to institutions such as court, council and church. Bibbesworth, on the other hand, 'concentrates largely on rural terminology .... These were the areas where an Englishwoman would have to learn a completely new vocabulary in order to deal with them in French' (1979: 295). He remarks that in view of the demonstrable degree of intermarriage between English and Normans in medieval England, the complete dominance of French would be contrary to all modern sociolinguistic findings: 'Only a closed linguistic community willing to practise exclusively intermarriage among its own members has any chance of keeping its vernacular alive in a strange land' (1975-6: 449). Miller comments that the offspring of early mixed marriages would have been bilingual, and that 'subsequent generations spoke a contact variety of English' (1997: 235). AN would therefore no longer have been 'a true vernacular': 'there is a world of difference between a language in widespread use and a vernacular', i.e. a language naturally spoken in all areas (Rothwell 1975-6: 455). Even 'widespread use' in referring to a written language could have been a relative term: Bergner estimates that only 19 per cent of the population was literate in medieval England (1995: 37-54: 40), and that of these 'only a fraction' had a 'basic command of Latin and French' (1995: 45).

However, some may have known French who could not read it, and many may have read French who could not read Latin. The latter view is supported by the early



proliferation of AN texts, both literary and administrative, and from assertions that some of them were written in French so that the unlearned could understand them (Baugh 1978: 135; Rothwell 1975-6: 450ff). Rothwell points to such 13th century AN terms as *nun lettrez* and *vulgar commun*, which he argues are to be understood as referring to those who did not know Latin (1975-6: 451-3). Nevertheless, he had already insisted that the ability of English people to read French need not mean they habitually spoke it; that by the time the teaching materials appeared, even AN had partly become 'an acquired language'; and that while some of the manuals purported to teach the prestige variety OF, their popularity was basically 'due to the desire of the men of the day for social, cultural, political or professional advancement, for which a knowledge of Anglo-Norman was essential' (1968: 45-6).

Kibbee (1991) sheds some light on the question by turning the previously accepted chronology of French integration on its head. He suggests that for about a hundred years after the Conquest French must have been slow to take hold: he quotes Berndt's (1965) estimate for the total number of Norman immigrants as 1.3% of the population. Berndt himself later concludes that there is no evidence that the ruling elite did not learn English; that the clergy, like the ruling elite, may have spoken French at first, but certainly became bilingual later; and that smaller landowners and knights, who would in any case have spoken various French dialects, intermarried with the local population and had English-speaking descendants (1969: 369-391). William himself attempted to learn English, priests were encouraged to preach in the vernacular, and the official language of record was not French but Latin (1991: 5). Furthermore, Kibbee claims that from the mid-12th to mid-13th centuries French actually lost some ground, especially in the Church, 'as the Cluniac and Cistercian orders, with their close ties to French mother houses, gave way to the Franciscans and Dominicans, with their

emphasis on preaching and their ties to the lower classes' (1991: 26). The Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds is said to have rewarded a tenant for not speaking French, and to have reproached a colleague for not speaking English (Kibbee 1991: 21). It was at this time, after the marriage of Henry II to Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1152, that Continental French (rather than AN) became the language of prestige, 'all the while inspiring nationalist anti-French movements among the old guard' (1991: 14, 26). Throughout the 13th century, however, a series of legal reforms established French-speaking courts for which AN became the professional language. The change was facilitated by the transfer of the legal profession to lay practitioners (rather than clerical, who might have been anti-French), and by the rise of a professional middle class, who would have been anxious to use any language that would give them advancement (1991: 28). In 1258 Henry III made the first proclamation in English and French, and according to Kibbee it was this date which, far from signalling the decline of French in England, actually marked the start of its period of greatest activity. This period he places between 1258 and 1362, when Edward III finally decreed that English should replace French as the language of the courts (1991: 57). Kibbee's dates are supported by evidence from writs and rolls in *Hengham Magna*, 1257-62, in which all legal dialogues are reported in French (Brand 2000: 65), and from texts of legal lectures in AN dated 1278 (2000: 71). Brand also comments on law reports pre-1291 in which direct speech was given either in AN or Latin, but in which the Latin could have been translated from the French (2000: 66-7).

Rothwell takes issue with Kibbee's dating of the rise of AN as a legal language, which he considers too late, pointing out that the *Leis Willelme*, 'the earliest law book in French', has been dated 'no later than the middle of the twelfth century' (1983: 262). Elsewhere he cites the existence of OE>French legal glossaries as early as the

beginning of the 12th century, and argues that Henry III could not possibly have begun his reforms in the absence of any legal tradition in French (Rothwell 2000a: 27-8).

Brand in fact also comments on the existence of legal literature in AN pre-1265 (2000: 70) and cites the indirect evidence of an oath transcribed in French c1210, arguing that this transcription would represent the customary form (2000: 65). Nor was the law the only area in which AN flourished. Lodge, however, points out that 'as in France, it was the mid-thirteenth century which saw a massive extension in the use of French as the language of government' (1992: 82). Rothwell agrees that there was a 'marked increase in the use of French for administrative documents of various kinds that took place roughly from the middle of the thirteenth century onwards' (1983: 262), pointing out that it was used in recording 'the workings of municipal government ... trade regulations and local bye-laws' as well as in maritime and agricultural affairs and most of 'the voluminous business correspondence of medieval England' (1983: 266).

Rothwell's summary is that in the 13th and 14th centuries 'Anglo-Norman remained a living language in the upper echelons of society, at least in the southern part of England' (1985: 47). His definition of a 'living language' has been carefully qualified in a slightly earlier paper: French is a language of 'current business ... able to deal with all the issues of the day, whilst Latin cannot', the proof being that 'French was called upon to fill the lexical gaps in a fossilized Latin'. (1983: 264). 'The easy familiar use of Anglo-Norman' is shown not only in major government documents but in 'less exalted chronicles' until well into the 14th century (1983: 262-3). Elsewhere he remarks that in the early 14th century Hugh le Despenser used Anglo-Norman (*nostra langue*) to rally English troops besieged in Gascony, 'using the French language of England to put heart into English soldiers' (1994: 56). It seems inconceivable that a commander would address his troops at a crucial moment in a language they did not understand. *Langue*

implied a standard language, suitable for a formal occasion, as distinct from *pateis*, a term applied elsewhere to English, the informal language of speech (Rothwell 1994: 57). Higden, writing c1327, states that at that time French was not only a mother tongue, perhaps bilingually with English, for the upper classes, but was the language of education for everyone; that is, everyone who received an education (Baugh 1978: 149). Higden may have exaggerated the status of French in support of his nationalist agenda. However Trevisa, in his later commentary on Higden, confirms that French as a medium of instruction in schools ‘was moche i-used to fore þe firste moreyn’, i.e. before the first epidemic of the Black Death from 1347-51, but that due to nationalist reformers, ‘in þe yere of owre Lorde a thowsand þre hundred and four score and fyue ... in alle þe gramere scoles of Engelond, children leueþ frensche and construeþ [i.e. from Latin] an Engliche’, famously complaining that as a consequence they now knew no more French than their left heel (Trevisa 26-39, in Sisam 1959: 149).

This too has a familiar ring, and may well also have been exaggerated. But by the end of the 14th century AN was being taught at Oxford for what would now be called ‘academic purposes’ (Kibbee 1991: 57; Rothwell 1992: 6), and English had replaced French as the language of law and of creative literature. Kibbee remarks that in the early 14th century AN and English had equal status as literary languages, but that by the 1360s AN had ceased to be used creatively (1991: 38). Lodge points out that while the early teaching manuals assume prior knowledge acquired at home, by the 14th century they start from scratch (1992: 80). Kibbee suggests that the appearance of tips on pronunciation in the c1400 edition of the teaching manual *Tractatus Orthographiae* (which in its first edition, c1300, had been mainly concerned with

grammar and spelling) signals the end of French as a spoken language in England (1991: 47-55).

But whatever the condition of the spoken language, Rothwell has established in a series of articles that AN remained a written language in England throughout the 13th and 14th centuries, and that works on all subjects appeared in it which were ‘often in advance of the Continental works’ (1985: 47). Elsewhere he argues that the discrepancies from Continental French should be regarded not as corruptions but as systematic, varietal differences (1983: 270; 2001: 554-556; see also 1968, 1975-6, 1980-81, 1991, 1992, 1994, 2000b, 2001). However low the prestige of the Anglo-Norman accent, his view is that the written version of the dialect was from the early 13th century ‘in all non-literary fields on a par with francien [Continental French]’ (1985: 47). A consequence of all this for English, Rothwell claims, is that the overwhelming majority of French lexis in English, both common and learned, has its origin in Anglo-Norman rather than in Continental French (Rothwell 1992).

The significance of this for my research is twofold. Firstly, it casts doubt on the status of many French words as ‘borrowings’ in Middle English; secondly, this in turn affects the semantics both of complex forms and of their bases, in that they would have entered the language with a full range of meanings and associations. ‘Very many of the French terms they used had been developing semantically on English soil since 1066, were absorbed quite naturally with all their semantic values into the native English of those who used them, and then continued to evolve in their new environment of ME’ (Rothwell 1991: 179-80; see also 1983: 265). Manczak has suggested that borrowings have a narrower range of meanings than native words (1985: 371-4). Much French lexis in ME, however, has a wide range of meanings. Examples are *array* and *apparel*, ‘equipment’ in OF but extended to ‘clothes’ in AN at an earlier date than in OF. Both

meanings appear in ME.<sup>1</sup> In an earlier article, Rothwell distinguishes the type of borrowing which merely fills a gap from that which becomes productive in the borrowing language. The former often restricts its meaning to that current in the circle from which it is borrowed, or to that of the gap which needs to be filled in the borrowing language. The latter may take on a life of its own and continue to develop morphologically and semantically in the borrowing language (1979: 289-291).

Coleman's statistical study (1995) confirms that 'Terms borrowed from French were subject to semantic development in English from as early as the late twelfth century, the period of earliest borrowing, but the period seeing the highest rate of semantic development of French terms is from the late thirteenth to the late sixteenth century'. She adds that this applies to both 'affixed and naturalised' [that is, analysable and unanalysable] forms. However, she correlates semantic development with frequency of use rather than rate of borrowing. According to her findings, in fact, 'semantic development from French sources peaked about a century after borrowing started to tail off' (1995: 112-13). During the 'borrowing' period we might therefore assume that the semantics of French items used in English reflected those they had in French; but we can also assume that words (and, by extension, word-classes) could subsequently acquire semantic characteristics not necessarily dependent on those they inherited, or on the restrictions of filling any particular gap. It seems clear from their ME contexts that complex words of French origin entered the language with multiple meanings.

### 2.1.3. *French lexis in Middle English*

Across a sample of 900 words in a statistical survey made in 1928, Jespersen found a rise in French lexis around 1150, then a peak period from 1300 to 1400, followed by a sharp drop in the 15th century (Baugh 1978: 177). Miller cites Baugh and Cable's estimate of some 10,000 French words introduced between 1150 and

1400, also with a peak period from 1300 to 1400 (1993: 174, quoted in Miller 1997: 235). Baugh and Cable suggest that borrowings until about 1250 consisted mainly of common words 'such as men speaking one language often learn from those speaking another', whereas after this watershed vocabulary began to be taken from administrative and ecclesiastical areas (Baugh and Cable 1978: 168). This is what we might expect from the findings on the use of French before and after this approximate date. Jespersen later wrote that his study showed 'that the linguistic influence did not begin immediately after the Conquest, and that it was strongest in the years 1251-1400, to which nearly half of the borrowings belong' (Jespersen 1982: 87, quoted in Coleman 1995: 100). Coleman agrees that before 1150 the impact of French was short-lived: 'The century following the Conquest saw a relatively high turnover in loans from French, with a quarter of those borrowed not surviving into the thirteenth century' (1995: 119). Jespersen found a statistical peak for borrowing towards the end rather than the beginning of the 14th century. However, Coleman points out that Jespersen's study was taken from the *OED* and was therefore biased in favour of certain periods, as the dictionary's readers 'found more words used for the first time during those periods in which they looked the hardest' (1995: 101). She acknowledges that 'There is indeed a peak in borrowing from French during the late fourteenth century, but it is paralleled by a peak in new forms from English sources, and is merely part of the increase in new usages recorded overall'. Taken as percentages, her findings show that 'the period seeing the highest relative rate of borrowing from French is actually the later thirteenth century'. Dekeyser's study (1986) finds the peak to be a little later, in the early 14th century, but according to Coleman this is accounted for by his exclusion of uncertainly dated citations (Coleman 1995 106-7).

In fact, French religious lexis such as CONSCIENCE and PENITENCE is found in *Ancrene Riwe* around 1200,<sup>2</sup> and Kibbee notes that the first use of French religious words, such as ‘advent, capelain, cardinal, clerk, miracle, obedience, penitence, sermon etc.’ occurs in the first half of the 13th century (1991: 23): that is, before the widespread use of French as an official language. However, native glosses were provided for the *Katherine Group*, which was compiled by approximately 1200 (Hall 1920: II, 492, quoted in Dor 1992: 483-505), suggesting that such lexis was not yet assimilated, at least for all audiences. John of Salisbury had complained in the 11th century that ‘it was the fashion to interlard one’s speech with French words’ (Dor 1992: 485, quoting Jespersen 1938: 85). The languages must then have been perceived as distinct. But by 1250 the English glosses for the French domestic vocabulary in Bibbesworth’s *Tretiz* include AN words which differ from their OF counterparts (Rothwell 1980-81: 137-9). This suggests that the vernacular to be distinguished from French at this time was already so mixed with AN that the AN components in an English context were no longer perceived as French. Indeed, Baugh and Cable and others have pointed out that the patriotic prologue to *Cursor Mundi*, with its plea at the end of the 13th century for ‘Inglis tong’ for ‘Inglis lede’, includes several words of French origin, such as *nacion* and *langage*, in the space of 18 lines (Prologue, ll. 232-50, quoted in Baugh and Cable 1978: 137-8). Kibbee finds a ‘massive importation of French words into the English language’ in the early 14th century; that is, in the middle of his peak period for French influence (1991: 41). Miller suggests that the French component in English vocabulary reached a peak of 30.2% in 1300, after which ‘the increase of French loans during the period 1375-1400 is less dramatic than in previous studies’ (1997: 236). He takes issue with Bailey and Maroldt’s claim that 50% of Chaucer’s vocabulary was French (Bailey and Maroldt 1977: 32, quoted in Miller



1997: 236), arguing that on the contrary the proportion of French vocabulary in Chaucer was a mere 13%, that the majority of this was not new, and that both Lydgate and Langland had higher averages. ‘What peaked [in the late 14th century] were technical transfers<sup>3</sup> from Medieval Latin and learned Latin-French constructs (cf Dekeyser 1986)’ (Miller 1997: 236).<sup>4</sup>

It is in the learned areas, especially in that of law, that according to Rothwell the most productive borrowing occurred. ‘Men whose native language was English deliberately set out to take ordinary French terms and make them the vehicle of their legal thought’; that is, ‘they did not just borrow legal terms and insert them into empty niches in the English legal system ... They took the same words that were used outside the courts, in romances, saints’ lives, letters and so on, and gradually ... shaped them into ... legal concepts, refining and adding to their meaning as they went along’ (Rothwell 1979: 292-3). Burnley comments on the reverse process which developed later: ‘Much adoption of foreign words into the later ME period took place in technical written contexts from which they were then generalised’, and remarks on ‘characteristic derivational morphemes’ such as *-acioun* in scientific and alchemical terms such as *ELEVACIOUN* and *ELONGACIOUN* (Burnley 1992: 456). In respect of suffixed words, Dalton-Puffer points out that by 1250 twelve OE nominal suffixes had been reduced to seven (1995: 46), and elsewhere that of those in the *Helsinki Corpus*, only *-ung* and *-ness* are more frequent than *-acioun* and *-aunce*, while *-ment* is more frequent than five of the OE suffixes, and *-age* more frequent than four of them (1996: 74). Miller reports a 73% decline in OE lexis between 1175 and 1225. On the 14th-century peak in technical transfers from medieval Latin, and also in learned Latin/French constructs (1997: 236), he comments that Latin abstract terms were ‘not created because OE had no equivalent’ and concluding that ‘the transfer/coining of

Latinate abstracts ... had to be stylistic' (1997: 245); that is, latinate lexis retained the connotations of its original domains. He points out that French and English synonyms persisted in different senses, and that while 'many native suffixes attained productivity at the expense of transferred suffixes', conversely 'several transferred suffixes acquired a domain different from native ones' (1997: 249). Blake remarks that the authority of Latin texts means that in learned contexts latinate words 'may well carry far more connotation than English words, which were not associated with particular contexts or themes' (1992: 522).

#### 2.1.4. *Code-switching*

Nevertheless, Rothwell in his more recent articles suggests that the mechanism of this 'borrowing' was 'a very long way from the traditional idea of linguistic borrowing', being more akin to a 'merger', in which 'words are adopted as part and parcel of a living language in daily use in England, not as isolated static units of a foreign language borrowed from across the Channel' (1991: 174). He thereby distinguishes this adopted lexis from OF terms which might be brought back by travellers, or gain currency from imported reading material: 'For medieval Englishmen ... French was not someone else's language, individual items of which might be "borrowed" for the circumstance' (1994: 56). As he had previously denied that the Norman vernacular as such could possibly have been kept alive in England (1975-6: 448-9; see 1.2. above), he seems here to be suggesting a state of meltdown. Macaronic administrative texts have shown that it was not only English that became mixed with French, but French with English and Latin with both (see Schendl, Hunt, Wright, Jefferson and Rothwell in Trotter [2000]). Rothwell had already suggested that 'It would be unrealistic to expect that the three languages [i.e. Latin, French and English] would always remain rigorously separated in their minds as the vernacular of the great

majority - English - grew steadily in importance', and that in administrative texts 'we may be seeing a significant penetration of English vocabulary into the fabric of French as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century, and a corresponding largely unconscious adoption of many French words into the English lexis' (1983: 269). The last paragraph of his article 'Lexical borrowing in a medieval context' is worth quoting at length on this subject:

In the past it has been customary for languages to be considered as separate entities and for lexical borrowing from one to another to be regarded as a largely external or even peripheral phenomenon. This view, however, has its roots in the modern equation of language with nationality: once we go back to the medieval period, this equation has nothing like the same force as in the post-medieval world, and the whole question of lexical borrowing in the Middle Ages must be tackled in a multi-lingual context (1980-1: 143).

Elsewhere he refers to the 'creative' use of Latin and French for two centuries after the separation of England from Normandy in 1204 (1991: 176).

Bailey and Maroldt (1977) even argue that ME was a French creole, that is, a variant of AN with OE borrowings, pointing out that although the function words, prosody and some word order remained Anglo-Saxon, much of the syntax as well as much of the lexis and derivational morphemes are French (1977: 51-53). They suggest that this process was facilitated by an earlier creolisation of English with Norse, resulting in the breakdown of OE norms. Poussa (1973) and Rothwell (1994), however, deny that any of the necessary conditions were present for the creolisation of English with French<sup>5</sup>. Dalton-Puffer (1992) has analysed the morphotactic and morphosemantic 'transparency' of Romance suffixes in ME and concludes that the degree of opacity in their morphophonological rules is inappropriate to a creole; elsewhere she makes a similar case for Romance prefixation (1995: 38). For Miller 'creolization is not the only account', quoting Wallmannsberger's distinction: 'diglossia and domain-specificity of linguistic means would equally respond to this situation'

(Wallmannsberger 1998:31, quoted in Miller 1997: 235). Lodge is less clear about the difference; he suggests that according to the sociolinguistic conditions of 13th century England, 'One would predict a gradual process of creolization' as French 'went native' (1992: 80); however, on the next page he states that 'The sociolinguistic profile of French and English in the thirteenth century can be described as diglossic' (1992: 81).

This debate seems to be partly about terminology. Bailey and Maroldt's description of ME is not very different from Dalton-Puffer's, but for them a creole is a mixed language, while for her it is a simplification. She also argues that creolisation has always been identified in respect of spoken languages (1995: 37-38), whereas Romance vocabulary in ME is only accessible from texts, and appears 'much larger in some styles and text-types than others' (1995: 36). Similarly it seems that for Lodge a creole may be the contact language arising from a diglossic situation, but not for Wallmannsberger or Miller. Görlach comments on four incompatible definitions of 'creole', concluding that 'in typology ... there are no absolutes', and that a language can be, for example, a pidgin for one community and a creole for another (1986:332-3). He further remarks that the simplification criterion applies to other processes besides creolisation, and that while simplification does exist in ME, i.e. of the inflectional system, this simplification is in accordance with regular Germanic sound changes (1986: 338-41).

By the end of the 14th century teaching materials in French had proliferated, suggesting that on paper the language systems could still be perceived as distinct. What we might perhaps envisage is a system of frequent code-switching in which these discrete systems were used for discrete purposes or even grammatical functions, as happens between English and Indian languages today. Verma quotes the following exchange:

kyo saheb! Hindii-me English-ke expressions kyo prayog hone lage hai

‘Why have so many English expressions found their way into Hindi?’  
 haa. yah to baRii hii unnatural lagtii hai. merii to is-topic-par scholars-se  
 kaanii frank discussions hui hai  
 ‘Yes. It seems very unnatural. I have had numerous frank discussions with  
 scholars on this topic’  
 (Verma 1976: 160, quoted in Fasold 1984: 206).

In my experience this happens also to a certain extent in modern Arabic-speaking states where English is an acquired language of education. In medieval England the situation was similar, but the language of education was French. As Rothwell remarks ‘It is strange to us today that in the middle of the thirteenth century Englishmen should have been teaching English law to other Englishmen through the medium of French, but the evidence for this is clear’ (1983: 266). It is probable that French was also used as a lingua franca to ease mutual comprehension, as happens in multi-lingual India; both Higden and Caxton comment on the wide differences in English pronunciation as compared to French (Higden [2]. 2.161, a1475[?a1425], *MED*; Caxton, *Preface to Eneydos*, 1490, in Hussey 1982: 18). Although French seems to have flourished mainly in the south-east, where government activity was carried on, we know that the London administration was staffed from all regions (see Salter 1980), and anyone joining it would have needed to learn French. The result was that ‘Generations of educated Englishmen passed daily from English into French and back again in the course of their work’ (Rothwell 1991: 179). A suggested textual analogy is the code-switching in Latin texts studied by Wright (1992), Voights (1996) and Davidson (1998), as well as by Schendl, Hunt, Wright, Jefferson and Rothwell in Trotter (2000), in which code-switching is principled but the principle varies with the author. Rothwell’s study of legal and commercial texts concludes that they ‘confirm Laura Wright’s claim that the use of mixed language for this type of document was recognised policy’ (Rothwell 2000b). Romaine has argued that there are no universal

principles of codeswitching in speech (1989: 4); everyone does it differently according to the languages involved, their own degree of proficiency in them and even the circumstances in which they learned them (1989: 69). She believes the motivation to be pragmatic rather than grammatical, equivalent to style-shifting for monolinguals (1989: 148ff): for example, an utterance which in English may be interpreted as a warning will in Hindi be received as an appeal (1989: 265). She further points out that multilingualism is statistically commoner than monolingualism, which for many communities would fail to offer the ‘varieties a person needs in order to manage the everyday things a normal person has to do’ (1989: 9). Blake (1992: 507) has suggested that in ME the description of the accomplishments of a gentleman would be impossible without French lexis, citing the courtly French terms used by the *Gawain* poet, who writes in a northern dialect with predominantly Scandinavian influence.

It was not until the 15th century that English finally began to replace French as a parliamentary language of record. ‘When French gave way to English in the *Rotuli parliamentorum*, the syntax changed, but a great proportion of the lexis was simply taken over as English without even minor changes in spelling’ (Rothwell 1985: 45). Sometimes the syntax did not change; as Bailey and Maroldt point out (1977), this assimilation was not always restricted to vocabulary. Elsewhere Rothwell quotes Burnley on calqued expressions such as ‘send for’ (*mander pur*) in which French syntax was adapted into English (1991: 174). As he says, this was language contact at a profound level (1994: 66). The consequences of such language contact, as Romaine points out, can be a new system which makes its own rules (1989: 4, 147). Bailey and Maroldt also make this claim in respect of creoles (1977: 36); however, for Rothwell the new system was not French but English, so that in the course of the 14th century, AN ‘did not really disappear but was absorbed into English, transforming the latter in

the process' (1985: 45). It may be worth noting that most of the English words in the Hindi example quoted above are of French origin.

Miller claims that calques are 'typical of bilinguals' (1997: 247) and that a 'sharp drop [in calqued phrases] between 1400 and 1450 correlates with the death of Anglo-French *and the initial production period for the loan suffixes*' (my italics); in other words, 'the highest rates of morphological borrowing correlate with imminent language death' (1997: 248). French affixes therefore would not become productive in English until the 'death' of French in England. However, my data shows considerable evidence of productivity in these suffixes before 1400, and Miller acknowledges a problem with the concept of language death here, in that according to sociolinguistic expectations '*the wrong language died*' (Miller's italics); the surviving language should have been that imposed by the conquerors. For Rothwell, language death is not the question, since AN was only a 'living language' in England within certain domains (1983b, 1991). He argues that within those domains Anglo-Norman remained productive well into the 15th century (2001: 552) and that what happened then was a two-way convergence, with calques occurring also from English into AN; according to him 'it can be seen that in England the influence of Anglo-French on English is lexical, that of English on Anglo-French syntactical' (2001; 551). In the 'later medieval period ... French can be seen to be quite literally turning into the administrative English in general use today' (2001: 553).

We should perhaps then imagine a situation similar to that in respect of English in post-colonial India, with French as the language of learning, business and administration, used primarily in writing but also in speech in the appropriate domains. As happened with English in India (Crystal 2003: 101, 360), the syntax of Anglo-Norman French was affected by the contact; conversely, much of the native

vocabulary in the relevant areas was replaced by French. French words then were not so much ‘borrowed’ as absorbed into English with a potential range of meanings, and potential also for further development. My research is concerned mainly with the bias of words in a given suffix towards some of these meanings rather than others; and it will be suggested also that these biases in some cases have undergone changes in the century after the ME period.

### Notes

1. See the discussion of these words in Rothwell 1992: 9-10, and the reference to *atteindre* and *entendre* as legal terms in Rothwell 1979: 293. As will be seen in the next chapter, all these words appear in ME as bases for *-ment*.
2. According to figures given by Mettig (1910), out of 365 French loans occurring between 1066 and 1258, 178 are first attested in this text (quoted in Miller, 1997: 236).
3. Miller in a footnote quotes Buccini’s distinctions between (1) ‘selection’ of linguistic forms (with domains in mind) and ‘borrowing’ (mainly lexical) on the part of the recipient language, and (2) of both from ‘imposition’ by the donor language (Buccini 1992: 18). However, ‘Since French at different times and places during the ME period would have been in any of these three relationships to English’ he chooses himself to use *transfer* ‘in a non-technical sense to encompass all three’ (Miller 1997: 235).
4. Bailey & Maroldt also claim that by 1460 French accounted for 40% of the English lexicon (Bailey & Maroldt 1977: 32, quoted in Miller 1997: 236).
5. Poussa agrees that such conditions had been present earlier for the creolisation of English with Norse, during the period when the inhabitants of Mercia were trapped between two Danish armies. Görlach rejects this analysis also, arguing that contact between two similar languages (such as English and Norse) merely speeds regular processes of simplification (1986: 41).



## Chapter 3

**THE SUFFIX *-ment* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH****3.1. History and Morphology****3.1.1. *History***

The suffix *-ment* is described by Marchand as chiefly forming deverbal nouns from Romance roots, and coming into the language through loans from continental Old French and Anglo-French (Marchand 1969: 331, 4.65.1). It derives ultimately from Latin formations in which V+ *-mentum* =N (Pattison 1975: 52).

**3.1.2. *Morphological types***

In my sample I have distinguished three morphological types for nouns in *-ment*

**3.1.2.1. *Type 1***

This type, e.g. TESTAMENT, is borrowed from the Latin deverbal noun and incorporates a vowel from the Latin verb stem, which generally does not correspond to a simplex form in English. It is therefore opaque in ME. Categorical exceptions among Latin borrowings are denominal Latin formations such as MACHINAMENT

**3.1.2.2. *Type 2***

Type 2, e.g. ENCHANTEMENT, is either borrowed from French or formed on a ME verb base, the suffix being added to the verb stem and linked to it by a vowel. There are denominal exceptions such as TABLEMENT.

This type tends to attach to verbs with prefixes, especially *en-* (Marchand, 1969: 332, 4.65.3). Nominalisations on bases following *a(d)-* and *co(n m)-* have been especially frequent in my samples.

### 3.1.2.3. *Type 3*

This type, e.g. EGGEMENT, is formed on a native verb base. Denominal exceptions include LEGEMENT.

### 3.1.3. *Co-occurrences*

The suffix may occur on bases with the prefixes *a(d)-*, *co(n m)-*, *su(b)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *pre-*, *per-*, *in(m)-*, *pre-*, *e(n/m/x)-* and *mis-*. There is no co-occurrence with *pro-* in my sample, but the list of headwords in *pro-* in the online *MED* includes PROCUREMENT. In the ME period the stem suffixes *-ize* and *-ify* may appear with *-ment* (e.g. ADVERTISEMENT, PURIFIMENT) as well as with the more usual *-ation*. *-Ment* may also be added to nouns already suffixed in *-al*, as in VITAILLEMENT, SUPPOWAILMENT.

### 3.1.4. *Transparency*

Dalton-Puffer (1992) has analysed Romance ME suffixes on scales of morphosemantic and morphotactic transparency, depending on the degree of modification which occurs when the affix is attached to a base. The consonant-initial suffix *-ment* neither undergoes nor imposes modification in ME, and scores at the top of the scale on both counts.

## 3.2. Phonology

### 3.2.1. *Stress*

Kastovsky has discussed the transition between OE and ME from a stem-based to word-based morphology, pointing out that in ME the two existed side by side (1992: 290-408), though the second became stronger as time went on. A word-based word formation rule implies that the base is a complete word within invariable boundaries. In Types 2 and 3, both in borrowings and in formations on ME stems, *-ment* appears to have been attached at word level, preserving

existing stress, which was generally on the second syllable of the verb (Jespersen, 1942: VI.376, 21.8[2]). Metrical evidence suggests, however, that in all ME latinate nouns the suffix also bore a stress, as it does in modern French.<sup>1</sup>

In Type 1, formed in Latin on verbs which do not correspond to an English simplex form, the suffix is attached at stem level to morpheme boundaries, which may be subject to morphophonological alternation. This means that in some of these nouns the stress has moved in modern English in accordance with trisyllabic laxing. Aronoff (1976:116) discusses EX<sup>1</sup>PERIMENT, <sup>1</sup>COMPLEMENT (both ME borrowings) and the like, pointing out that *-ment* operates on these bases as a Level 1 suffix and that they are subject to different word formation rules from the majority of nouns in *-ment*. (For example, the adjectival suffix *-al* may be added to these words, as in *experimental*, against the general rule for V + *-ment*).

### 3.2.2. *Phonetics*

From metrical evidence it appears that the linking vowel immediately preceding the suffix, written as <e> or <a>, was pronounced, at least in verse, and it is generally considered to have had a sound as in modern French *de*. However, it may not have been a regular phonetic feature; it is missing from some 15th century texts and from the 14th-century text of *Gawain*. In my present sample it does not appear in the analysable nouns AMENTISSMENT, ANNULMENT or APPARELMENT, the first two of which seem to have been independent ME formations. With or without this vowel, the suffix may also follow a cluster of CC (ARESTEMENT) or CCC (ASSEMBLEMENT).

My sample in *-ment* shows no restrictions on stem-final single consonants. Stem-final /n/ appears to be especially common. In unanalysable opaque nouns any

vowel but /ɔ/ may also precede the suffix. Analysable nouns in the present sample also include stem-final diphthongs /ei/ and /ɔi/.

Dalton-Puffer finds a correlation between phonetic structure and analysability (the latter to be understood here in the sense of belonging to my Type 2 or 3, i.e. formed on ME bases). If the base is ME, she notes that it will normally be of two syllables, not counting the linking vowel. If the base is of only one syllable, as in *TORMENT*, she finds that it is unlikely to be analysable (1996: 108). In my sample this is true of latinate bases; however, the hybrid *EGG(E)MENT* can appear without the linking vowel, indicating that the native base may sometimes have been monosyllabic.

### **3.3. Integration**

#### **3.3.1. Productivity**

This suffix was considered by both Marchand and Jespersen to have become productive at quite an early date. Marchand states that ‘By 1300, *-ment* was obviously a derivative suffix’ (Marchand, 1960: 268, 4.65.1), though adding that many of the 14th and 15th-century coinages were short-lived. Jespersen agrees with Marchand that the ending came to be ‘considered as an E[nglish] formative’ in ‘the latter part of the 13th c[entury]’ (Jespersen, 1942: VI.375, 21.8[1]). Dalton-Puffer finds an influx of words from 1250-1350, her period ME2 (corresponding to the peak period found by Kibbee for French usage in England), with a high proportion of ME bases, remarking that at this period in her sample ‘opaque loans are actually fewer than later on’ (1996: 109). Nevertheless, she believes that ‘we need to rule out the possibility of intra-Romance productivity within ME’ (1996: 220). Burnley on the other hand finds *-ment* productive, but ‘only with a Romance base’ (Burnley 1992: 449).

There are, however, certain occurrences in my sample which might be

tentatively considered to be signs of productivity. One is the existence of forms alternative to earlier or simultaneous ME forms in another suffix on the same base. An example is SAVEMENT (?c1300), an alternative to SALVACIOUN (c1230[?a1200]). I have noted 19 such pairs in my sample, (not including five more pairs whose relative dates are doubtful), where all the nouns in *-ment* are analysable (see 3.3.2. below), and the earliest is dated before 1300. (See Appendix 1, Table 51).

Nevertheless, multiple forms in alternative suffixes of course also existed in French, and such sets could have been borrowed into ME. A more persuasive sign of productivity might be the existence of suffixed forms which are not recorded in a donor language. The most convincing examples of these are words formed on native bases, which start to appear in the sample for *-ment* in the late 14th century. The sample also includes 21 nouns on Romance bases without attested counterparts in Romance languages. By this criterion, one item in the sample supports the early date for productivity suggested by Marchand and Jespersen. This is the noun ACOUPEMENT, first recorded in ME c1300(c1250), at the same time as a verb *acoupen*. The verb seems to have been well established in ME and has 11 citations in the *MED* as against only two for the noun. Neither of these forms has an equivalent in the AN or OF dictionaries, and the noun has none in Medieval Latin (ML). There is therefore a possibility that it was formed in ME on the ME or ML verb.

### 3.3.2. *Analysability*

There may, finally, be a further indicator of productivity in the incidence of analysable nouns in Pattison's sense, i.e. those occurring only after related verbs or other simplex forms have become established in ME. This is Pattison's own view (1975: 159; see 1.2.2. above). It seems clear that widespread productivity cannot take place until a pattern is generally analysable, though isolated formations may be coined

long before that is the case by analytical and educated individuals. Indeed, for analysability to become general, such early, possibly short-lived coinages appearing from time to time are exactly what we would expect. My sample suggests such a pattern for the integration of *-ment* in the ME period. Throughout my early period (1150-1300) most nouns in *-ment* were technically unanalysable. In the 14th century the sample shows almost four times as many analysable as unanalysable neologisms, and it can be shown that coinages were made from time to time throughout that century, though they were usually short-lived. They include the native CURSEMENT (c1400(?a1387), EGGMENT (c1390), MARREMENT (c1391), ONEMENT 'unity' (1425[c1395]), formed on a verb *onen* (a1333), and MURDERMENT (a1400); according to Miller, this is the total number of hybrids found in *-ment* before 1400 (1997:252). In the present sample there are also five nouns of Romance origin coined in the late 14th century: APPARAILMENT (a1425[?c1380]), CONJECTEMENT [1532rev.(c1385)], ABATAYLMENT (c1390), CONSPIREMENT (c1390) and TEMPERAMENT (a1398).

With these of course it must be borne in mind that dating can be doubtful, that lack of records can never prove conclusively that a word did not exist in a given language at a given time, and that the dates of ME words relative to medieval Latin (ML), AN and OF counterparts are especially problematic, as dates of first appearances are not given in dictionaries of the donor languages. A coinage in *mis-* on a noun in *-ment* (MISGOVERNMENT, 1384), serves to exemplify this. No counterpart to it is recorded in AN or OF. However, the noun *gouvernement* exists in AN and OF and appears in English for the first time in Chaucer's *Boethius* (c1380), where it is used repeatedly (Bo.1. pr.4.40; Bo.1.pr. 5. 20; Bo.2.pr. 7. 12, *MED*). Chaucer's slightly later

use of MISGOVERNEMENT c1384 (*House of Fame* 1975, *MED*, 'of good, or *mysgouvernement*'), therefore seems a clear extension of his own word GOVERNEMENT, which (though technically 'analysable') would certainly have been one of the words absorbed into English contexts by familiarity with administrative French. We cannot, however, rule out the possibility that the records are deficient in French as well as English and that both these ME nouns may be borrowings. But on the evidence, the situation seems to be that Chaucer's word is a coinage in *mis-* on the borrowed but analysable noun GOVERNEMENT.

However, there may have been an even more significant rise in analysability for the suffix during the 15th century: by this time, analysable neologisms in my sample outnumber unanalysable neologisms by more than three to one. Partly as a result of previous coinages, a general familiarity with the rules for such formations would have been established by 1400, and throughout the 15th century new formations could have occurred freely on existing ME verbs.

We cannot of course assume that all analysable nouns in the 15th century were independent formations on the ME verbs, as most of them also appear in AN or OF, and could technically have been holistic borrowings. However, there are wide chronological gaps between the verbs and nouns. Most of the verbs date at the latest from the previous century, and 18 are earlier. There are also four more native coinages, and 14 more nouns not attested in either AN or OF which appear to have been formed of French components. There are therefore some grounds for supposing that these are ME formations on the ME verbs; for example AMENTISSMENT (1488) could have been formed on *amemusen* ('to diminish', a1325), from OF *amenuir*, and ANNULMENT (1491) on *amullen* (1395) from OF *amuller*. These examples, taken together with the degree of transparency and analysability of nouns in *-ment*

during this period, suggest that productivity was probably established for the suffix in the course of the 14th century.

### 3.3.3. *The sample in -ment*

Table 1 gives a complete list of the 210 nouns in my sample in *-ment* in chronological order. Where dictionary dates are given for both manuscript and original text, the original date is bracketed to the right of the manuscript date. These dates for original texts are estimated by the MED as correct within margins of 25 years on either side. Occasionally this makes the estimate of analysability uncertain. These cases are marked with an asterisk, as also are all nouns which first occur in the same year as their possible base.

ME forms on the same stem are given in the centre and right hand columns. Those appearing later than the nouns are given in square brackets. Those appearing earlier than the ME period are dated OE (Old English).

**Table 1: NOUNS IN *-ment* IN 3 ME PERIODS WITH FORMS ON THE SAME STEM**

#### **The early period (1150-1300)**

##### *Unanalysable nouns of the early period (1150-1300)*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1150	piment		
c1230(?a1200)	ournement	[a1382 v ournen]	
	tornement	[c1330(?a1300) V torneien]	[c1330(?a1300) N tournei]
	vestment	[1425 V vesten]	
	contenement	[c1300(?a1300) V conteinen]	[c1330(c1250) N contenance]
	pavement	[c1325 V paven]	
c1300(c1250)	acouplement	[c1300 V acoupen]	
1275	amonestement	[1340 V amonesten]	[?a1425(c1380) N amonicioun]
c1275	commaundement	[c1330(?a1300) V commaunden]	[a1400 N commande] [1447 N commanderie] [1452 N commandance]
	commencement	[c1330(?c1300) V commençen]	
a1325(c1280)	monument		
c1330(a1325)	oynement	[a1400(1303) V enointen]	
c1290	enchauntement	[c1380 V enchanten]	
	torment	[c1300 V tormenten]	
c1330(?a1300)	parlement	[c1400(c1378) V parlen]	[1577 N parley] [1579 N parlance]



	testament	
	enterement	[a1425(?c1375) V enteren]
c1400(?a1300)	garnement	

*Analysable nouns of the early period (1150-1300)*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200)	chastiment	a1225(?a1200) V chastisen	
	sacrament	a1225 (OE?) V sacren	
	amendement	c1230 V amenden	
	jugement*	c1230(?a1200) V jugen]	
c1290	foundement	c1290 V founden	[c1430(c1386) N foundacioun]
c1330(?a1300)	encombremment*	c1275 V acombren [?a1400(a1338)V encombren] 1330(?a1300) N encombraunce	1290 N encombre [c1330 N acombraunce]
	norishment*	c1400(?a1300) V norishen	
	enticement	a1325(c1280) V enticen	
	corounement	?c1200 (OE?)V corounen	a1121 N coroune
	consentement	c1230(?a1200) V consenten	
c1400(a1300)	advancement	a1250 V avancen	[a1300 N avantage]
	afetement	?a1200 V afaiten	
	acordement	1120 V acorden	[a1400(c1303) N acordaunce]

**The 14th century**

*Unanalysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300	instrument		
	detriment		
	element		
a1400(c1303)	tenement		
a1333	argument	[c1380 V arguen]	[(c1443) N argumentacioun]
a1325	amercement	[c1400(c1378) V amercen]	
	verifiement	[(a1387) V verifien]	
a1450(?1348)	experiment		[c1450(c1380) N experience]
c1380	abettement	[1442 V abetten]	
	adubbement	[a1500(c1450) V adubben]	
c1400(c1380)	emprisonment	[(1402) V emprisonen]	
c1480(?c1380)	apparement	[1450 V apparen]	c1330(?a1300) N apparail
a1425(c1385)	sentement		
1532rev(c1385)	arbitrement	[1425 V arbitren]	[c1390 N arbitracioun] [1480 N arbitrage]
c1475(1392)	nocument		
(a1393)	aspirement	[1450(a1400) V aspiren]	
a1400	impediment		

*Analysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1325(c1300)	conferment	?a1250(?939) V confermen	
c1330(?c1300)	savement	c1230(?a1200) V saven	c1230(?a1200) N salvacioun
	prechement	c1230(?a1200) V prechen	
a1400(c1303)	presentement	c1400(?a1300) V presenten	[c1330 N presence]
	procurement*	c1330(a1300) V procuren	
	vesselment		a1325(c1280) N vessel
	concelement	a1400(a1325) V concelen	
	enditement*		
a1400(a1325)	ointment	a1400(1303) V enointen [c1400(1375) V ointen]	

c1325	apeirement	c1300 V apeiren	
c1320(a1333)	aveiement*	c1350(a1333) V avaien	
?a1400(a1338)	amountment	c1275 V amounten	[c1380 N amountance]
	abatement	a1300 V abaten	
	vengement	c1330(a1300) V vengen	c1325(c1300) N vengeaunce
	avisement	c1325(c1300) V avisen	
	esement	(c1290) V esen	
	feffement	1290 V feffen	
(1340)	martirement	a1225(?a1200) V martiren	OE N martyr c1175 (OE?)N martirdom a1400(c1300) N marteric [a1475(?a1425) martirizacion]
c1350	compasement	c1300 V compassen	
(1363)	approvement	a1325 Vapproven	
c1374	movement	c1290 V moven	
a1425(?c1380)	apparailment	c1275 V aparailen	c1330(?a1300) N apparail [c1411 N apparure]
c1380	abusement	c1300 V abushen	
c1400(?1380)	devisement	c1300(?c1225) V devisen	
a1425(?c1380)	gouvernement	c1375(?c1280) V governen	(c1370) governaunce
c1450(c1380)	entendement	c1290 V entenden	[(a1393) N entendaunce]
(a1382)	adjurement*	a1425(a1382) V adjuren	[c1390 N adjuracioun]
c1384	misgouvernement	c1375(?c1280) V governen	(c1370) N governaunce
		[c1400 V misgovernen]	c1380 N gouvernement (c1375) N misgovernaunce
1384	attainment	c1400(a1300) V atteinen	
1385	accusement	c1300 V accusen	?a1425(c1380) N accusacioun
a1425(c1385)	hardiment		c1230(?a1200) A hardi
1532rev(c1385)	adornement*	a1425(c1385) V adornen	
	congelement	?a1400(a1338) V congelen]	[(a1393) N congelacioun]
	commendement	a1500(c1340)V commenden	c1230(a1200) N commendac'n
	conjectement*	?a1425(c1380) V conjecten	
	punishment	a1400(c1303) V punisshen	
	refresshement*	?a1325(c1380) V refresshen	
c1400(?a1387)	cursement	?a1160(OE) V cursen	
1389	assignement	c1300 V assignen	[(1432) N assignacioun]
	examinement	a1400(c1303) V examinen	[(c1390) N examinacioun]
	encresement	c1350(a1333) V encresen	
c1400(c1390)	finishment	a1375 V finisshen	
	abataylment	c1380 V embataillen	
	eggment	a1225(?a1200) V eggen	
1390	paiement	a1225(?a1200) V paien	
1391	marrement	c1225(?a1200) V marren	
a1393	delaiement	a1300 V delaien	?a1300(a1250) N delai
	conspirement	c1390(a1376) V conspiren	(1357) N conspiracioun
(a1393)	excusement	a1250 v excusen	
(1394)	refeffement	1290 V feffen	a1325 N feffement
		a1525(?a1426) V refeffen	
a1425(c1395)	onement	(a1333) V onen	(a1300) N unioun c1330(?c1300) N unite
(a1398)	temperament	a1225(c1200) V tempren	(1340) N temperaunce [c1440(?a1375) N attempraunce]
	complement	a1398 V completen	a1425(?a1384) A complete
	stablement	a1350(?c1280) V stablen	
(1399)	(ar)raiment	a1400(a1325) V (ar)raien	
a1400	attachement	a1400 V attachen	
	additament	?a1425(c1380) V adden	[c1450 N addiacioun]

	murtherment	c1230(?a1200) [OE]V murtheren	
a1425(?a1400)	alleggement	c1390(c1350) V alleggen	c1300(?a1300) N allegaunce
c1450(?a1400)	agrement	c1430(c1380) V agreen	
	seurement	(c1375) V assuren	
		?c1430(1383) V seuren	
	tirement	c1330 V tiren	

### The 15th century

#### *Unanalysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1500(1413)	machinament	[?c1450 V machinen]	
?a1425	meliorament		
	appodiment		
?a1475(?a1425)	liniament		
c1425	ferrement		
a1475(?a1430)	predicament		
(1435)	emolument		
(?1440)	condiment		
	medicament		[?a1425 N medicacioun]
1440	eslargissement*	[?c1450 V eslargen]	
(1440)	jogulment		
	appatissement		(1429) N pacte
	entertainment		
(a1443)	document		
(1445)	implement		
(a1447)	agistement		
a1450	botement		
c1450	perjurement		
	delirament		
a1500(?c1450)	entassement		
1472-5	excommengement		
a1500	implicament		

#### *Analysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1500(c1400)	restorement	c1325(c1300) V restoren	
1401	annulment	1532rev.(1385) V annullen	[(1450) N adnullation]
a1450(1408)	misavisement	c1325(c1300) V avisen	1400(a1338) N avisement
c1430(a1410)	abaishment	?a1400(a1303) V abaishen	[ a1450 N abaishaunce]
c1450(1410)	chaungement	c1230(?a1200) V chaungen	
a1450(c1410)	purifiment	?a1400(a1338) V purifien	
a1500(1413)	alterment	a1425(c1385) V alteren	(a1398) N alteracioun
			[a1500(?c1425) N alterite]
	purgement	(c1290) V purgen	
?a1425(a1415)	soilment	a1400(a1325) V soilen	
	wonderment		a1150(OE) N wonder
1417	apointement	a1425(c1385) V apointen	
(1420)	pechement	a1500(a1400) V pechen	
(1421)	repaielement	c1275 V paien	?a1425(?c1350) N paiement
(1422)	abilement	?a1425(c1380) V ablen	a1450(?1348) A able
1422	auctorisement	a1500(?c1378) V auctorisen	
a1425	ordeinement	a1400(c1250) V ordeinen	c1330(?a1300) N ordinaunce
	lavament	a1225(?a1200) V laven	
a1500(?a1425)	aloinement	a1325 V aloinen	
	abreggement	(a1382) V abreggen	
	acuement		(a1398) A acu

			?1425 N acuite
?a1475(?a1425)	reteinement	?a1475(a1396) V reteinen	(a1338) N retenaunce a1475(?1383) N retencioun
c1425 (1425)	enointment	a1400(1303) V enointen	
c1425	accomplisshemt	c1385 V accomplisshen	
(1426)	excitement	a1500(c1340) V exciten	
(1426)	attournement	c1225(?c1200) V attournen	
(1428)	advertisement*	?a1475(?a1425) V advertisen	
1429	utensilment		
(1429)	averrement	c1475(a1400) V averren	
1430	anientishment	c1400(c1378) V anienten	
(1430)	appesement	c1300 V apesen	
1431	stallment	c1350(a1333) V stallen	
	aquitement	1230 V aquiten	?a1400(a1338) N aquitaunce (1430) N aquitaille 1273) N legge
(1434)	legement		
(1436)	ravishment	c1330(?a1300) V ravishen	
c1436	emblemishment	a1425(?c1384) V emblemishen	c1425(c1400) N blemure [1450 N contentacioun]
1437	contentement	a1425(?a1400) V contenten	
(1437)	remevement	1400(?a1325) V remeven	
	emploiment*	?a1425 V emploien	
(1439)	amortisement	c1400(c1378) V amortisen	
(1440)	enrollement	a1400 V enrollen	
	empoverishment	c1425(a1420) V empo[ve]rishen	
	bochement		c1330 N boche [(1456) N preferraunce] (a1199) N relief
(1443)	preferrement	(a1393) V preferren	
	relevement	c1450(c1370) V releven	
(c1443)	apprisement	(1402) V apprisen	
(1444)	arreinement	c1400(?c1380) V arreinen	
	ajornement	?a1400(a1338) V ajornen	
(1447)	(en)douement	?a1400(a1338) V douen	
(c1448)	acrochement	c1400(?c1380) V acrochen	
c1460(a1449)	groundement	c1275 V grounden	
(1449)	improvement	(1440) V improven	
	recettement		
a1450	botment	c1330(OE?-c1300) V boten	1131(OE) N bote
(1450)	exploiment	(?1440) V exploien	
c1450	recurement	c1400(?a1300) V recuren	
a1500(?c1450)	sustenement	a1325(c1280) V sustenen	
c1475(?c1451)	trespassement	a1400(?c1300) V trespassen	
(1453)	vitaillement	a1450(a1338) V vitailen	a1450(a1338) N vitaille
(1454)	countrollement	1422 V countrollen	
(a1455)	emblaiment	(1438) V emblaien	
(1455)	conversement	?a1425(c1380) V conversen	(1340) N conversacioun
	denombrement	c1400(?a1300) V nombren	c1330(?a1300) N nombre
a1500(1455)	amentissment	a1325 V amenusen	
?1457	attendement	c1330(?a1300) V attenden	c1374 N attention ?a1425(c1380) N attendaunce
c1475(1459)	reconcilement	c1390(c1350) V reconcilen	
	suppowaillement	1440(?a1400)V suppowailen	c1450(?a1400) N suppowail
1464	resignement	c1450(c1370) V resignen	a1387 N resignacioun
	poisonment	c1400(?a1300) V poisonen	c1225(?c1200) N poison
	imagement	a1500(c1340) V imaginen	
	usurpement	a1325 V usurpen	
	privilegement	(a1387) V privilegen	
	famishment	c1450(?a1400) V famishen	
(1470)	failment	c1230(?a1200) V failen	

1472/3	heritement	c1400(?a1300) V heriten	c1225(?c1200) N heritage 1532(c1385) N heritaunce
1474	arestement	a1375 V aresten	
1475	achievement	c1300 V acheven	c1430 N achevisaunce 1531 achievance
(c1475)	brevement	c1225(?a1200)[OE] V breven	
a1500	anoiment	c1275 V anoien	(c1390) N anoiaunce
	departement	c1300(c1250) V departen	
c1500	embatement	?c1200 V baiten	a1400(c1300) N bait
?c1500	maintement	c1330(?c1300) V maintenen	(a1333) N maintenaunce

### 3.4. Semantics

Commenting on modern English (modE), Jespersen suggests that ‘most of the words in *-ment* are nexus-words and correspond rather closely to *-ing* of the gerund, but in some cases they may have a passive import (“being -ed”) ... But like other action-nouns, words in *-ment* may [also] denote the means or result of the action’ (Jespersen, 1942: VI. 337, 21. 8[3]). Pattison (1975) points out that the ‘means or effect of verbal action’ was a primary meaning of Latin V + *mentum* =N. ‘Means’ and ‘effect’ (result) would correspond respectively to Kastovsky's instrumental and factitive (result) cases. In her ME sample, Dalton-Puffer finds result and instrumental nouns more prominent than those expressing verbal action (1996: 108). In Kastovsky's (1986) analysis the dominant meaning for modE *-ment* is action/fact, though the suffix also functions with objective, resultative, instrumental and locative cases. Pattison found that the verbal action itself, though a secondary meaning in Latin, accounted for two-thirds of derivative formations in Spanish *-miento* (Pattison, 1975: 52ff). For Marchand the verbal action meaning is also primary in modE nouns in *-ment*, but with an important qualification. He states that ‘Substantives in *-ment* have the meanings which are usual with deverbal substantives. They denote 1) act or fact of [V-ing], *with a tendency to denote a specific instance* [my italics].’ His further categories are ‘ 2) something concrete and material

connected with [V-ing] ... 3) the state of being [V-ed] ... 4) the place connected with [V-ing]' (Marchand, 1969: 332, 4.65.5). He remarks that his last group is comparatively small, and that group 3) has been especially productive for the last 150 years, citing words such as *bewilderment*. It is the first two groups that are prominent in the ME period.

In the next section I shall analyse the semantic categories of first attributions of nouns in *-ment* in successive periods of ME, comparing the profiles of unanalysable with analysable nouns in each period. My Introduction included a brief survey of the semantic categories which will be used for analysis (1.3.4.). These are instrumental, agentive and objective case, result/state, and the core meaning of action with the aspects quality, fact and specific instance. There follow here some further notes on multiple meanings and ambiguities in their application to this suffix.

#### 3.4.1. *Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Result/ state*

Result/state can of course occur as an extension of other meanings. An early example of extension is *TORMENT* 'instrument of torture' (1290), which could also mean '[state of] mental or physical pain', the result of having been tortured:

Are louerd ... ire yeve þere Studefaste bi-leve  
 And in hire *tormenz* treowe heorte  
 S.Eng.Leg. 1. 84/33, *MED*  
 'Our Lord gave them their firm faith and true courage in their sufferings'.

The meaning 'instrument of torture' was recorded in the same year.

Extensions to stative meanings were also undergone, later than the ME period, by the nouns *CONTENTEMENT* and *CONCELEMENT*. In the ME period *CONTENTEMENT* (1437) had the instrumental sense of a payment, and *CONCELEMENT* (a1325) meant the act or habit of concealing. The meanings 'state of being satisfied' and 'state of being concealed' are not recorded until 1597

and 1605 respectively (see *OED*).

I remarked in 1.3.4.2. that resultative nouns may be formed not only on adjectives or stative verbs, but also on active verb bases, where there can be difficulty in distinguishing a result from an action. In cases such as the following, where the meaning of the base suggests both an action and a resulting condition, I have taken the preposition as a grammatical marker of intention:

(1) Result

To the uttermost distruction and *anientissment* of the said Merchants  
RParl. 4.352a (1429), *MED*  
'As far as in the complete destruction and [state of] annihilation of the  
said merchants';

(2) Action

Without suffring any other persone there to hunte or have ... other disporte,  
in distroing or *amentissment* of the game  
Let. Marg. Anjou in Camd.86 91 (a1500(a1455), *MED*.  
'Without tolerating that any other other person there should hunt or have ...  
other sport, in [the act of] destroying or diminishing the game'.

In (1) the preposition *to* seems to look forward to a completed result, while in (2) the use of *in* implies an action in progress. However, this is not an infallible guide; in the following phrase, for example, I have preferred an action interpretation of APPESEMENT:

To peyne hem to th'*appesement* of these werres  
Instruct. Ambass. in Rymer's Foedera (1710) X 727, *MED*  
'To work at resolving these disputes',

perhaps because of the active sense of the accompanying verb *to peyne*. Clearly interpretation may depend on other elements of the context, and possibly in the last analysis remains subjective.

### 3.4.2. *Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Action*

#### 3.4.2.1. *Fact or Quality*

I suggested in 1.3.4.3. that where the base naturally extends to the semantic area of ‘moral quality’, an action noun may also be extended metaphorically to sum up the quality of the action. With these nouns it is sometimes difficult to tell whether fact or quality is intended, but it seems clear that the one meaning may be extended to the other. A 13th-century example is JUREMENT, which was used in *Ancrene Riwe* (1230[?a1200]) in a sense given by the MED as ‘ability to judge: [quality of] discernment’:

þeowhule þet te heorte walled wið”innen of wredð”e, nis þer no riht  
dom, ne no riht *gugement*  
Ancr.R., 118, *MED*  
‘while the heart is seething inwardly with anger, there is no good  
judgement or true discernment’.

But both *dom* and *gugement* here could as well mean ‘[act of] judging’.

#### 3.4.2.2. *Fact or instance*

As also stated in 1.3.4.3., a noun expressing an action which is always specific in practice may nevertheless be used in general contexts in order to name the action. This applies especially to legal or scientific terms which have become institutionalised. ATTACHEMENT (a1400) is an AN legal term meaning ‘distrain’ or the act of compelling. When first used in English it appears in a generalised context:

þat everich man of þe fraunchyse ... habbe þe resonable  
somounces ... þere þat *a-tachment* ne by-lyth nouzt  
Usages Wyn. p.84, *MED*;  
‘That every man of the franchise ... should have reasonable summonses ...  
except where [the principle of] distrain applies’.

ABATEMENT (?a1400[a1338]) is also an AN legal term, meaning the quashing of a suit or writ. However, its first appearance in English is in a specific context, with a similar meaning to ‘encroachment’:



ȝit held þe kyng of France Gascoyn with outrage ...  
 For þat *abatement* he challenges it  
 Mannyng Chron.Pt.2, p.278, *MED*  
 ‘The king of France always held Gascony by force ... He challenges  
 it because of that [act of] encroaching’.

### 3.4.3. 1150-1300: *unanalysable nouns*

There are 18 unanalysable nouns in the sample for this period.

#### 3.4.3.1. *Instrument*

Instrumental senses in deverbal nouns may be concrete (as in *ORNAMENT* ‘means of adorning’), or abstract (as in *COMMANDEMENT* ‘means of commanding’). The earliest item in the sample is the unanalysable borrowing *PIMENT* ‘spice’ (c1150), which is a concrete noun with an instrumental meaning. Six more unanalysable borrowings in this period have concrete instrumental meanings. These are *OURNEMENT* ‘ornament’ (?a1200), *VESTIMENT* (?a1200), *OYNEMENT* ‘ointment’ and *MONUMENT* ‘memorial [means of reminding]’ (both a1325[c1280]), *TORMENT* ‘instrument of torture’ (also ‘state of suffering’ [c1290, see 3.4.1. above]), and *GARNEMENT* ‘garment’ (c1400[?a1300]).

*ACOUPEMENT*, *COMMAUNDEMENT* and *ENCHAUNTEMENT* were used in this period in the abstract instrumental senses ‘criminal charge’ (c1250), ‘order’ (c1275) and ‘magic spell’ (c1290) respectively. *TESTAMENT* appeared a1300 in a reference to the Old Testament.

#### 3.4.3.2. *Object*

*PAVEMENT* ‘paved area’ (a1300(c1250)) is the only noun in this section with an objective sense.

#### 3.4.3.3. *Agent*

The first appearance of *PARLEMENT* (c1330[a1300]) was in the modern

agentive sense of ‘executive body’:

After his enterement  
 Ðai gan make a *parlement*,  
 To whiche *parlement* was yfet [fetched]  
 Al þat hadde power gret  
 Of þis londe al about.  
 Arthur & Merlin 27623, *MED*  
 ‘After his burial they called a parliament, to which parliament  
 was brought everyone who had great power all over this land’.

However, this word exemplifies a range of meanings available to an action noun in *-ment*. Around this date it also appears several times in the *Gloucester Chronicle* (c1325[c1300]), where the primary meaning seems to have been ‘occasion for discussing’:

- (1) At winchestre a *parlement* hi hulde of þis þinge  
 Glo.Chron.A. 9238, *MED*  
 ‘At Winchester they held a parliament on this matter’.

Here, perhaps for historical reasons, the occasion is still thought of as specific rather than institutionalised, so that in the same phrase in a different syntactic context the base meaning of ‘talk, discuss’ can still seem present in the noun:

- (2) þere he huld is *parlement*, wat were best to done  
 Glo.Chron.A. 3579, *MED*  
 ‘There he held his discussion (of) what it would be best to do’.

Elsewhere in the same text the sense is simply ‘act of discussing’:

- (3) To þe erl ek of Gloucetre þe lettres sone come  
 So þat priue *parlement* bituene hom hii nome  
 Glo.Chron.A. 11573, *MED*  
 ‘Letters soon came to the Earl of Gloucester, so they had  
 that private discussion between themselves’.

Later in the century it is recorded with the meaning ‘an instance of talking’:

- (4) Ibidde *ȝow* takeþ good tent  
 þat *ȝe* holde no *parlyment*  
 With no cristen mon  
 When *ȝe* come þe Churche withInne  
 Treat. Mass c1390, 278, *MED*

‘I ask you to take good care not to talk to anyone when you come inside the church’.

#### 3.4.3.4. *Result/ state*

TORMENT (c1290, discussed above in 3.4.1.), is the only unanalysable noun in this category in this period.

#### 3.4.3.5. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

In gauging specificity I have taken into account contextual indicators, for example specifiers such as *the*, *that* and *the said*, the existence of a direct object, or (where the base suggests action)<sup>2</sup> the plural indicating countable instances, as in CONTENEMENZ, discussed in 1.3.4.3. Substitution of the gerund (V+-ing) for the deverbal noun is of course an indicator for general as well as specific action senses.<sup>3</sup>

Where the action is public or collective, an action noun can denote an occasion, which perhaps should be regarded as a public instance. An example would be TORNEMENT ‘tournament’ (c1230[?a1200]), which with ENTEREMENT ‘funeral’(c1330[?a1300]) is an early example of the ‘occasion’ meaning. Three more unanalysable borrowings in this period denote specific instances of action.

CONTENEMENT (c1230[?a1200]) was discussed in 1.3.4.3. AMONESTEMENT (c1275) appears c1230 in *Kentish Sermons*, in a reference to:

þe *amonestement* of þo dieule  
*Kentish Sermons*, Bennett and Smithers 1966: 215, 1.67  
 ‘the inciting of the devil’ .

The other is COMMENCEMENT (c1275):

þis was þe *commencement* of þo miracles of ure lorverde þet he made  
 flesliche in erþe  
 Ken.Serm. 220/214, *MED*  
 ‘This was the beginning of the miracles of Our Lord which he performed during His incarnation on earth’.

COMMENCEMENT developed the specialised ‘occasion’ meaning of ‘graduation’

a1387, a century later than its use c1275 denoting a specific act.

#### 3.4.4. 1150-1300: *analysable nouns*

There are 13 analysable nouns in the sample for this period.

##### 3.4.4.1. *Instrument*

In this category may be placed the concrete nouns FOUNDEMENT (c1290) and NORISHMENT (c1330[?a1300]).

ENCOMBEMENT (c1330?a1300) underwent a sense extension comparable to that of TORMENT (discussed in 3.4.1. above). It appears to have had an instrumental meaning in its earlier occurrences:

Merlin made enchaument and kest gret *encumberment* into þe pavilionis,  
wild fer...  
Arthur & Merlin 3202, *MED*  
'Merlin cast a spell and threw a great [means of] difficulty into the pavilions:  
wildfire'.

Later it took on a resultative sense 'state of being encumbered':

Alle France suld be brouht tille *Encumberment*, þorgh comon Enterdite  
a1400, Mannyng Chron.Pt. 2, p.230, *MED*  
'The whole of France should be brought into [a state of] difficulty, through a  
common interdict'.

However, this noun was superseded by its competitor *encumbrance*, which was first recorded, also in 1330, with this resultative sense 'state of trouble', and was later used in the modern instrumental sense by Chaucer.

##### 3.4.4.2. *Result/ state*

AVAUNCEMENT (1297) had the resultative meaning '[state of] promotion'.

The earliest context of ACORDEMENT (c1400[?a1300]) qualifies it with an adjective. The context suggests the resulting state rather than the action:

He shulde come as amy  
And don hym in his mercy ...  
Good shulde be þ*acordement*  
K. Alex. 1836, *MED*

‘He should come as a friend and throw himself on his mercy ... The [state of] reconciliation would be good’.

AMENDEMENT (c.1230) appears in *Ancrene Wisse* in a speech attributed to the devil:

*ze* mai doon þe *amendement* ant con swaliches doon hit, þat Ich ant tu baþe...schule beon unblamet.

*Ancrene Wisse*, Bennett and Smithers 1966: 232, line 257

‘You may make the amendment and can do it in such a way that neither you nor I shall be blamed’.

The syntax here is ambiguous, and could refer to the action (see the discussion of *make* and *do* + N in 3.4.6.7. below). However, the sense of the base, which looks to the result, also suggests the reading ‘amended state of affairs’.

CONSETEMENT (c1330[a1300]) is first quoted in a prepositional phrase

þai *zave* al her to *concentement*

Arthur & Merlin 2825, *MED*

‘They brought everyone here to [a state of] agreement’.

This is comparable with a use in the same year of ACORDEMENT :

Zhe...kist him to *acordement*

7 Sages (1)56/1356, *MED*

‘She ... kissed him as a sign that they were in [a state of] agreement’.

#### 3.4.4.3. *Action* : Fact

CHASTIMENT (1230[?a1200]) appears in *Ancrene Riwle* as a generalised

action with a gloss:

Indignacio, þet is þe ... forhoheþ *chastiment* oþer ei lahres lare

Ancr. 52b, *MED*

‘Indignacio, which is one [sic] who ... despises punishment or any teacher’s lesson’.

Elsewhere it is ambiguous between specific action, state and instrument:

Ne chastie *ze* na swuch mon neaver on oþer wise, for in wiþ þe *chastiment* ...

Ancr. 25a, *MED*

‘Such a man should never be punished in any other way, so that along with the [punishing? being punished? means of punishment?] ...’

#### 3.4.4.4. *Action: Quality*

JUGEMENT (1230?[a1200]) was discussed in 3.4.2.1. above. Here the semantics of the base make it hard to distinguish the sense ‘general act’ from ‘quality of judgement’. The same is true of AFETEMENT ‘proper conduct’ (c1400[?a1300]). AFETEMENT was later extrapolated to ‘form, nature’:

Of þyse apples y say *zow* also þe manere & þe *afetement*  
 Femina 26, c1400, *MED*  
 ‘I will also tell you the form and nature of these apples’.

#### 3.4.4.5. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

ENCOMBREMENT (c1330?a1300) was discussed in 3.4.4.1. as appearing in *Arthur & Merlin* with an instrumental sense. Elsewhere in the same text it is also used in the sense of ‘an instance of ensnaring’:

It was verrament þe deuels foule *encumbrement*  
 Arthur & Merlin, 706, *MED*  
 ‘It was truly the devil’s foul ensnaring’.

ENTICEMENT appears in the same text, also in a specific context:

Ð e fendes *enticement*  
 Arthur & Merlin, 758, *MED*  
 ‘The devil’s enticing’.

JUGEMENT (1230?a1200) was first recorded with the sense ‘act of judging’.  
 (By c1300 it also denoted the occasion of a trial, besides the resultative ‘sentence’).

SACRAMENT (a1225[?a1200]) first denoted any rite of the Christian church, i.e. An occasion, though in the 14th century it was also used as an instrumental, meaning the bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist (c1390). The ambiguous

AMENDEMENT (c1230) was discussed above in 3.4.4.2. The ‘occasion’ noun

COROUNEMENT also appeared before 1300.

#### 3.4.4.6. *Summary*

The sample for the early period has more unanalysable than analysable

nouns. 12 out of 18 unanalysable borrowings have instrumental meanings, of which more than half are concrete nouns. In addition, five denote action. All these first appeared in specific contexts, of which two can signify a public occasion.

Of the 13 analysable nouns, three have instrumental meanings, two of which are concrete. Four first appear in result senses and seven as action nouns (two being ambiguous between these meanings). Of the action nouns, two are also interpretable metaphorically as qualities, while five (including the two ambiguous uses) denote instances or occasions.

### 3.4.5. *The 14th century: unanalysable nouns*

There are 16 unanalysable nouns in the sample for the 14th century.

#### 3.4.5.1. *Instrument*

A number of 14th century instrumental nouns have concrete meanings.

INSTRUMENT appears c1300 in its modern concrete sense, here specifically ‘musical instrument’. In the 14th century the unanalysable borrowing APPAREMENT (a1325) had the concrete instrumental meaning ‘clothes’. A version of this, PARAMENTS, was used by Chaucer in the *Knight's Tale* (c1385) to mean rich garments. ADUBBEMENT (c.1400[1380]) in English is used only in the poem *Pearl* but appears there three times, once with the instrumental sense ‘adornment’ but elsewhere being glossed in the *MED* as ‘splendour’, a ‘quality’ sense perhaps felt to be implicit in the French sense ‘dubbing a knight’:

Rych rokkes wer to dyscreven ...  
 wern never webbes þat wy zes weven  
 Of half so dere *adubmente*  
 Pearl 72, *MED*

‘I could describe rich jewels ... There never were tapestries woven of half such costly splendour’.

The abstract nouns VERIFIEMENT (a1325), ARGUMENT (1330), EXPERIMENT ‘evidence’ (?1348) and NOCUMENT ‘cause of harm’ (c1475[1392]) were also recorded first in instrumental contexts.

There remain two legal terms. AMERCEMENT (a1325) had the lexicalised instrumental meaning ‘fine’, while ARBITREMENT appears around 1380 with the instrumental meanings both of a legal sentence and of the means of arbitration.

#### 3.4.5.2. *Object*

TENEMENT (a1400[c1303]) had the objective sense ‘property held’, though a little later (a1325) it also appears with the action/fact sense ‘holding property’.

#### 3.4.5.3. *Agent*

The opaque noun ELEMENT (c1300) meant a basic component of the universe, that is earth, air, fire or water. By extension at approximately the same date it also meant ‘weather’.

#### 3.4.5.4. *Result/state*

EMPRISONMENT (c1400[?c1380]) first appears ambiguously in *Cleanness*, where it could simultaneously be read as the resultative ‘state of being imprisoned’ or ‘act of sending to prison’:

On payne of *emprisonment* & puttyng in stokkes  
Cleannes 46, *MED*.

#### 3.4.5.5. *Action: Quality*

Only one unanalysable word, SENTEMENT ‘sensibility’ (a1425[c1385]) solely denotes a quality in the 14th-century sample for *-ment*. However, there are in this period more simultaneous first appearances of words with multiple meanings. A number of words introduced at this time with instrumental or action/fact meanings also suggest resulting states, or qualities implicit in their bases.



### 3.4.5.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

Apart from the ambiguous EMPRISONMENT (c1400[?c1380]) (see 3.4.5.4. above), only two unanalysable nouns first appear in contexts of specific instance.

These are ABETTEMENT (1380):

For hure covyne toward þat route and hure *abettyment* ...  
 Firumb.(1) 2364, *MED*  
 ‘For their conspiracy towards and their abetting of that riot’ .

and ASPIREMENT (a1393):

Air is the thridde of elementz,  
 Of whos kinde his *aspirementz*  
 Takth every lifissh creature  
 Gower, C.A., 7. 256, *MED*  
 ‘Air is the third element, from the nature of which every living creature derives its [acts of] breathing’.

### 3.4.6. *The 14th century: analysable nouns*

#### 3.4.6.1. *Instrument*

21 of the 61 analysable nouns in this period were first recorded with instrumental meanings. Six are concrete. ESEMENT ‘amenities’ (?a1400[a1338]) and ADORNEMENT (1535rev.[c1385]) also had concrete meanings at this time. ABATAYLMENT ‘battlement’(c1390), had its modern meaning. (This noun looks denominal, but it follows a verb *abataillen*, c1380.) ARRAIMENT (1399) was first recorded with the French instrumental meaning ‘equipment’:

armery at al pees, and horses, and other *araement*  
 Let. in Ellis Orig. Let. ser. 2.1.6, *MED*  
 ‘a full suit of armour and horses and other equipment’.

Malory used the form RAYMENT in 1450 to mean ‘clothes’:

They brought hym thyder in a fysshers *rayment*  
*Morte d'Arthur*, 8,23, 237  
 ‘They brought him here in a fisherman’s clothes’.

APPAREILLEMENT (a1425 [c1380]) and TIREMENT (c1450[?a1400]) also

meant 'clothes'.<sup>4</sup>

PRECHEMENT 'tedious speech' (c1330(?c1300) designates the words by which the effect is obtained. 'Is this a sermon or a *prechement*?' asks a later user (Beryn, c1460[?c1400] 1263, *MED*). APEIREMENT 'means of impairing'(c1325), AVEIEMENT 'instruction' (c1350[a1333]) and VENGEMENT 'means of vengeance' (?a1400[a1338]) are non-concrete instrumental nouns. Chaucer first used MOVEMENT in *Boethius* (1375) with the instrumental sense 'power of moving':

Thow nylt nat thanne denye... þat þe *Movement* of goynge nis in Men by  
Kynde

Chaucer Bo. IV.pr.ii.89(Camb.MS), *MED*

'You will not then deny ... that the faculty of movement is in men by nature',

a sense shared with the action meaning in OF and AN, and with a further range of AN senses such as 'exercise', 'emotion' and 'the passage of time' (Godefroy).

Other abstract instrumentals are AVISEMENT 'advice' (?a1400[a1338]), ABUSHEMENT 'ambush' (c1380), DEVISEMENT 'description'(c1400[?c1380]), ACCUSEMENT 'criminal charge' (1385), REFRESHMENT with its modern abstract meaning (1532rev.[c1385]), ENCRESEMENT 'amount by which X is increased' (1389), EXCUSEMENT 'excuse' (a1393), STABLEMENT 'means of stabilising' (a1398), COMPLEMENT with its modern meaning (1398) and SEUREMENT 'surety [means of assuring]' (c1450[?a1400]).

#### 3.4.6.2. *Object*

In this group are CONJECTEMENT 'scheme [things plotted]' (1532rev.[c1385], PAIEMENT 'sum paid' (1390) and ADDITAMENT (a1400), first recorded in the plural with the meaning 'things added'.

APPROVEMENT (1402[1363]) was first used with the concrete objective sense 'land to be improved'. It was a legal term, more usually with the action/fact

meanings ‘utilisation of waste or common land for improvement’ or ‘leasing in return for a fraction of the yield’ (*MED*).

#### 3.4.6.3. *Collective nouns*

In a small number of denominal nouns the suffix *-ment* appears to function as a simple intensifier or quantitative extension of the base. An example in this period is *VESSELEMENT* (a1400[c1303]), apparently a collective extension of the earlier *vessel* (a1325[c1290]):

... Stones, eren, or glas ... Or any oþer *vesselement* Ðat falleþ to holy  
cherches seruyse  
Mannyng HS 9338, *MED*  
‘... Stone, iron, or glass ... Or any other vessels used in the service of Holy  
Church’.

#### 3.4.6.4. *Result/state*

There are also nine analysable nouns in this period which were first recorded expressing result. These include *AMOUNTMENT* (?a1400[a1338] ‘final total’, i.e. the result of accounting):

Ðei brouht ... þe olde chartres & titles ... of ilk a bisshop se & ilk a priourie ...  
examend þam, & cast ilk *amountment*  
Mannyng, Chron. Pt. 2, p.248, *MED*  
‘They brought ... the old charters and titles of each bishop’s see and each  
priory ... examined them, and calculated the final total of each’.

*FINISHMENT* (c1390) first appeared in *Gawain* with the resultative meaning ‘death [state of having died]’. The denominal *TABLEMENT* (a1400[a1325]) was an architectural term for various features made from a flat piece of wood or stone.

The others denote passive states: *SAVEMENT* ‘salvation [state of having been saved]’(?a1300), *MARREMENT* ‘state of being troubled’(c1391), *ONEMENT* ‘union [state of having been united]’ (a1425[c1395]) and *ALLEGEMENT* ‘relief [state of having been relieved]’ (a1425[?a1400]). *ONEMENT*, coined on a

native base, translates the Latin *unitas* in the *Wyclif Bible*. The English context suggests less a quality ('unity') than a state resulting from a specific act:

layne thou the trees oon to the tother in to o tree to thee; and tho  
schulen be in to *onement*  
WBible[1] Ezek. 37. 17, *MED*  
'And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in  
thine hand' (King James' Bible, 1611).

Among active experiential states are MARTIREMENT 'state of suffering' (1340) and ENTENDEMENT 'state of having understood' (c1430[c1380]):

More clere *entendement*  
Nas me never yit ysent  
Ch. HF 983, *MED*  
'A clearer state of understanding was never yet granted me'.

Shortly after this date (a1425[c1385]), Chaucer used the word to denote the instrumental faculty of understanding:

For mannes hed imagynen ne kan,  
*Nentendement* considere ...  
Ch. TC 4. 1696, *MED*  
'For a man's mind cannot imagine, nor his intellectual faculty  
consider ...'

#### 3.4.6.5. *Action: Quality*

HARDIMENT 'courage' (a1425[c1385]), from the adjective *hardi* 'daring' (1230[?a1200]), is the only pure quality to be found in this part of the sample. Several nouns, however, express actions implying qualities, and are discussed here under this heading.

CONCELEMENT (a1325) represents a holistic transference into English of an ambiguity in French. *Concelement* in OF and AN signifies a secret or fraudulent action:

Si je tieng l'eritage par malvese cause, si comme par force or par  
nouvele dessaizine ou ... par *concelement* ...  
BEAUM., Cout. du Beauv., xx, 2, Beugnot, Godefroy

‘If I hold the inheritance unlawfully, for example by force, by disseisin ... or by fraud [concealing the action] ...’

An AN citation suggests the attribute as well as the action:

Le rays ount il ja tuez, sanz *concelement*  
Langt. 96, *AND*  
‘The king had already killed him, without secrecy’.

In the first citation of ME CONCELEMENT (a1325), it is paired with a moral quality:

... for hoere *concelement* and for hoere laschesse, forte abaten hoere  
pouer of felons  
MS Rawl. B.520 lf. 31b [OD col.], *MED*  
... ‘To remove their power to commit misdeeds, because of their  
deceitfulness and cowardice’.

Both meanings are brought out in a later English use (?a1400[1338]):

þorgh fals *concelement* William did his wille,  
Our castels has he brent  
Mannyng Chron. Pt.2 p.297, *MED*  
‘William achieved his aim by treacherously concealing his intentions.  
He has burnt our castles’.

COMPASSEMENT had already appeared in AN (c1290) in a specific  
context with the sense ‘plotting’:

Si ... il de ceo *compasement* de tiele felounesse volunte soit atteynt  
Britton 1, 43, *MED*  
‘If ... he is attainted for this plotting, of such felonious intent’

The first occurrence in English c1350 is obscure, but seems to express a typical action  
in a general context:

Ðe heued of her *cumpasement* & þe trauail of her lippes shal couer hem  
MPPsalter 199, *MED*  
‘The sum (?) of their plotting and the work of their lips shall cover them’.

A less obscure generalised context is found later in Gower:

Thurgh whos *compasement* and guile  
Ful many a mon hath lost his while  
In love  
Gower CA 2. 2323, *MED*  
‘Through whose plotting and guile very many men have wasted the  
time they spend on love’.

GOVERNEMENT appears repeatedly in Chaucer's *Boethius* (?a1425[c.1380])

and can be variously interpreted in context according to a range of meanings.

These include (perhaps) the agentive sense 'body of people who govern'; though allowing for loose syntax, this context might allow the general sense 'fact of governing':

Yif thow remembre of what cuntre thow art born, it nys nat governed by  
emperoures, ne by *gouvernement* of multitude

Bo.1.pr.5.20, *MED*

'If you remember of what country you were born, it is not governed by  
emperours, nor by the rule of the mob'.

Elsewhere in the same text it appears with the action meaning extended to the moral  
sphere:

wenestow that ther be inne it any *gouvernement* of reason?

Bo.1.pr.6.11, *MED*

'Do you know that there is in it [the world] any reasonable governance?'

From this might be predicted its use in 1450 to denote an absolute quality,  
without a qualifying phrase:

Thou are thanne: thing that hast no techinge ne *gouvernement* in thee

Pilgr. LM 158, *MED*

'You are then a thing with no education or self-control in you'.

MISGOVERNEMENT (c1384) by virtue of the prefix extends the generalised  
action/fact meaning to the sphere of moral quality:

Of good, or *misgouvernement*

Chaucer, H.Fame 1975, *OED*

'Of good or bad governing'.

CURSEMENT (c1400[?a1387]) is first used metaphorically to convey the  
quality of an action:

Envye ... criede mea culpa, corsynge ally hus enemys ... Hus clopes were  
of *corsement* and of kene wordes

P.Pl.C 7. 65, *MED*

'Envy ... cried "Mea culpa", cursing all his enemies ... His clothes were  
[made] of blasphemy and of sharp words'.

#### 3.4.6.6. *Action: Fact*

FEFFEMENT (?a1400[a1338]) first appears in ME as the fact of holding a title to land :

After þe forty days of þat *feffement*, etc.  
 Mannyng Chron. Pt. 2 p. 254, *MED*  
 ‘After the forty days’ duration of that entitlement, etc.’

Other legal terms are ATTACHEMENT (a1400) and ABATEMENT (?a1400[a1338]), discussed above in 3.4.2.1., and ATTAINEMENT ‘encroachment’ (1384), which also first appears in a generalised context:

Landis and tenementis ... fre and quyte of alle maner axions, axing, and attenement  
 Arnold Chron. (1811) 19, *MED*  
 ‘Lands and holdings ... free and acquitted of any kind of claim, demand and encroachment’.

PUNISHMENT (1532rev.[c1385]) also first occurs in a generalised context:

A man vengeable in wrath no governance in *punisshment* ought to have  
 Usk TL 90/93, *MED*  
 ‘A man vindictive in anger is bound to have no restraint in punishing people’.

#### 3.4.6.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

17 analysable nouns appear first in contexts of specific instance. These contexts are given below.

CONFERMEMENT (c1325[c1300]) first occurs in the context *make* + N.

This construction sounds ambiguous to a modern ear, as the verb *make* apparently turns the noun into a direct object, suggesting result. ME, however, lacked the modern distinction between transitive *make* and intransitive *do*, and it seems to me that where N = V+ suffix and the base is active, the sense intended was probably ‘do V’ rather than ‘make N’:

He made a *confermement* to westmunstre of ech thinge  
 Ðat þoru him hom i *ziue* was, oþer eni oþer kinge,  
 So þat no king after him ne dude no destourbinge

Glo. Chron. A, 7169, *MED*

‘He confirmed to Westminster each item that he granted them, so that no king after him could make any trouble’.

PROCUREMENT and ENDITEMENT (a1400[c1303]) were legal

procedures, both evidently subject to abuse:

PROCUREMENT, a1400(c1303):

Coueyt nat thy neighbours þyng,

For to reue hym wykkedly

... wyþ wykked *procurement*

To make hym lese hys tenement

Mannyng HS 2909, *MED*

‘Do not covet your neighbour’s property, so that you wrongfully rob him ... through a wrongful act of procurement so that he loses his holding’.

ENDITEMENT, a1400(c1303):

Ne quest take of *endytement* yn holy cherche

Mannyng HS 8913, *MED*

‘Do not make an act of accusation in a sanctified church’.

ENDITEMENT, however, appears more frequently later with the instrumental sense

‘words, content of accusation’:

These beth these *Enditementis* and the presentementz founden defectif

Plea & Mem. In Bk. Lond. E. 123/63 (1422), *MED*

‘These are those accusations and presentations which were found defective’.

Other specific contexts are as follows:

ADJUREMENT (1382):

Thou seest hou Raguel hath coniuroid me, whos *adiurement* [WB 2: charyng: *L.adjuramentum*] I mai not dispisen

W.Bible (1) Tob. 9.5., *MED*

‘You see how Rachel has addressed me, whose charging I may not hold in contempt’.

CONGELEMENT (1532rev.[c1385]):

So noble a dewe that, after *congelement*, a Margaryte ... was yeven to every creature

Usk TL (Skeat) 93/68, *MED*

‘So noble a dew that, after congealing, a pearl ... was given to every creature’.



## EXAMINEMENT (1389):

De foure Wardeynes ... schul ... enquere by *examination* of þe  
 breþeren ... wheer he be worþi ... or not  
 Lond. Gild Ret. in Bk. Lond. E, 54/31, *MED*  
 ‘The four wardens ... shall ... inquire by examining the brethren ...  
 whether he is worthy ... or not’.

## ASSIGNEMENT ((1389)

At ye aldermannes *assignement*, alle ye bretheryn and systeryn ... schul comen  
 togedere in cause of devocioun  
 Nrt. Gild. Ret. 43, *MED*  
 ‘When the alderman requests, all you brothers and sisters ... shall come  
 together for the purpose of worship’.

## EGGMENT (c1390):

Thurgh womman's *eggement* Mankynde was lorn  
 Chaucer ML B 842, *MED*  
 ‘Through woman’s urging mankind was lost’.

## CONSPIREMENT (a1393):

The gulteles was dampned ...  
 But such a fals *conspirement*  
 God wolde nocht it were unknowe  
 Gower CA 2. 1704, *MED*  
 ‘The innocent were condemned...But God did not wish such deceitful plotting  
 to remain unknown’.

DELAIEMENT (a1393), like CONFERMENENT above, first occurs in the  
 context ‘make + N’. The meaning therefore would be as follows:

He made non *delaiement*,  
 Bot goth him home in alle hihe  
 Gower CA 4. 226, *MED*  
 ‘He did not delay, but went home in all haste’.

REFEFFEMENT (1394) is a legal term, a coinage in *re-* on FEFFEMENT (see

3.4.6.6. above):

By that *refeffement* were we alle forsaide confeffes of alle oure astat... in the  
 Forsaide londes, tho fulliche dismettid  
 Doc. In Collect. Topogr. 3, 256, *MED*  
 ‘By that [act of] re-enfeoffing all we aforesaid were joint holders of the  
 aforesaid lands, though [the enfeoffment had] fully expired’.

COMMENDEMENT (c1395):

Thus mightest thou have ful preef in thy Margarytes goodnesse, by  
*commendement* of othe jewels badnesse  
 Usk TL (Skeat) 97/104, *MED*  
 ‘In this way you might have full proof of the goodness of your pearl, by  
 assessing the poor quality of other jewels’.

TEMPERAMENT (a1398):

Ʒe keynyge of þe kinde hete is a temperat indrawinge of coold aier &  
 þe keynyge of ... spiritus vitalis ... Of þe *temperament* of þis spirit is þe  
 spirit gendrid þat hatte animalis  
 \*Trev. Barth. 23a/a, *MED*  
 ‘Natural heat is maintained by a temperate inhaling of cold air and the  
 maintaining of ... vital spirit ... The tempering of this spirit results in the spirit  
 we call animal’

MURTHERMENT (a1400):

... Ʒei toke her rede  
 Dernely to do him to dede...  
 Bi *murþerment* to do him di ze  
 Cursor 19716, *MED*  
 ‘They took their advice to brutally kill him ... to do him to death by  
 murdering [him]’.

AGREEMENT (?a1400):

Without assent of all somyn ... And by *agrement* of the gret  
 Destr. Troy 8915, *MED*  
 ‘Without the assent of the whole gathering ... And by those with power  
 agreeing [to it]’.

This word appears later as a concrete resultative noun and refers to a contract

(a document which results from agreeing):

Suche as þe Kyngys lawe ... and þis *agrement* asketh and requireth  
 Proc. Privy C. 3. 176, 1425, *MED*  
 ‘Such as the King’s law ... and this contract demand and require’.

The legal term ABATEMENT (a1350) also comes into this group and has  
 been discussed above in 3.4.2.2.

PRESENTEMENT (c1303) is the occasion of the formal nomination of a

cleric for preferment:

De fyf þe sacrament, þe order of þe bysshopes *presentement*:

Ðys falleþ to þese lordynges,

As popes, emperours, and kynges,

And to alle þat Clerkys advaunce

Mannyng HS 10944, *MED*

‘The fifth sacrament [is] the occasion of nominating a bishop. This is the responsibility of such lords as popes, emperors and kings, and everyone with clerical advancement in their gift’.

#### 3.4.6.8. *Summary*

In this period there are many more analysable than unanalysable nouns in the sample for *-ment*. The two groups have different semantic patterns. Most of the 16 unanalysable borrowings have instrumental meanings. Three have action meanings, two denoting specific instance.

Most of the 61 analysable nouns are divided between instrumental and action meanings. 21 are instrumental (six being concrete nouns), nine are resultative, and four have objective senses. The largest number, however (27), denote some aspect of action/fact. Of these 27, 17 were first used in contexts of specific instance (one, *PRESENTEMENT*, being an ‘occasion’ noun). The notable difference between analysables and unanalysables here is the increase in action nouns and, among the action nouns, the predominance of specific instance.

#### 3.4.7. *The 15th century: unanalysable nouns*

##### 3.4.7.1. *Instrument*

Of the 22 unanalysable nouns in the sample for this period, 11 are Latin borrowings. These include six of the eight instrumentals, four being concrete nouns.

*MEDICAMENT* and *CONDIMENT* (?1440) have their modern meanings. The others are *PODIMENT* ‘splint’ (?a1425), the abstract *DETRIMENT* ‘damage’(c1425), *IMPLEMENT* ‘supplement’ (1445) and *IMPLICAMENT* (a1500), first denoting a tie or

means of personal involvement:

Be pure and fre wipinfurpe, wipout *implicament* or incombraunce of eny creature

Imit. Chr. 49/18, *MED*

‘Be pure and nobly independent from henceforth, with no tie or obligation to anyone’.

French borrowings are ENTERTENEMENT (1440), one of many terms for ‘means of support’ (see 3.4.8.1. below), and AGISTEMENT ‘right of pasture’ (a1447).

### 3.4.7.2. *Object*

Two Latin borrowings have objective sense: PREDICAMENT

(a1475[?a1430], meaning ‘predicate [something previously stated]’, a concept in formal logic, and DOCUMENT (c1443), which in its first context has its derivational meaning ‘thing taught’. APATISSEMENT ‘contracted payment’ (1440), from OF, also has objective meaning.

### 3.4.7.3. *Result/state*

FERREMENT (c1425) means ‘ironwork [product of iron]’. MACHINAMENT (a1500[1413]), has the meaning ‘product of machinery’:

I sawe befor me a wonder *machinament* ... two huge ymages of disparaile forme ... in an heighe place

\*Pilgr. Soul 4. 31. 75b, *MED*

‘I saw in front of me something miraculously devised; two huge images of disparate shape ... in an elevated position’.

EXCOMMENGEMENT ‘excommunication’ (1472-3) is a passive state. (The ‘by’ clause here probably modifies the verb *pronounced*):

A grete sentence Appostelik of *excommengement* by grete nombres of Bisshopes ayenst the brekers therof was pronounced

RParl. 6. 158b, *MED*

‘A severe apostolic sentence of excommunication [being excommunicated] was pronounced by great numbers of bishops against those who broke it’.

The four other result nouns are Latin derivatives. These are LINIAMENT

‘feature [product of line])’ (?a1475[?a1425]), MELIORAMENT ‘state of having been improved’ (?a1425), EMOLUMENT ‘money arising from a source of profit’ (1435) and DELIRAMENT (c1450), a nonce word for the mental state of delirium.

#### 3.4.7.4. *Action: Quality*

There are four action nouns. PERJUREMENT (c1450) first appears in the same text both as an action and as the name of a personified quality:

My tunge, which is mesel, is cleped *periurement* ... Bi menterye is also *Periurement* born and engendred; For *periurement* may not be but if mensoige make him come foorth; And in mensoige and in *periurement* may not be the ther ne is sum baret

Pilgr. LM 151, *MED*

‘My tongue, which is wretched, is called Perjury ... Perjury is also born and conceived by lying; For perjury cannot exist unless a lie produces it; And lies and perjury cannot exist without causing some sort of trouble’.

#### 3.4.7.5. *Action: Fact*

JOGULMENT ‘entertainment’ (1440) first occurs in the generalised context of a Latin gloss:

Iogulynge or *iogulment*: Prestigium ... mimilogium

PParv. 263, *MED*

‘Juggling, jugglement: Conjuring ... mime’.

#### 3.4.7.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

ESLARGISSEMENT ‘releasing’ (1440) and ENTASSEMENT ‘piling up’ (a1500[c1450]) first occur in contexts of specific instance:

Be the deliveraunce and *Eslargissement* of the Duc of Orleans

In Rymer’s *Foedera* (1710) 10.764, *MED*

‘By the setting free and releasing at large of the Duke of Orleans’;

Ther was grete *entassement* of men and of horse vpon hepes

Merlin 398/7, *MED*

‘There was much piling up of men and horses into heaps’.

### 3.4.8. *The 15th century: analysable nouns*

#### 3.4.8.1. *Instrument*

Of the 70 analysable nouns in the sample for this period, 22 first appear with instrumental meanings. Only four at this period have concrete senses: ABILEMENT ‘equipment’ (1422), LAVAMENT ‘washing solution’ (a1425), EMBATEMANT ‘bait’ (c1500) and possibly POISONMENT (1543[1464]). It is unclear whether this last was formed on the noun *poison* (c1400[?a1300]) or the verb *poisonen* which is even earlier (c1225[?c1200]). If the former, it would simply have been an intensified form meaning ‘poison’; but the earliest context suggests the latter, by juxtaposition of a synonymous gerund:

Some in his sherte put ofte tyme *venemyng* ...  
 And some in meate and drinke great *poysonment*  
 Hardyng Chron. B p.370, *MED*  
 ‘Some would often put the means of poisoning on [the victim’s] shirt ... and others in food and drink’.

Of the 18 abstract instrumentals, SOILMENT ‘absolution’ (?a1425[a1415]), first appears as ‘means of absolving’, a commodity to be sold:

Whennes comeþ þanne þis outcry ... to selle þis goostli þingis wiþ suffragis  
 & *soilmentis*  
 Wycl. Lantern 76/10, *MED*  
 ‘From which then comes this outcry ... selling these spiritual things by means of indulgences and absolutions’.

PRIVILEGEMENT (1543[1464]) similarly meant ‘dispensation’, that is a paper by which the bearer was dispensed from an obligation. Several quasi-official terms bear this sense of ‘document by which X is done’. APOINTEMENT in 1417 had the instrumental sense ‘letter of appointment’, and ORDEINEMENT (a1425) that of ‘ruling, decision’. ADVERTISEMENT (1426) had its modern instrumental meaning and AVERREMENT (1429) that of ‘statement, deposition’.

Another semantic cluster signified means of various kinds of support. These

include CONTENTEMENT ‘means of [monetary] satisfaction’ (1437) and BOCHEMENT (a1440, a denominal formation meaning ‘supplement’, formed on the OF noun *boche* ‘swelling’). RELIEVEMENT (1443) has a similar meaning:

We graunted unto our saide cousin, in *relievement* of him... and in aide and paiement of his raunson ... The gavel of ij mewes of salt Wars France in RS 22.1, 435, *MED*  
 ‘We granted to our said cousin, as means of relief ... and in aid and payment of his ransom ... the tribute of two stacks of salt’

SUSTENEMENT ‘means of sustaining’ (a1500[?c1450]) was first used in a personification:

When Arthur had killed Magloras, the kinge that was the *sustenement* of the saisnes ... than fledde thei alle Merlin 591, *MED*  
 ‘When Arthur had killed Magloras, the king who was the support of the Saxons ... then they all fled’,

while CONVERSEMENT in 1455 meant ‘means of livelihood’:

In asmeche as he hadde no lyvelode in the shire, nor *conversement* Paston 3. 38, *MED*  
 ‘Inasmuch as he had no livelihood in the shire, nor means of earning a living’.

SUPPOWAILMENT (?1457), a formation on a noun in *-al*, had the instrumental meaning of ‘help, support’, and MAINTEMENT (?c1500), at the end of the period, was a version of *maintenaunce*, ‘life support’. BOTMENT ‘help’ (a1450) was a native formation on the OE noun *bote*, also meaning ‘help’.

The remaining four are RESTOREMENT ‘amends’ (a1500[c1400]), GROUNDEMENT (c1460[a1449], formed on a native verb, meaning ‘origin, cause’, RECUREMENT ‘remedy’ (c1450) and CONTROLMENT, which in 1454 signified a government department by which money was controlled:

The countynghous: John Brekenoke, clerk of þe *controllement*, j yoman. Proc. Privy C. 6.226, *MED*  
 ‘The counting house: John Brecknock, clerk of the controlment, one

yeoman’.

#### 3.4.8.2. *Collective nouns*

UTENSILMENT (1428) meant simply ‘utensils’, formed on a noun which had already appeared in 1411 and of which it is an intensification.

#### 3.4.8.3. *Object*

WONDERMENT (?a1425), in modE an experiential state, appears in the 15th century as ‘object of wonder’:

Ou schalt to prisoun ... but þou wilt revoke þi worde and make an open  
wondirment at þi parische chirche at home  
Wycl. Lantern 100/11, MED

‘You will have to go to prison ... unless you want to take back your word and make yourself an object of open wonder at your parish church at home’.

Other analysable nouns with objective meaning are REPAIEMENT ‘money repaid’ (1421), ENROLLEMENT ‘official copy or record of a statute or ordinance’ (1440), EMBLAIMENT ‘crop sowed or harvested’ (a1455, from a verb *emblaien*), ENDOUEMENT ‘dower’ (1447), DENOMBREMENT ‘sum calculated’ (1455), ASSEMBLEMENT ‘people assembled’ (1543[1464]) and HERITEMENT ‘properties inherited’ (1472-3). ACHIEVEMENT was first recorded in 1475 with the concrete meaning ‘hatchment’ or ‘heraldic device’. This word derives from the verb *cheven* (c1300) which originally meant to obtain money. The noun is classified in the *MED* under ‘completion; successful performance’; the meaning here appears to be ‘things completed’:

With thachievement of these devises the King aproched  
Caxton Jason 1106, *MED*

‘With the full complement of these devices the king approached’.

#### 3.4.8.4. *Result/state*

10 nouns are first recorded with resultative meanings. LEGEMENT (1427-8) is an architectural term formed on the native noun *legge* and meaning various



features made from a transverse board or ledge. Seven signify passive states. Two have an identical meaning 'state of being annihilated':

(1) ANNULMENT (1401):

Of humylyte procedeth mortyfycacyon and *annullement* of his propre wyll  
Caxton Vitas Putr. (W.de W.) lii xxiv (1495) 325/2, *OED*  
'From humility proceed [states of] mortification and the annihilation of self-will'.

(2) ANIENTISSMENT (1429):

To the uttermost distruction and *anientissment* of the said Merchants  
RParl. 4.352a, *MED*  
'To the complete destruction and annihilation of the said merchants'.

ANNULMENT, however, seems ambiguous in this context, as the two states of mortification and annulment would not proceed directly from the virtue of humility, but from a series of actions which humility would predispose the possessor to undertake.

The others are listed below.

ABAISHEMENT 'state of being embarrassed' (a1410):

The perfi *zt* meke may not here his preiyngge with oute *abasshement* and shamefastnesse  
Love Mirror 26, *MED*  
'The perfectly meek cannot hear themselves pray without embarrassment and shame'.

AUCTORISEMENT 'state of being emancipated' (a1500(1422]):

Abow al thyngge lowed princes in olde tyme the commyn prowte and the *Auctorisement* of the Pepill  
Yonge SSecr. 177/10, *MED*  
'Princes in old times had at heart above all the common benefit and emancipated state of the people'.

EMBLEMISHMENT 'state of being disgraced' ( c1436):

To grete esclaundre of the toune and *embleschement* [sic] of the lawes  
Ipswich Domesday (2) 19, *MED*  
'To the scandalous dishonour of the town and disgrace of the laws'.

FAMISHMENT ‘state of being starved’ (1543[1464]):

For drede of *famyshment*  
 He treated with the duke Androgeus  
 Hardyng Chron. B p. 78, *MED*  
 ‘For fear of being starved he treated with the duke Androgeus’.

ANOIMENT ‘state of being distressed’ (a1500):

I warant she never fele *anoymment*  
 Play Sacr. 503, *MED*  
 ‘I guarantee she will never feel distress’.

ABREGGEMENT ‘precis [result of abridging]’ (a1500[?a1425]) and

PREFERREMENT ‘promotion [a situation which results from being promoted]’ (1443)

are respectively an entity and a situation resulting from action.

#### 3.4.8.5. *Action: Quality*

ACUEMENT ‘bitterness’ (a1500[?a1425]), following the adjective *acu* (a1398) is the only pure quality in the analysable sample for this century. The contexts of the action nouns, however, emphasise qualities implicit in their bases. MISAVISEMENT (a1450[1408]), as with MISGOVERNEMENT and GOVERNEMENT in the 14th century (3.4.6.5. above), seems to have been coined in ME as a negative of the OF based noun AVISEMENT:

In whiche time most worschipe may be ywonne of good *avisement*, oþer  
 moost perel by falle of *mis-avisement*  
 \*Vegetius (1) 73/a, *MED*  
 ‘In which time the utmost respect may be incurred by good advice, or the  
 utmost danger by the chance application of bad advice’.

APPRISEMENT (c1443) is ‘the act of appraising’ conceived also as a quality:

... thilk *apprisement* or thilk judgement in resoun wherby a man holdiþ hym  
 silf such and so good ... as he knowiþ hymself to be  
 Pecock Rule 298, *MED*  
 ‘... That appraisement or that reasoned judgement whereby a man believes  
 himself such [a person] and as good ... as he knows himself to be’.

ATTENDEMENT (?1457) is the quality of conscientiousness which results in

(rather than resulting from) conscientious acts:

O gode lorde god, that knew his hertes intent,  
 That was so sette ... by his *attendement*,  
 To converte so that londe  
 Hardyng, Chron. A p.744, *MED*  
 ‘O good Lord God, who knew his heart’s resolve, which was so set  
 on thus converting that land by his determination’.

RECONCILEMENT [(c1475[1459] here seems to be a fact, given a value by

juxtaposition with a quality, rather than a state of being reconciled:

I conclude, hit were a grete simplenes to accept them by way of reason or of  
*reconsylement*  
 Pros. Yorkists in EHR 26, 522, *MED*  
 ‘I conclude, it would be great naivety to accept them in a spirit of reason or of  
 reconciliation’.

IMAGENEMENT (1543[1464] is the attribute of guile allied to activity:

Some ... put ofte tyme venemyng ... in hir hose, by grete *ymagenement*  
 Hardyng Chron. B p.370, *MED*  
 ‘Some ... often put poison in their [enemies’] stockings, by great guilefulness’.

#### 3.4.8.6. *Action: Fact*

PURGEMENT (a1500[1413]) is the purgation of the soul in the afterlife.

PECHEMENT (1420) and IMPROVEMENT (1449) are legal terms meaning  
 respectively ‘liability of compensation for damage’ and ‘management for profit’. Both  
 first occur in generalised contexts.

#### 3.4.8.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

The remaining 30 analysable nouns seem to have first denoted specific  
 instances of action. As with the early period and the 14th century, in defining this I  
 have used various criteria: substitution of the gerund *-ing* for the suffix *-ment*,  
 indicating an action sense, together with the presence of contextual indicators of  
 specificity, such as a gerund in apposition to *V-ment*, plural *N+ment* (suggesting  
 countable instances), the specifiers *these* and *the said*, either adjacent to or in phrases

following the noun, and the prepositions *in* or *by* before the noun, suggesting an action in progress. The items are given below with their earliest recorded citations.

PURIFIMENT (a1450[c1410]):

For the holigost discendid Adown at pentecost ... For to Clensen And forto Maken Clene ... and, for alle *pvrifiments* be-longen to þe holigost, Therefore as 'Cleansere' it signefiet  
Lovel. Grail 17. 317, *MED*  
'For the Holy Ghost came down at Pentecost ... to cleanse and to make clean ... and, because all acts of purifying belong to the Holy Ghost, therefore it is understood as 'the Cleanser'.

CHAUNGEMENT (c1450[1410]):

Ðer falleþ neuer suche sodeyn *chaungementes* [But] þat your corage somewhat chaunged is  
Walton Boeth. P.62, *MED*  
'Such sudden instances of changing never happen without one's courage being somewhat affected'.

ALTERMENT (a1500[1413]):

... ther be non *altermentes* [Cx: *alternementes* ('alternations')] of dayes nothir of monethis, but one contynual day þat nevere schal be ended  
\*Pilgr. Soul 5. 11. 94a, *MED*  
'... there are no changings [alternatings?] of the days or months, only one continual day that will never end'.

REPAIEMENT (1421):

That monaie that so excedith stonde, and be to the avantage of the paier of the same, in allouance or *repaielement* to hym to be made by the Resceyvour of the same  
RParl. 4. 151/a, *MED*  
'The sum in excess [of what is owed] shall stand and be to the advantage of the payer, in the recipient's allowing or repaying it to him'.

ACCOMPLISHMENT (a1425):

Write to your liegemen ... in *accomplissement* of your saide promesse  
Proc. Privy C. 3. 173, *MED*  
'Write to your liegemen ... fulfilling your said promise'.

## ALOINEMENT (a1500[?a1425]):

þe disposicioun of þe planetes and departyng of signes and ... þair  
*aloignementes* and ... þair sterynges

SSecr.(1) 65/38, *MED*

‘The disposition of the planets and distribution of constellations and ... their  
withdrawings and ... their movements’.

## EXCITEMENT (c1425):

Myracles ... to the laude of God and *excitament* of holynes

Found. St/ Barth. 31/10, *MED*

‘Miracles ... causing the praise of God and the urging [of others] to holiness’.

## APPESEMENT (1430):

To peyne hem to th'*Appesement* of these Werres...

Instruct. Ambass. in Rymer's *Foedera* (1710) X. 725, *MED*

‘To work at resolving these disputes’.

## STALLEMENT (1430):

Yf .... þe said commissair ... entredesir of *stallement* of þe dette þat he oweþ  
to þe King ... þei shal condescende to stallement of þe said paiement

Proc. Privy C. 4. 26-7, *MED*

‘If ... the said commissar... prefers staggering the debt he owes the King ...  
they shall graciously agree to staggering the said payment’.

## AQUITTEMENT (1431):

We jn recompense of the saide services, and in *acquittement* of the  
saide dette, have yeven unto oure said brother ... an annuite and  
Pension

Doc. in Flasdieck Origurk. 99, *MED*

‘We in recompense of the said services, and in acquitting the said debt,  
have given our said brother ... an annuity and pension’.

## RAVISHMENT (1436):

William Pulle ... to yentent to exclude hir of hir suyte and lawefull remedie of  
ye said *Ravyschement*, hir emprisoned

RParl. 4. 498/a, *MED*

‘William Poole ... with the intention of excluding her from her lawsuit and the  
lawful compensation for the aforesaid act of abduction, imprisoned her’.

## REMEVEMENT (1437):

The said Thomas Stamford may abide and remayne still in the said prison of

Flete ... withoute eny *remevement* to be hadde of him into the seid prison called the Kyngges Benche

Parl. 4. 510/a, *MED*

‘The said Thomas Stamford may stay and remain still in the said prison of the Fleet ... without any removing of him into the said prison called the King’s Bench’.

#### EMPLOIEMENT (1437):

... to bye and employe ... and to bringe trewe and auctentique Certification ... of his said bying and *employment*

RParl. 4. 508/b, *MED*

‘... to buy and invest ... and to bring true and authentic certification ... of his said buying and investing’.

#### EMPOVERISHMENT (1440):

This maner of contynuanse of the werre is but a longoure of thair *empouerissement* and final destruccion

Wars France in RS 22.2, 456, *MED*

‘This manner of continuing the war is just a prolongation of their ruining and ultimate destruction’.

#### AJORNEMENT (1444):

Youre Parlement ... by divers prorogations and *adjornaments* unto the xxi day of Januar’ ... contynued ...

RParl. 5. 112/a, *MED*

‘Your Parliament ... by means of several acts of prorogation and adjournment until the 21st of January ... continued ...’

#### RECETTEMENT (1449):

Such takyng or takynges, *recettements*, abettementses, or reteignements ... should be adjugged grete Treson

R Parl. 5. 151a, *MED*

‘Such robbery or robberies, harbouring of criminals, abetting or holding [unlawfully] ... should be regarded as high treason’.

#### EXPLOIEMENT, (1450):

To the weele of him, this his Roiaulme, and good *exploiment* of the same graunte

RParl. 5. 174a, *MED*

‘For the benefit of himself, [and of] this his kingdom, and for the good deploying of this same grant’.

## TRESPASSEMENT (c1475[?c1451]):

... from the second yere of his reigne in to the day of his *trespasement*  
 Bk. Noblesse 41, *MED*  
 ‘... from the second year of his reign up to the day of his dying’.

## VITAILLEMENT (1453):

... payment to be had for wages and *vitaillement* of the soudeours, etc. ...  
 RParl. 5. 235/b, *MED*  
 ‘... payment to be had for wages and victualling the soldiers, etc. ...’

## AMENTISSMENT (a1500[a1455]):

Without suffering any other persone there to hunte or have ... other  
 disporte, in distroing or *amentissment* [diminishing] of the game  
 Let. Marg. Anjou in Camd.86 91, *MED*  
 ‘Without allowing any other person there to hunt or have ... other sport,  
 in destroying or diminishing the game’.

## RESIGNEMENT (1543[1464]):

His title he sought By *resignement* and renunciacion  
 Hardyng Chron. B.2 p.29, *MED*  
 ‘He sought his title by resigning and renouncing’.

## USURPEMENT (1543[1464]):

The kynge saide at hys deathe ... nought of repentaunce of *vsurpement* of the  
 realme  
 Hardyng Chron. B p. 369, *MED*  
 ‘The king said nothing at his death about repentance of usurping the  
 kingdom’.

## FAILMENT (1470):

To aide and assiste us to thentent aforesaid without *failment*  
 Stonor 1. 116, *MED*  
 ‘To aid and assist us in the aforesaid intention without failing’.

## ARRESTEMENT (1474):

*Arreistementes* be Crowners or Serjandes ...  
 Act 7 Jas iii (1597) 2, *MED*  
 ‘Acts of arrest by coroners and sergeants ...’

BREVEMENT ‘accounting’ (c1475) first appears in the same context in

both singular and plural. The plural is ambiguous between action and result:

All other officers that must be at the *brevement* have their breakfast together in the Compting-house, after the *brevements* be made

Ordin. Househ. Edw. IV 39, *MED*

‘All other officers who have to take part in the accounting have their breakfast together in the office, after the accounts are completed’.

#### DEPARTEMENT (a1500):

O gude Jhesu, gif vs so wirshippe this sacrament

Yat we come to þi joys with out *departement*

Mirror Salv. p. 63, *MED*

‘O good Jesus, let us so worship thy sacrament that we come to thy joys without parting from them’.

#### RETEINEMENT ‘holding’ (?a1425), ATTOURNEMENT

‘acknowledgement of service to landlord’ (1426), AMORTISEMENT ‘alienation

of property in mortmain’ (1439), ARREINEMENT (1444) and ACROCHEMENT

‘encroachment’ (c1448) are legal terms which are first recorded in specific contexts.

#### RETEINEMENT (?a1425):

... places of the *retenement* of the duke of Lancastre

Higd. (2)Ctn. 436, *MED*

‘... places for retaining by the Duke of Lancaster’.

#### ATTOURNEMENT (1426):

John and Anne shall haue liuere of þe seide londes and tenements and *attournement* of þe tenantz, whoos *attournement* beth nedefull onely in þe fourme aboueseide

Doc. In Collect. Topogr. 4, 250, *MED*

‘John and Anne shall have possession of the said lands and holdings and acknowledgement of service from the tenants, whose acknowledging is only necessary in the abovesaid form’.

#### AMORTISEMENT (1439):

... the costes and expensis of this *amortisement*

Papers Trevelyan in Camd. 67 20, *MED*

‘... the costs and expenses of alienating this property in mortmain’.

#### ARREINEMENT (1444):

... that ... a speciall Commission be made to the chief Justice ... to procede of *areignement* of the seide John

RParl. 5 112a, *MED*



‘... That a special commission should be made to the Chief Justice ... to proceed in the calling of the said John to answer the formal charge’.

ACROCHEMENT (c1448):

The said fynes of xxvii li affixed upon the said meir and comonalte and upon other persones for the said *acrochment*

Rec. Norwich 1.344, *MED*

‘The said fines of twenty-seven pounds affixed upon the said mayor and commonalty and upon other persons for the said encroaching [on someone else’s land]’.

#### 3.4.8.8. *Summary*

The 15th century shows a marked change of profile in the semantics of analysable nouns. Of 22 unanalysable neologisms the largest group is of eight instrumental nouns, five of them concrete and formed on Latin. Of the 79 new analysables, however, almost half (39) fall into the action category, and just over three quarters of these (30) first occur in the context of a specific instance. It is notable that more than half of these latter are to be found in official or administrative documents such as the *Rolls of Parliament*.

#### 3.4.9. *Conclusions*

Across the total sample, the majority of words in *-ment* have their first attributions in administrative texts (see Appendix 2).

It will have been seen that instrumental and verbal action meanings are prominent for nominalisations in this suffix. This agrees with Kastovsky's analysis (Kastovsky, 1985: 226). Abstract state and quality meanings also appear, the former being more common than the latter. State may be seen as an extension of result (Kastovsky's ‘factitive case’), while quality is partly dependent on the implications of the base, as in GOVERNEMENT and MISGOVERNEMENT, or the de-adjectival ACUEMENT.

It has been said that word meanings in general typically drift from concrete to abstract (Riddle 1985: 451). Conversely, however, Zbierska-Sawala remarks on the ‘unpredictable concretization’ of derived nouns across semantic categories, whereby a noun expressing a state or quality may come to mean the bearer of the property rather than the property itself (see Dokuli, 1979: 63) and an action noun can signify a place or tool connected with the action (Zbierska-Sawala, 1992: 21). Many of the unanalysable and some of the analysable nouns with instrumental sense in the sample for *-ment* are concrete nouns. Some are borrowings with primary concrete senses, such as *ARRAIMENT* ‘means of adorning’, where ‘means of adorning’ means ‘clothes’. Some nouns in the action group, such as *JUGEMENT*, can also be used in non-concrete instrumental and resultative senses such as ‘trial’ and ‘sentence’.

For Dalton-Puffer, instrument and result are the primary meanings for nouns in *-ment*. (1996: 108). However, it seems that for her instrumentals can only be concrete, as in *OURNEMENT*; some of her ‘result’ nouns would have been classified by me as abstract instrumentals (for example *COMMANDEMENT*, ‘utterance by which one commands’, rather than ‘result of commanding’). She also apparently feels that ‘proper lexicalisations’, such as *PARLEMENT* and *SACREMENT*, fall outside such semantic categories. I do not share this view, though of course the categories I assign to them may depend on opaque derivations rather than conscious use.

Pattison tells us that ‘the means or effect of verbal action’ was the primary semantic area of Latin nouns in *-mentum*, but accounted for only one-third of Spanish nouns in *-miento* (Pattison, 1975: 52ff; see 3.4.). However, more than half the unanalysable ME nouns in my sample (30 out of 56) are first recorded with instrumental meanings. Only nine first carry possible resultative meanings, of which one, *EMPRISONMENT*, could conceivably be read in context as an instance of action.

Of the 17 remaining unanalysable nouns, 12 first signify the act or fact of V-ing, of which nine were first used in a context of specific instance. One of these, *TORNEMENT*, has an ‘occasion’ sense, which I suggested above might be regarded as an extension of instance (see 3.4.3.5.).

The sample of 210 words in *-ment* has almost three times as many analysable forms (154) as unanalysable (56). Among analysable nouns, instrumental meanings outnumber resultative, and are themselves outnumbered in every period by those signifying action. Not counting ambiguous *AMENDEMENT*, there are overall 22 analysable result meanings, 46 instrumentals, and 72 denoting aspects of action. Of the action meanings, 50 first occurred in contexts of specific instance, outnumbering instrumentals, and clearly a much higher proportion than that for unanalysable borrowings. Of these 50, more than half were first recorded in the 15th century, where new analysable nouns outnumber new unanalysable nouns by more than five to one, and the suffix may be considered to have become productive.

Allowing for the smallness of the sample, the figures and timing nonetheless suggest that instrumentality can be seen as the original primary meaning of ME borrowings, and ‘specific instance of action’ the emergent primary meaning of analysable nouns in *-ment*.

## Notes

1. See Jespersen on *-age* (1942); see also the frequent use of *-ance* in rhyming positions in Chaucer, and the scanning of a line such as ‘And eke of othere ornamentes alle’ (Clerk of Oxford's Tale, B258).

2. Zbierska-Sawala (1992: 36) has remarked that the plural may also be a specifier in other categories, such as Result. See my discussion of *BREVEMENT* in 3.4.8.7. above

3. Note that where specific action is expressed in the plural, the gerund cannot always be acceptably substituted in modern English.
4. See Rothwell 1992: 9-10, quoted in my Chapter 2, for the development of the original French and AN meanings in *arraai* and *apparail*.

## THE SUFFIX *-ance/-ence* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

### 4.1. History and Morphology

#### 4.1.1. *History*

This suffix, usually spelt *-aunce* in ME, comes via OF and AN *-ance/-ence*, deriving from the Latin endings *-antia* and *-entia*, which form nouns from the present participles of verbs. The initial vowels of the Latin endings reflect those of the Latin verb stem, and are reflected in the French spellings *-ance* and *-ence*. According to Marchand, French *-ance* became generalised at the expense of *-ence* during the ninth and tenth centuries. This bias is reflected in English borrowings and derivations during the medieval period, but after 1500 the English spelling came to be distinguished more systematically according to the Latin conjugational origins (1969: 248, 4.8.1.). Marchand suggests that nouns in *-ance/-ence* lacking simplex verbs in English sometimes come to be ‘derivationally connected’ with adjectives in *-ant/-ent*, and acquire meanings related to the adjective (1969: 249, 4.8.3.). However, as far as actual derivation is concerned, in my sample 36 out of 58 related adjectives were first recorded considerably later than the noun. Variants in *-ancy/-ency* also in general appear later than nouns in *-ance/-ence*, and are considered by Marchand to embody a semantic distinction from them.

In the literature on English word formation, ME *-ance/-ence* seems to be generally treated as one suffix (see Dalton-Puffer, 1996: 102, and Szymanek, 1988). For semantic purposes this seems adequate, though there are morphological differences between the variants.

#### 4.1.2. *Morphological types*

The majority of nouns in *-ance/-ence* derive from Romance bases. In my sample I have distinguished the following three derivational types:

##### 4.1.2.1. *Type 1*

This type, e.g. CONSCIENCE, ARROGAUNCE, is borrowed via French from Latin and does not incorporate a French or English stem. The derivational base may be a verb or an adjective. As in Type 1 of *-ment*, a different word formation rule applies to opaque forms, where the adjectival suffix *-al* may be added to the noun (e.g. *reverential*; cf *experimental*). Here this seems to apply as a general rule only to words in *-ence* (cf *\*arrogantial*), in which the majority of Type 1 nouns in the sample are formed.

##### 4.1.2.2. *Type 2*

This type, e.g. SUFFERAUNCE, is borrowed from French or formed on a ME verb base.

##### 4.1.2.3. *Type 3*

Formed on a native English base, this type, e.g. UTTERAUNCE, is rare in ME. There are only five more examples in my data. Marchand quotes several formed after 1500, e.g. RIDDANCE (1535), FORBIDDANCE (1608), ABIDANCE (1647) (Marchand 1969: 248, 4.8.2.).

#### 4.1.3. *Co-occurrences*

In common with all five suffixes under investigation here, *-ance/ence* is found on stems with the prefixes *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n m)-*, *re-*, *dis-* and *pre-*. It also appears with *per-*, *in-*, *pro-*, *e(x)-*, *e(n'm)-*, and the native prefix *mis-*.

#### 4.1.4. *Transparency*

Dalton-Puffer points out that ME *-aunce*, like *-acioun (-ation)*, forms words on stems, not bases, in that the initial vowel of the suffix elides with the final vowel of the base. She finds the morphosyntactic transparency of the suffix to be ‘far from uniform’, only one third of her sample being ‘ideally transparent’ and the rest distributed over several different thresholds on the scale of transparency she takes from Dressler (Dalton-Puffer, 1996:110 ff). In my sample, her ‘ideally transparent’ intrinsic allophonic PR (phonological rule) of stem+ affix occurs in nouns with both V-final and C-final stems, examples being *VARIAUNCE* and *AQUITAUNCE*. However, nouns in *-ance/-ence* may also observe an extrinsic allophonic rule leading to resyllabification, as in <sup>1</sup>*COMMANDAUNCE*, or a morphological rule (MR) according to which the noun stem varies from the base stem, as in *obeien/OBEISSAUNCE* (Dalton-Puffer 1992: 475ff).

## 4.2. Phonology

### 4.2.1. *Stress*

In ME there was probably little difference in stress between Type 1, where the suffix is attached at stem level, and Type 2, where it is attached at word level. As in modF, the suffix seems to have borne a strong secondary stress in both, the evidence being its frequent appearance in rhyming positions in ME verse (Jespersen, 1948: 96 ). Type 1, however, like its equivalent in *-ment*, has since been subject to trisyllabic laxing, in which the stress has shifted to the antepenultimate syllable (usually the first, as in <sup>1</sup>*REVERENCE*).

### 4.2.2. *Phonetics*

The suffix is attached directly to both V- and C-final stems. Stem-final /f/ and

/ks/ do not appear in the sample. CC-final bases appear, as in *acquaint+ance*, *resist+ence*. Stem-final *-er* generally loses the <e>, as in *remembraunce*, *entraunce* (*perseveraunce* is an exception). Among V-final stems, the suffix is not attached to /ɔ:/ or (for obvious reasons) /a/, but all others occur, as do the diphthongs /u/ and /ei/. The commonest stem-final consonants are /t/ and /r/, and the commonest vowel is /i/.

### 4.3. Integration

#### 4.3.1. Productivity

Dalton-Puffer (1996: 102) remarks that 87% of all her data on *-ance* appears between 1350 and 1420. This is mostly later than Kibbee's (1991) peak period for the use and influence of Anglo-Norman in England; however, Merk (1970: 198) notes that the suffix was favoured locally in Picardy, where England had business contacts throughout this later period (see also Kibbee, 1991: 34, 56). My own sample is almost equally divided between the 14th and 15th centuries, with a slight majority (77 out of 210) appearing after 1420; however, my sample also shows a solid intake of earlier borrowing, with 38 unanalysable items appearing before 1350. Dalton-Puffer remarks on the high frequency of types in this suffix, which, after *-ung* and *-ness*, scores with other Romance suffixes above many OE suffixes in the ME period (1993: 186). She believes, however, that a 'less than ideally transparent' suffix such as *-ance/-ence* has little chance of becoming productive (1996:110).

Marchand, on the other hand, states that 'The suffix quickly gained a footing in English' (1969:248, 4.8.2), and quotes the 15th century native coinages *UTTERANCE* and *FURTHERANCE* as evidence of productivity. As with other Romance suffixes, Dalton-Puffer's data includes no native coinages, and she also doubts intra-Romance productivity, although elsewhere she notes with Bybee that frequency 'certainly has an impact' on productivity (Dalton-Puffer, 1996:225; Bybee



1985: 134; see also 1.2.1.). She mentions DALIAUNCE as a Romance formation recorded in ME only, with the usual necessary proviso that the absence of attestation does not prove that there was no French counterpart (1993:198, 4.3).

My sample suggests that the suffix established its presence in the language very early with unanalysable borrowings from AN: the sample includes 23 between 1150 and 1300. After this early start it seems likely that conditions for intra-Romance productivity were in place in the 14th century, when the incidence of borrowing was still high, but overtaken by that of analysable neologisms. My sample includes five Romance-based nouns from the 14th century for which there are apparently no recorded French counterparts. CONTEMPLAUNCE (c1395), a variant of the more usual and much earlier CONTEMPLACIOUN (c1230[a1200], from OF and ML), was coined by Chaucer for a rhyme with GOVERNAUNCE. MAGNIFIENCE (c1384), formed on the verb *magnifien* (a1382), is a variant on the earlier borrowing MAGNIFICENCE (1340), and SIGNIFICAUNCE (a1400) is an alternative to SIGNIFICACIOUN (a1400[a1325]). DISTROUBLAUNCE ‘disturbance’ (1398), an alternative to the earlier DESTOURBAUNCE (a1325[c1280]), was formed according to the *MED* on an ME Romance-based verb *distroublen* (a1400[c1303]), while OBEIAUNCE (c1450[?a1400]) is an anglicised variant of OBEISSAUNCE (a1382). These were followed by 23 possible coinages in the 15th century, examples including ALLEVIAUNCE (1451), a variant of ALLEVIACIOUN (a1425; modelled on ML *alleviatio* by the medical writer Chauliac),<sup>1</sup> PREFIGURAUNCE (a1500), an alternative to PREFIGURACIOUN (a1382, also modelled on ML), and ASPIAUNCE (c1475[c1445]), a later alternative to ESPIAILLE (c1390) from the ME verb *aspien* ‘to spy’, borrowed from French. PROUISSAUNCE (c1440) is thought to be a portmanteau word combining *prouesse* (c1300[?c1225]) and PUISSAUNCE

(a1450[c1410]). ME origins are also suggested tentatively in the *MED* for DALIAUNCE (a1349), AMOUNTAUNCE (c1380) and PARFOURMAUNCE (1494). However, DALIAUNCE has been discovered by Rothwell in an Anglo-Norman (AN) text, though he does not give its date (Rothwell, 1992:15-16), and AMOUNTAUNCE is listed (also undated) in the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (*AND*).

Marchand states that ‘As early as the 15th century we find derivatives from native verbs, such as **utterance** 1436’ (1969: 248, 4.8.2.). My sample includes this and five others: SONDERAUNCE (1435), FURTHERAUNCE (a1500[c1435]), HINDRAUNCE (a1500[1436]), FORYEVENAUNCE (c1475) and STOPPAUNCE (1493).

Including several of the Romance formations mentioned above, my sample contains 34 later or simultaneous alternatives in *-ance* to nouns on the same bases with other suffixes. 23 of these are analysable, excluding five pairs where the relative dates are doubtful. (See Appendix 1, Table 54).

#### 4.3.2. *Analysability*

Analysable and unanalysable nouns are less unevenly divided in the sample for *-ance -ence* than in that for *-ment*, the totals for *-ance* being respectively 124 and 86. Here again my sample differs from that of Dalton-Puffer, who finds unanalysable nouns outweighed by analysables in all periods (1996: 103). However, not only is her periodisation slightly different from mine, but so is her working definition of analysability, which only requires a related verb to have existed at some time in ME (see 1.2.2.). Even so, she comments that the suffix had ‘a fair chance of becoming productive due to the high rate of items derived from *bases that are also independent lexemes in the language*’ (1996:103) [my italics]. ‘Derived from’ implies Pattison's

(1975) chronological analysability, according to which the noun must follow an earlier verb. Using this criterion, my sample shows only 10 analysable items recorded before 1300 (three of them of doubtful dating), compared with 24 unanalysable. Rothwell comments on the prevalence of *-aunce* in AN: ‘the substantival ending *-aunce* is usually one of the more obvious indicators of an Anglo-French, not continental, origin’ (1992:13); although most of the early borrowings also have counterparts in OF. The 14th century nouns PLESAUNCE and DISPLESAUNCE are a good example of the hazards of relying on dating: the negative is actually recorded a year before its ME base (so is probably a borrowing), but PLESAUNCE appears in the same year as an adjective *plesaunt*, from which it could therefore in theory derive. This makes it potentially analysable (with a query), though the dating of DISPLESAUNCE would suggest that PLESAUNCE also is a borrowing. However, neither dates may record genuine first appearances.

Once under way, the pattern of analysability looks similar to that of *-ment*; *-ance*, however, unlike *-ment*, takes off from a substantial base of earlier borrowings. This earlier familiarity may account for the higher proportion of possible ME derivatives in the sample: among Romance-based analysable nouns, six in the 14th century and 23 in the 15th have no attested French counterparts (see 4.3.1. above). This excludes two in the 14th century whose counterparts in AN are thought actually to derive from ME.

Unlike *-ment*, *-ance* in the 15th century has more neologisms overall than in the 14th, and almost twice as many are analysable as unanalysable.

#### 4.3.3. *The sample in -ance/-ence*

In Table 2 there follows a complete list of the sample of 210 ME nouns in *-ance*, together with forms on the same stem. As with *-ment*, forms later than the nouns

are given in square brackets. Where double dates are given, the first indicates the date of the MS and the second the putative date of the original text. An asterisk indicates doubtful analysability status, due to dating uncertain within a margin of 25 years on either side of both noun and simplex form.

**Table 2: NOUNS IN *-ance/ence* IN 3 ME PERIODS WITH FORMS ON THE SAME STEM**

**The early period (1150-1300)**

*Unanalysable borrowings of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1225(?a1200) penitence		[1341 A penitent] [c1350(c1370) N penitent] [a1500 N penitencie] [?a1425(c1380) A ignoraunt]
c1230(?a1200) ignoraunce conscience patience		[c1350 A pacient] a1425(c1385) N pacient [ a1250 N pite] [?a1475(?a1425) A preeminent]
	[a1475 V pitien]	
a1250	[a1500(c1340) V despeiren]	[(a1460) A desperaunt] [c1450(c1370) N desperacioun] [1470 A observaunt (pl.as N)] [(a1382) N observacioun] [1567 N observancy ]
	[c1390 V observen]	
c1300(c1250) contenaunce	[c1330(a1300)V conteinen] [1486 V contenauncen]	c1230(?a1200) N contencement
a1325(c1280) penaunce reverence bobaunce	[a1425(?c1375)V reverencen]	[?a1425(c1380)A reverent]
1297	[c1330(?c1300) V allien]	
c1330(?a1300) allegeaunce substaunce remembraunce ordinaunce sustenaunce	[c1390(?c1350) V allegen] [?a1400(a1338) V remembren] [c1300 V ordeinen] [a1325(c1380)}V sustenen]	[a1425(?a1400) N allegement] [a1425 N ordeinement] [a1500(1413) N sustenal]
c1400(?a1300) appurtenaunce demurraunce	[a1325 V pertenen]	[c1450(c1370) A appartenaunt]

*Analysable nouns of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200)obedience* inobedience	[a1325 V obeien]	c1230(a1200)A obedient [c1330 A inobedient] ?a1475(?a1425) N inobediencie
c1230 c1275	c1230(?a1200)V aqueinten c1275 V signifien	[a1400(a1325) N significac'n] [a1400 N significaunce]

a1325(c1280) destourbaunce	c1230(?a1200) V destourben	
1330(a1300) encombraunce	c1275 V acombren	c1330(?a1300) Nencombremment
	[a1400(a1338) V encombren]	1290 N encombre
c1330(a1300) defence	c1250 V defensen	
c1400(?a1300) sufferaunce	c1230(?a1200) V sufferen	
grevauunce	c1230(?a1200) V greven	
defiaunce*	c1330(?a1300) V defien	
	[?a1425(c1380)V appertenen]	

### The 14th century

#### *Unanalysable borrowings of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300	violence		[a1382 A violent]
	suraunce	[c1400(a1376) V seuren]	
c1330(?c1300) creaunce			
a1400(c1303) arrougaunce			[c1390 A arrougaunt]
	pestilence		[(a1398) A pestilent]
	olipraunce		
a1325	reconisaunce		
?a1400(a1338) retenaunce	[?a1475(a1396) V reteinen]	[c1475(1392) N retencioun]	[?a1475(?a1425) N reteinement]
1340	abstinence*	[c1390(?c1350) V absteinen]	[c1390 A abstinent]
	prudence		[a1500(a1450) N prudencie]
	perseveraunce	[a1425(c1385)V perseveren]	[a1500(?a1400)A perseveraunt]
	magnificence	[a1382 V magnifien]	[(a1415) N perseveracioun]
			[c1384 N magnificence]
			[?a1425 N magnificacioun]
c1440(a1349) displesaunce	[c1400(c1378) V displesen]		[(1427) N displesir]
a1425(?a1350) science			
c1390(c1350) resistence	[?a1425(c1380) V resisten]		[c1450(1410) A resistant]
	audience	[(1457) V auditen]	
(1355)	relisaunce		
c1450(1369) eloquence			[(a1393) A eloquent]
(c1375) accustomaunce	[a1500(1422) V accustomen]		
c1400(a1376) sapience			[(1468) A sapient]
(c1378) evidence			[(a1382) A evident]
?a1425(c1380) prescience			[a1626 A prescient]
			[1572 N presciency]
c1450(c1380) experience			a1450(?1348) N experiment
	providence	[c1450(?c1408) V providen]	
	advertence	[c1450(?c1408) V adverten]	
a1500(c1380) outraunce*	[c1450(?a1400) V outren]		
(c1384) incontineuce			[c1390 A incontinent]
			[(?a1425) N incontineuce]
(1390)	surveiaunce	[c1400 V surveien]	
(c1393) accidence			[(?a1425) A accident]
			1450(c1380) N accident
(c1395) contempraunce	[c1450 V contemplen]		c1230(?a1200) N contemplacion
	inconstaunce		[(1402) A inconstaunt]
(a1398) convenienc			
c1475(c1399) alligeaunce			
a1400 emineuce			[c1425, A eminent]
a1425(a1400) frequence			[c1450 A frequent]

*Analysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300	honoraunce	c1300(c1250) V honouren	c1225(?a1200) N honour
c1325(c1300)	vengeaunce*	c1330(?a1300) V vengen	[?a1400(a1338) N vengement]
	purveiaunce*	c1330(?a1300) V purveien	[a1500(1422) A purveiaunt]
c1300	repentaunce*	c1400(?a1300) V repenten	c1230 A repentaunt [a1450(a1338) N repentaille]
	deliveraunce	c1230(?a1200) V deliveren	
a1400(c1303)	acordaunce	1120 V acorden	[1333 A acordaunt] c1400(?a1300) N acordement
	affiance*	c1400(?a1300) V affien	
a1400(a1325)	coveraunce	c1325(?c1250) V coveren	
	restoraunce	c1325(c1300) V restoren	
c1330	presence	c1400(?a1300)V presenten	c1330(?a1300) A present a1400(c1303) N presentement [?c1430(?1383)N presentac'n] [?c1500 N maintement]
(a1333)	maintenaunce	c1330(?c1300) V maintenen	[?c1500 N maintement]
?a1400 (a1338)	aquitaunce	1230 V aquiten	[(1430) N aquitaille] [1431 N aquitement]
	quite-clamaunce	c1330(?c1300) V clamen	(a1325) N claim
	deceivaunce	a1400(c1303) V deceiven	
(1340)	aboundance	c1325 V abunden	[?a1425(c1380) A abundant]
	temperaunce	a1225(c1200) V tempren	[(c1384) A temperaunt] [a1398 N temperament]
	diligence*	[(1418) V diligencen]	(1340) A diligent
	innocence*		1340 A innocent a1225(c1200) N innocent [c1390(?a1350) N innocencie] [c1475 N daliacyon]
a1425(a1349)	daliaunce	c1330(?a1300) V dalien	[?a1425(c1380)N continuacioun]
	continuaunce	a1425(c1340) V continuen	c1350 A plesaunt(?c1350)
c1350	plesaunce*		c1400(a1349) A excellent
c1390(c1350)	excellence*		[?1425(c1380) N gouvernement]
c1450(c1370)	governaunce	c1375(?c1280) V governen	
(c1375)	misgovernaunce		
c1400(?c1378)	allouance	a1400(a1325) V allouen	[1447/8 N allocacion]
c1378	absence	c1450(c1370)V absenten]	[c1385 A absent] [1600 N absentement] [1800 N absentation]
c1380	usance	1240 V usen	c1380 A usaunt c1230(?a1200) N use c1330(?a1300) N usage [1556 N usation]
	amountance	c1275 V amounten	?a1400(a1338) N amountment
?a1425(c1380)	attendaunce	c1330(?c1300) V attenden	(a1398) 1374 N attention a1398 A attendaunt [1457 N attendement]
	suffisaunce	a1325 V suffien	
c1450(c1380)	renovelaunce	c1350(a1333) V renovelen	
	aparaunce	c1275 V apperen	
(a1382)	obeissaunce	a1325 V obeien	c1325(c1300) A obeisaunt
	inobeishaunce	a1325 V obeien	(a1382) A inobeishaunt
	offence	?a1450(c1250-75)V offenden	
c1384	magnifience	a1382 V magnifien	[(a1460) A magnificent] (1340) N magnifience [?a1425 N magnificacioun]
a1425(c1385)	assuraunce	(c1375) V assuren	

1532rev(c1385)	heritaunce	c1400(?a1300) V heriten	c1225(?c1200) N heritage [1472/3 N heritement]
	vailaunce		a1325 A vailaunt
a1425(c1385) (a1387)	variaunce concordaunce	c1390(?c1350) V varien a1425(c1385) V concorden	1532rev(c1325)A variaunt [1477 A concordaut]
c1390 (c1390) (a1393)	anoiance insolence* entendaunce	c1275 V anoien  c1290 V entenden	a1400(a1325) N concorde [a1500 N anoiment ] c1390 A insolent c1330 A entendaunt c1450(c1380) N entendement (a1390) A resemblaunt c1330(?a1300) A miscreaunt ?c1430(?1383) N miscreaunt
	resemblaunce miscreaunce	(1340) V resemblen	
(a1398)	discontinuaunce	a1425(c1340) V continuen (a1398) V discontinuen	
(1398) 1399 a1400 c1450 (?a1400)	distroublance affermaunce significaunce obeiaunce signance	a1400(c1303) V distroublen c1400(?a1300) V affermen c1275 V signifier a1325 V obeien a1225(?OE) V signen	a1400(a1325) N significacioun  c1230(?a1200)N signe c1450(c1380) N signal

### The 15th century

#### *Unanalysable borrowings of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
?c1400 (1405) (1407)	inspiraunce tresauce covenaunce		a1400(c1303) N inspiracioun
c1430(a1410) a1450(c1410) (?c1412)	jactaunce puissaunce benevolence insipience		[a1475(1450) A puissaunt] [(c1443) A benevolent] [?1457) A insipient]
a1500(1413) (a1420) c1425(a1420) a1500(1422) 1424	pardonauce demonstraunce toleraunce voillaunce assistance/ance	[1426 V assisten]	?a1425(c1380) N demonstrac'n  [1433 A/N assistent] [1642 N assistency]
a1500(?c1425) (1428) (?1439)	trepidaunce defesaunce adolescence*		[?1440 A adolescent] (a1398) N adolescence
c1460(a1449) (c1449) a1450 c1450 (a1460)	humiliaunce unperseveraunce tribulaunce obliaunce adjuvance artilaunce navigaunce		
1543(1464)	deficiencie		[1581 A deficient] [1634 N deficiency]
a1475	congaudence lachaunce		
1480 a1500	memorance intoleraunce combustaunce		(a1382) N memorial

*Analysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1400	unrepentaunce	c1400(?a1300) V repenten	c1230 A repentaunt c1300 N repentaunce a1450(a1338) N repentaille c1475(1392) A inconvenient [c1410 N inconvenient] [(1429) N inconveniencie]
c1460(?c1400)	inconvenience*		
c1450(c1400)	vauntaunce	a1400(c1303) V avaunten a1425 V vaunten	
c1375(?c1400)	allegaunce	c1300 V alleggen	[?a1475(?a1425)N allegacioun]
c1450(?a1405)	perturbaunce	(c1385) V perturben	
c1450(1410)	contrariaunce	a1500(c1340) V contrarien	
a1450(c1410)	verifiaunce	(a1387) V verifien	
	tariaunce	a1400(?a1325) V tarien	
(1414)	dependaunce	c1425(a1420) V dependen	(a1398) A dependaunt [(1425) N dependaunt]
c1450(?a1422)	repugnaunce	?a1425(c1380) V repugnen	
(1422)	esperaunce		a1450(a1338) N espeir
a1500(1422)	severaunce	a1400(?c1300) V severen	
a1425	avoidaunce	?a1475(1373) V avoiden	
	untemperaunce	a1225(c1200) V temperen	(c1384) A temperaunt a1398 N temperament (a1398) A concurrent [1593 N achievement] (1389) N afferaunt [a1500(?c1450) A afferaunt]
?a1475(?a1425)	concurrence		
c1430	achevisaunce	c1300 V acheven	
(1433)	afference	a1250 afferen	
(1435)	sonderaunce	c1230(?a1200/OE) V sonderen	
a1500(c1435)	furtheraunce	a1300(?a1150/OE) V furtheren	
1436	utteraunce	?a1400 V utteren	
a1500(1436)	hindraunce	a1225(?a1200/OE) V hindren	
c1436	disacordaunce	1532rev.(c1385) V disacorden	
(?1440)	consideraunce	?a1325(c1380) V consideren	
	fecundaunce	[c1460(a1449) V fecunden]	a1456(c1425) A fecound
c1440	prouissaunce		c1300(?c1225) N prouesse a1450(c1410) N pouissaunce [?a1475 A duraunt]
c1443	duraunce	c1325 V duren	
c1425(c1445)	aspiaunce	a1250 V asprien	
c1460(a1449)	laudaunce	c1400(c1378) V lauden	
(1449)	exorbitaunce		(1437) A exorbitant
(c1449)	unconstaunce		a1500(?c1425) A unconstant
a1450	abaisshaunce	a1400(c1303) V abaisshen	1435 N abaishment
	sportaunce	c1450(c1380) V disporten c1540(?a1400) V sporten	
(1450)	adherence*		(1425 A adherent
c1450	sojournaunce	c1330(?a1300) V sojournen	
	queraunce	c1390(c1350) V queren	
1451	alleviaunce	?a1475(?a1425)V alleviaten	?a1425 N alleviacioun
1452	commandaunce	c1330(?a1300) V commanden	c1275 N commandement a1400 N commande (1443) N preferrement (1394) N reversion ?a1425 N reversacioun [1488 N reversall]
(1456)	preferraunce	(a1393) V preferren	
?1457	revertence	?a1300 V reverten	
(a1460)	frequentiaunce		c1450 A frequent a1425(a1400) N frequence



	moderaunce	(1429) V moderen	
	ministraunce	?a1400(a1338) V ministren	
	prosperaunce	c1350 V prosperen	
	resonaunce	?a1425(c1380) V resounen	(a1460) N resoun
	favouraunce	c1450(c1350) V favouren	c1400(?a1300) N favour
	militaunce		a1500(1413) A militaunt
	principaunce*		(a1460) A principaunt
1543(1464)	misusaunce	1240 V usen (a1382) V misusen	c1380 N usaunce
	mainouraunce	(c1290) V mainouren	
(1473)	entraunce	a1325(c1280) V entren	
a1475	paraunce	c1450 V paren	a1400(?c1280) N per
	aspectaunce		(c1385) N aspect
	repliaunce	(a1382) V replien	
?a1475	socouraunce	c1275 V socouren	
c1475	fastaunce	c1400(?a1300) V festen	c1230(?a1200) N feste
	foryevenaunce	c1175(?OE) V foryeven	
1483	jouissance	1260 V joyen	
1493	stoppance	c1000 (OE) V stoppen	c1400 N stoppal 1465 n stoppage
1494	enduraunce	c1380 V enduren	
	parfourmaunce	a1450(a1338) V performen	
a1500	recreance	c1425 V recreaten	(a1393) N recreacioun
a1500	prefiguraunce	a1500(?a1425) V prefiguren	(a1382) N prefiguracioun
	immoderaunce	(1429) V moderen	(a1460) N moderaunce

#### 4.4. Semantics

Marchand points out that ‘Derivations in *-ance/-ence* are learned words, many of them legal terms, and almost all verbs are of Romance origin’ (Marchand 1969: 249, 4.8.4.). In Marchand’s view, *-ance/-ence* in ModE is restricted to senses of ‘act’ and ‘action’, while the co-existence of *-ance/-ence* (derived from verbs) with *-ancy/-ency* (derived from adjectives in *-ant/-ent*) implies a ‘contrast of action and quality or property’ (1969: 249-50, 4.8.3). Szymanek queries this derivational distinction, giving counter-examples (e.g. A *fragrant* > N *fragrance* but V *tend* > N *tendency*), and remarking that it is not always possible to determine whether the derivation is from the adjective or the noun (1988: 63, 1.6.1.). He finds ‘considerable overlapping’ between the derivations of *ance/-ence* and *-ancy/-ency*, and goes on to suggest that ‘what is true about the morphological types must also be true about the [semantic] categories these types are said to represent. We conclude that the English categories of NA [Nomina

Actionis] and NE [Nomina Essendi] display considerable fuzziness' (Szymanek, 1988: 66). The relation between *-ance/-ence* and *-ancy/-ency* will be discussed further in 4.4.8.

#### 4.4.1. *Multiple meanings and ambiguities: Result/state*

I shall, as for *-ment*, use the case analysis of Kastovsky (1985) as a starting point for my own treatment. In his classification, *-ance -ence* in modE has the dominant sense action/fact with occurrences in agentive, factitive (result) and locative senses. For the relation of result to state, and the various aspects of 'action', e.g. quality, fact, specific instance and occasion, see 1.3.4.2. and 1.3.4.3. respectively. The 'fuzziness' referred to by Szymanek displays itself particularly between the concepts of state and quality, both prominent in the semantics of *-ance*. I have tried to distinguish them, not in terms of historical derivation but in terms of their relation to the concept of action: that is, though either may be connected with active verbs, such states will be experiences resulting from action, whereas qualities are predispositions to act. However, problems arise when there is no verb in the paradigm, as in the case of *innocent/INNOCENCE*, where the noun may still be used in a context suggesting action. INNOCENCE (1340) appears in both kinds of context in *Ayenbite of Irwit*:

- (1) God him behat þe huyte robe of chastetee and of *innocence*  
Ayenb. 146/33 (1340), *MED*  
'God grants him the white robe of chastity and innocence';
- (2) Ðe on leme uorberþ and lokeþ an oþer þet me na ȝt him misdo..  
and ine þis we orderstondeþ [sic] þe *innocence*.  
Ayenb. 181/17 (1340), *MED*  
'The one light forbears and considers others so as not to harm them,  
and in this we understand innocence'.

In (1) both *chastetee* and INNOCENCE are probably understood as conditions or states, similar to the whiteness of the robe which symbolises them.

However, these states are also attributes, not temporary conditions, so the ‘quality’ meaning seems latent there as well. In (2), INNOCENCE appears to be defined as a quality relating to actions, comparable to ARROGAUNCE (a1400[c1303]), in the same text:

Ð e þridde boz of prude is *arrogance* þet me clepeþ opweninge oþer  
oþnimminge, þanne þe man wenþ more of him-zelue þanne he ssolde.

Ayenb. 21 (1340), *MED*

‘The third branch of pride is arrogance, which we call overweening or pretension, when a man thinks more of himself than he should.’

As noted above, not only de-adjectival nouns are concerned here, but certain uses of deverbal nouns which also express states, in this case resulting from actions. Zbierska-Sawala refers to OE nouns ‘whose semantics contain elements of both Action and ... Result’ (1992:30). I suggested in the Introduction that if the ‘action’ involved is stative or experiential the state may equally be the result of an active verb (as in REPENTAUNCE, a state resulting from having repented) as of a passive one (as in ASSURAUNCE, a state of being/having been assured). A comparison of the contexts for ASSURAUNCE ‘being assured’ and AFFIAUNCE ‘trusting’ will make clear the similarity between the concepts of states resulting from passive and active experiential verbs:

- (1) O trust! O feyth! O depe *assuraunce*,  
Who hath me reft Criseyde...?  
Chaucer, TC.5.1259 (a1425[c1385]), *MED*  
‘Oh trust! Oh faith! Oh, massive over-confidence! Who took  
Criseyde away from me...?’
- (2) Oft mayst þou fynde hyt ryght  
Ð at þou hast mete vpon þe nyght;  
But þerof to haue mochel *affyaunce*,  
Ð e may betyde þe sunner a chaunce.  
Mannyng HS 385 (a1400[c1303]), *MED*  
‘You might often find that you actually do have food in the evening,  
but a sinner would be lucky to have much confidence in that.’

The meanings in context are more or less identical.

#### 4.4.2. 1150-1300: unanalysable nouns

##### 4.4.2.1. Instrument

Out of 23 unanalysable borrowings in the early period, eight are first recorded with instrumental meanings. Examples are PITAUNCE ‘charitable donation [means of showing charity]’ (c1230[?a1200]), OBSERVAUNCE ‘religious practice [means of practising religion]’ (a1250), ALLEGEAUNCE and SUSTENAUNCE ‘[means of relief]’ and ‘means of supporting oneself’ (a1325[?a1300]). The opaque noun SENTENCE (c1230(?a1200) first occurred with the sense ‘statement of doctrine [means of teaching]’, not appearing as ‘statement of punishment’ until a century later (c1300, MED). The others, CONSCIENCE (a1225[?a1200]), REVERENCE ‘means of showing courtsey’ (c1250) (a1325[c1280]) and PENAUNCE (a1325[c1280]) are in semantic areas which easily extend to include mental states. CONSCIENCE and REVERENCE both later expressed mental states as their primary meanings, but their earliest uses are as ‘means of understanding sin’ and ‘means of expressing respect’.

##### 4.4.2.2. Agent

PREEMINENCE (c1230[?a1200]) is first used with an agentive meaning in *Ancrene Riwe*, where it appears in the plural as ‘things which stand out’:

In anlich lif he bi *zet* þreo *preminences*: privilegie of prechur, merite of martirdom, Meidenes mede

Ancr. 83/6, MED

‘In the solitary life he finds three things which stand out: the privilege of prayer, the merit of martyrdom, the mercy of the Virgin’.

SUBSTAUNCE ‘thing existing’ (a1325[?a1300]) and CIRCUMSTANCE ‘thing surrounding’ (c1230 [?a1200]) also have agentive senses. SUBSTAUNCE has an institutionalised meaning with little relation to its composition. The meaning of

CIRCUMSTANCE, however, has a clear relation to the literal translation of its components:

Abute sunne ligged six þing þat hit hulied, o latin *circumstances* ...  
 beon icleopede: Persone, Stude, Time, Manere,  
 Tale, Cause  
 \*Ancr. 866, *MED*  
 ‘Around sin lie six things which hide it, called circumstances in Latin ...  
 Person, Place, Time, Manner, Number, Cause’.

APPARTENAUNCE ‘thing belonging’ (a1325[?a1300]) also has agentive meaning.

#### 4.4.2.3. *Object*

ORDINAUNCE (a1325[?a1300]) first appeared with the objective sense ‘thing ordained’. However, it soon acquired the instrumental sense ‘decree’ (or ‘document by which X is decreed’).

#### 4.4.2.4. *Result/state*

Five unanalysable nouns entered the language in this category in the early period. The archaic form DESPERAUNCE (a1250), analagous with modE *despair*, denotes an active experiential state, as do IGNORAUNCE and SILENCE (a1225[?a1200]). PENITENCE (a1225[?a1200]) occurs at this date in both passive and active senses, in a single text which well illustrates the distinction:

##### (1) Passive

Swo ure lorde ihesu fette adam ut of helle þo þe haedde his *penitence*  
 enden  
 Trin. Hom. 61, *MED*  
 ‘So our lord Jesus brought Adam out of hell when his punishment [state of being punished] was over’.

##### (2) Active

Ða biseh ure drihte mildeliche to hire *penitence* ... hadde reuthe of hire  
 Trin. Hom. 145, *MED*  
 ‘Then our Lord looked kindly upon their repentance [state of repenting] and took pity on them’.

All are nouns of being, which were first quoted in theological contexts. ALLIAUNCE (1297) is a factitive ‘state of affairs’, the result of action, as well as a passive state of being allied.

#### 4.4.2.5. *Action: Quality*

The opaque noun PATIENCE, related to the later adjective, signifies a moral quality, first defined as such in *Ancrene Riwe* (a1225[?a1200]):

To þe utre temptatiun is neod *patience*, þet is, þolemodesse.  
Ancr. 94/19, *MED*  
‘The utmost temptation requires patience, that is, longsuffering’.

BOBAUNCE (a1325[c1280]) is a noun of uncertain origin meaning ‘ostentation’:

Al ffor *bobaunce* of þe worlde, & ffor þe loue of god nou *ȝt*  
SLg. Pass. 552, *MED*  
‘All that matters [to them] is worldly ostentation, and the love of God not at all’.

Deverbal REMEMBRAUNCE (a1325[?a1200]), more usually the instrumental ‘faculty’ or ‘means’ of remembering, first appears metaphorically transformed to the quality ‘worthiness to be remembered’:

Ðer was noble contenance  
In bataile of *remembraunce*  
Arth. & M. 5288, *MED*  
‘There was noble comportment in battle, of a quality worthy to be remembered’,

a use similar to modE ‘a person of consideration’. CONTENAUNCE (c1250) ‘bearing’ appears in this and earlier contexts suggesting a quality:

Here *cuntenaunce* and here blis  
Floris 97/516, *MED*  
‘Their [enviable] demeanour and their happiness’.

Shortly afterwards (c1330[?c1300]) it suggests the virtue of self-control:

Ðe nadder ... smot so Beues wiþ þe taile  
Dat ne *ȝ* ales þer *contenaunse*  
Bevis 1561, *MED*

‘The adder ... struck Bevis so hard with its tail that he nearly lost his composure there’.

In *Gawain* (c1440[?c1390]) it appears with the action/fact meaning ‘usual conduct’:

Ðis watz kynges *countenaunce* ...

At vch farand fest among his fre meny in halle

Gawain 100, *MED*

‘This was the way the King behaved ... at each splendid feast among his noble household in hall’.

#### 4.4.2.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

DEMURRAUNCE (c1400[?a1300]) first expresses an instance of demurring:

He wil wende ... saunz *demurraunce*

KAlex. 4116, *MED*

‘He will go ... without making any objection’.

#### 4.4.3. *1150-1300: analysable nouns*

In contrast to the influx of borrowings, the sample shows few fully analysable items at this period. One, DEFIAUNCE, has a paradigm of doubtful dating and may not be analysable. The total of nine words is spread almost equally across semantic categories.

##### 4.4.3.1. *Instrument*

DEFIAUNCE (a1275[?a1300]) first appears with the instrumental meaning ‘challenge’, and DEFENCE (c1330[?a1300]) as ‘means of defending’:

Ðai ... made swiche *defense* & slei *ȝt*

Ðat ye no may telle it ari *ȝt*

Arth. & M. 9107, *MED*

‘They ... had such means of defending themselves and deceiving [the enemy] that you couldn’t begin to describe it’.

##### 4.4.3.2. *Object*

AQUEINTAUNCE (c1230) and SIGNIFIAUNCE (c1275) have the objective meanings ‘people we know’ and ‘thing meant’.

4.4.3.3. *Result/state*

DESTOURBAUNCE (a1325[c1280]) and GREVAUNCE (c1330[?a1300]) signify passive states of disorder and distress (i.e. being disturbed and aggrieved) respectively. ENCOMBRAUNCE (1330[a1300]) is the passive state of being encumbered ('placed in difficulty'):

For sche no held hir penaunce  
 Sche was fallen in *encombraunce*  
 Arth. & M. 864, *MED*  
 'Because she did not keep to her penance she found herself placed in difficulty'.

It has since adopted an instrumental sense from ME *encumberment*. SUFFERAUNCE (c1400[?a1300]) 'suffering' is ambiguous, being an experiential state which also implies the quality of endurance:

By *suffraunce* of swich manere  
 ... *zee* maken amendement  
 K.Alex. 3188, *MED*  
 'By suffering in such a way you make amendment'.

4.4.3.4. *Action: Quality*

OBEDIENCE and INOBEDIENCE (c1230[?a1200]), relating to the adjective *obedient* of the same date, are first defined as pure qualities in *Ancrene Riwe* :

## OBEDIENCE:

Nan ancre ... ne schal makien professiun ...bute þreo þinges, þet beoþ, *obedienc*e, chastete, and stude steaþeluestnesse.  
 Ancr. 8/22, *MED*  
 'No anchoress shall be professed without three qualities, which are obedience, chastity and stout steadfastness.'

## INOBIENCE:

Vnsteaþeluest bileaue a *zein* godes loue, nis hit te spece of prude *inobedienc*e?  
 Ancr. 108/24, *MED*  
 'An unstable belief in God's teaching, is it not a kind of proud lack of obedience?'



#### 4.4.3.5. *Summary*

The majority of neologisms in *-ance* in the sample for this period are unanalysable borrowings with instrumental meanings, all on abstract bases. Most of this is moral or religious lexis which later occurs in contexts expressing mental states. With the exception of one objective and four agentive uses, the rest of the borrowings are equally divided between result/state (with a preponderance of mental states) and action (with a preponderance of moral qualities).

New analysable items are few. Only result/state and action/quality have more than two members, but one of those is shared between them.

#### 4.4.4. *The 14th century: unanalysable nouns*

There are 35 unanalysable nouns in the sample for the 14th century.

##### 4.4.4.1. *Instrument*

SURAUNCE (c1300), PESTILENCE (c1303), EVIDENCE (c1378) and OUTRAUNCE (a1500[c1380]) entered the language with the instrumental senses ‘guarantee’, ‘epidemic [means of spreading disease]’, ‘evidence [means of demonstrating]’ and ‘outrage [means of outraging]’. RECONISAUNCE (a1325) is the means of registering allegiance:

Non ne sal be don out of his oune schire in aquestene *reconisaunces* or in  
to ani Iurees

\*Rwl. Statutes lf. 31b, *MED*

‘No one shall be forced out of his own county into [falsely] acquired recognitions of allegiance, or onto any juries’.

ADVERTENCE (c1450[c1380]) first appears in Chaucer as the faculty of paying attention:

So that thou yeve thyn *advertence*

To understonde my sentence

HF 709, *MED*

‘So that you give your attention to understanding my statement’.

#### 4.4.4.2. *Agent*

RELISAUNCE (1355) is the name of a cloth which shines (cf modern French *reluisant* ‘shining’). AUDIENCE (c1390[?c1350]) first appears with its modern meaning of ‘hearers’. The earliest recorded context for EMINENCE (a1400) gives it the agentive sense ‘protruberance [thing which protrudes]’:

On þe hyndre partie of the schuldre he haþ an *eminence*  
Lanfranc 155/11, *MED*  
‘At the back of his shoulder he has a protruding part’,

and FREQUENCE (a1425[a1400]) has the agentive meaning ‘assembly [people who assemble]’. EMINENCE predates the adjective *eminent* (c1425) in English, as FREQUENCE predates the adjective *frequent* (c1450) ‘populous’.

#### 4.4.4.3. *Object*

The first contexts of RETENAUNCE ‘things retained’ (?a1400[a1338]) and SCIENCE ‘things known’ (?a1350) give them objective senses.

#### 4.4.4.4. *Result/state*

Four unanalysable nouns first appear in this class. PRESCIENCE ‘foreknowledge’ (c1384) and CONTEMPLAUNCE ‘contemplation’ (c1395) express active experiential states, theological and religious respectively. ACCUSTOMAUNCE (c1375) is a passive state ‘habit [state of being accustomed]’.

#### 4.4.4.5. *Action: Quality*

OLIPRAUNCE (a1400[c1303]) is a synonym of BOBAUNCE meaning ‘ostentation’. ARROGAUNCE, MAGNIFICENCE, PRUDENCE and PERSEVERAUNCE are all defined as vices and virtues in *Ayenbite of Irwit* (1340). ARROGAUNCE had in fact appeared earlier (a1400[c1303]):

Ðys ys pryde and *arrogauce*,  
 Vnworthy þe to avance..  
 Mannyng HS 3117, *MED*  
 ‘This is pride and arrogance, to put yourself forward without  
 justification’.

Its appearance in *Ayenbite* is discussed above in 4.4.1. PRUDENCE and SAPIENCE resemble these, in that in ME they are related to adjectives rather than verbs, yet can express qualities deriving from the verb bases of the Latin nouns, rather than states deriving from the English adjectives, which in any case are later than the nouns. PERSEVERAUNCE and PRUDENCE (a contraction in French of the Latin noun *providentia*; see *OED*) are first listed as virtues elsewhere in *Ayenbite*:

Ðise virtue oure greate filosofe, Iesu crist, clepeþ *perseveraunce*  
 Ayenb. 168/23, *MED*  
 ‘This virtue our great philosopher, Jesus Christ, calls perseverance’.

... þise byeþ þe þre deles of þe virtue of *prudence*.  
 Ayenb. 152/25, *MED*  
 ‘These are the three parts of the virtue of prudence’.

DISPLESAUNCE (c1440[a1349] ‘unpleasantness’) is first used by Rolle to refer to words in a moral context:

Ðat þay say to þam na wordes of myssawe, ne vnhoneste, ne of  
*displesaunce*  
 Rolle 10 Com. 11/26, *MED*  
 ‘So that they say no words to them which are rude, dishonest or  
 unpleasant [of displeasing quality]’.

SAPIENCE (c1400[a1376] ‘wisdom’) appears first as a semi-personification in *Piers Plowman* :

So seiþ þe sauter & *sapience* boþe ...  
 PPl. A[1] [Trin-C] 8.46, *MED*  
 ‘Both the psalter and wisdom say this ...’

Chaucer takes up the term and attributes it as a quality first to St. Cecilia in the *Second Nun's Tale* (c1380, G101) and then to Prudence and others in *Melibeus* ( c1390,

B2304, 2354, 2450). ELOQUENCE (c1450[1369]) and INCONSTAUNCE (c1395) are found first in Chaucer, the former as a term of praise in *The Book of the Duchess* (BD. 925), the latter as a term of dispraise in the *Summoner's Tale* (CT. Sum. D 1958). INCONTINENCE (c1384) is a sexual vice:

Turne *ze* a *zen* to the same thing ... lest Sathanas tempte *zou* for *zoure*  
*incontynence*

W Bible (1) 1. Cor. 7.5., *MED*

‘Keep going back to the same object ... lest Satan tempt you because of your lack of control’

and ACCIDENCE (1393) is a philosophical term meaning ‘non-essential characteristic’. CONVENIENCE (a1398) is the attribute of compatibility:

... þat we may knowe þe ... *conueniens* and differens of al þe ordres

\*Trev. Barth 14a/a, *MED*

‘... that we may know the ... compatibility and difference of all the orders.’

ALLIGEAUNCE (c1475[c1399]) ‘allegiance’ first appears as a quality in an ironic context:

Of *alegeaunce* now lerneth a lesson ...

Wher-by it standith and stablithe moste ...

By dride, or be dundes of domes vntrowe

Mum & S. (1) 1.9, *MED*

‘Now learn a lesson about loyalty ... Whether it is mostly firmly established by terror, or by the force of unsound legal judgements’.

MAGNIFICENCE (1390) is glossed in *Ayenbite* by the native word *bleuing* (modE *believing*), which in OE meant ‘staying’ or ‘sticking with [something]’. Perhaps by association with the later ME verb *magnifien* (1382), it is defined by Chaucer in 1390 partly according to its literal meaning, ‘doing great things’, though it still carries the sense of ‘perseverance’:

Thanne comth *Magnificence* ... whan a man dooth and perfourneth grete werkes of goodnesse that he hath bigonne.

CT.Pars. 1. 736, *MED*

‘Then comes Magnificence ... when a man carries out and completes

great works of goodness which he has begun.’

Six more unanalysable nouns refer to acts in their moral contexts. The earliest are VIOLENCE (c1300) and CREAUNCE (c1330[?c1300]):

- (1) *ʒif* ani man hand on ov set, ich ov hote al-so þat *ʒe* þe sentence of holi churche for swuche *violence* ... do  
S.Leg. Becket (Ld) 932, *MED*  
‘If any man lays hands on you, I urge you immediately to impose the sentence of Holy Church for such violent acts’.
- (2) And *ʒif* he ben of gode *creaunce* ... he no shuld nou *ʒt* be þer ful longe  
St. Patr. Purg. (1) p.99, *MED*  
‘And if he has genuine faith ... he should not be there [in Purgatory] very long’.

ABSTINENCE appears for the first time personified as a good but stern guardian in *Ayenbite*:

... chastete ssel bi streytliche yloked and wel wiþdra *ʒe* be *abstinence*  
*Ayenb.* 236, *MED*  
‘... chastity shall be well locked up and kept strictly apart by abstinence’.

PROVIDENCE first appears in Wyclif’s *Bible* (1) (a1382) and denotes the good providing of God.

#### 4.4.4.6. *Action: Fact*

SURVEIAUNCE (c1390) first appears in Chaucer as ‘general fact of supervision’:

Thogh ye han children, be it oon or mo,  
Youre is the charge of al hir *surveiaunce*  
CT.Ph. C. 95, *MED*  
‘If you have children, whether one or more, yours is the entire responsibility for looking after them’.

#### 4.4.4.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

RESISTENCE (1390[?c1350]) has its modern meaning. It first appears with the verb ‘make’:

Oþur nul I make no *resistens*  
SVrn.Leg. 20/268, *MED*

‘Otherwise I do not resist’.

EXPERIENCE (c1380) is used several times by Chaucer in the scientific sense of ‘demonstration’:

I preve hyt thus...  
 By *experience*; for yf that thow  
 Throw on water now a stoon ...  
 HF 788, *MED*  
 ‘I prove it in this way ... by demonstrating; for if you now throw  
 a stone into water ...’

#### 4.4.5. *The 14th century: analysable nouns*

There are 52 analysable nouns in the sample for the 14th century.

##### 4.4.5.1. *Instrument*

Eight analysable nouns in this period have first attributions in instrumental contexts. These are VENGEAUNCE ‘means of being avenged’ (c1325[c1300]), QUITE-CLAMAUNCE ‘means of clearing a debt’ (?a1400[a1338]), AQUITAUNCE ‘means of repaying’ (?a1400[a1338]), OFFENCE ‘means of offending’ (?a1450[?1350-75]), CONCORDAUNCE ‘means of referring’ (a1387), ANOIAUNCE ‘means of annoying’ (c1390), AFFERMAUNCE ‘means of [legally] affirming’ (1399) and SIGNANCE ‘means of showing’ (c1450[?a1400]).

CONCORDAUNCE (a1387), first used in its modern scholarly sense, later appears as an experiential state in a gloss on French:

*Concordaunce* amour veut rendre: *Concordaunce* loue wyl *zælde*.  
 Femina 97, *MED*  
 ‘Agreement leads to love’

##### 4.4.5.2. *Agent*

SUFFISAUNCE ((?a1425[c1380]) and VARIAUNCE (a1425[c1385]) are things which respectively suffice and vary.

4.4.5.3. *Object*

Three nouns in this part of the sample first appear with objective senses. They are DALIAUNCE ‘subject of conversation’ (a1425[a1349]), USAUNCE ‘things usually done’ (c1380) and SIGNIFICAUNCE ‘what is meant’ (a1400).

4.4.5.4. *Result/ state*

12 analysable nouns in the 14th century come into this class. Among de-adjectival nouns of being, INNOCENCE ‘sinlessness’ (1340) is analysable in respect of the adjective *innocent*, which appears in English at the same date (see 4.4.1. above). PRESENCE (c1330) and ABSENCE (c1400[c1378]) are analysable in respect of verbs as well as being related to ME adjectives ( *absent* is not recorded in English until c1385, slightly later than the noun). Passive states are expressed by DELIVERAUNCE ‘state of being rescued’ (c1300), ASSURAUNCE ‘state of being assured’ (a1425[c1385]), and ANOIAUNCE (c1390), which appears in the same text as its instrumental use (4.4.5.1. above) as ‘state of being annoyed’. In addition, active experiential states are expressed by REPENTAUNCE ‘state which results from repenting’ (c1300), AFFIAUNCE ‘state which results from trusting’ (a1400[c1303]), and ACORDAUNCE ‘state which results from agreeing’ (a1400[a1338]). ABOUNDAUNCE (1340), AMOUNTAUNCE (c1380) and SUFFISAUNCE (c1387-95) have the senses ‘resulting large amount’, ‘resulting amount’ and ‘resulting adequate amount’ respectively.

4.4.5.5. *Action: Quality*

PURVEIAUNCE ‘foresight’ (1325[c1300]) appears in the *Gloucester Chronicle* as a virtue lacking in the subject:

Folehardi he is inou  
ac al wipoute rede,

Hastif wiþoute *pourveaunce*

oþer wisdom in dede

Glo. Chron. A. 9387, *MED*

‘He is foolhardy enough and totally ill-advised, hasty without foresight or wisdom in action’.

INNOCENCE, like PRUDENCE and SAPIENCE, has no English verb base, yet seems in one context to function as a quality related to action (or, more strictly, non-action, i.e. doing no harm) in *Ayenbite*, in addition to its appearance as a ‘state’ noun mentioned above. Both contexts are quoted above in 4.4.1. DILIGENCE, like INNOCENCE, first appears in *Ayenbite*:

Hi ssolle do greate payne and grat *diligence* wel to loki hare chastete

*Ayenb.* 32/37, *MED*

‘They shall take great pains and work conscientiously at keeping their chastity well locked up’.

PLESAUNCE (c1350) is the quality of gratification, and like its opposite *displesaunce* is first applied to words:

Make, Lord, þe wilful þinges of my mouþe in gode *pleasaunce*

MEPsalter 118.108, *MED*

‘Lord, let my deliberate remarks be gratifying [to others]’.

In Chaucer it later acquired the passive ‘mental state’ sense of ‘enjoyment’:

Thus is this queen in *pleasaunce* and in joye

Chaucer, LGW 1150 (1430[c1386]), *MED*

‘Thus this queen is in a state of pleasure and joy’.

INOBEISHAUNCE first appears in Wyclif’s *Bible* (1) (a1382) as a re-spelling of the French *inobeissance*, first occurring as a translation of the Latin *inobedientiam*:

We ben redy to vnderzouk all *inobeyschaunce*

W.Bible (1) Pref. Jer. (Bod. 959) 3.15, *MED*

‘We are ready to amend all acts of disobedience’.

VAILANCE (1532rev. [c1385] ‘worthiness’) and INSOLENCIE (c1390) are also pure qualities, the latter defined by Chaucer as one of a list:

Ther is Inobedience, Auauntynge, Ypocrisy, Despit, Arrogance ...



*Insolence, etc.*

Chaucer CT. Pars. I. 391, *MED*

‘There is disobedience, boasting, hypocrisy, spite, arrogance, insolence, etc.’

MAINTENAUNCE (1333) according to the *MED* meant ‘interference in a quarrel’ with a view to the prolonged employment and payment of lawyers, and was therefore regarded as a vice.

EXCELLENCE (c1390[?c1350) first appears with a verbal action sense ‘excelling’:

For þreo causus of gret fame: Ðe first is *excellence* of dignite

SVrn.Leg. 61/3, *MED*

‘Now for three causes of great fame: The first is excelling in dignity’.

GOVERNAUNCE (c1450[c1370]) first appears in Chaucer as ‘self-control’, one of a list of desirable attributes:

Assured Maner, Youthe, and Honeste,

Wisdom, Estaat, Drede, and *Governaunce*.

Pity 41, *MED*

‘Assured manners, youth and uprightness, wisdom, status, respect, and self-control’.

However, the many subsequent occurrences of this word cited in Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate appear to be almost equally divided between quality (here ironic):

What *governaunce* is in this prescience

That giltles tormenteth innocence?

Chaucer, CT.Kn. A.1313 (c1395), *MED*

‘What wisdom is in this foreknowledge, which torments the innocent with impunity?’

and general fact:

He yaf me al the brydel in myn hond

To han the *governaunce* of hous and lond

Chaucer, CT.WB. D. 814 (c1395), *MED*

‘He handed the reins over to me entirely so that I could rule over house and land’.

The negative MISGOVERNAUNCE (c1375) also appears first in Chaucer, and refers to a general act in its moral context:

Adam ... for *mysgovernaunce*  
 Was dryve out of his hye prosperitee  
 Chaucer, CT.ML. B. 3202, *MED*  
 ‘Adam ... was driven out of his noble and prosperous position for  
 bad governing’,

as does the positive OBEISAUNCE (a1382) translating L. *obedientia*:

Betere is *obeisaunce* þan slayne sacrifices  
 WBible (1) (Bod.959) 1 Kings 15. 22, *MED*  
 ‘It is better to obey than to kill sacrifices’.

*WBible*[2] has the earlier OBEDIENCE(c1230[?a1200]), a translation of Latin  
*obedientia*, in this context.

MAGNIFIENCE (1384) is a version of the borrowing MAGNIFICENCE (see  
 4.4.4.5. above). MISCREAUNCE (a1393 ‘bad faith’) also first appears in Gower, with  
 an additional sense of ‘treacherous act’:

Se now the foule *mescreance*  
 Of Greks in thilke time  
 Gower CA. 5. 1444, *MED*  
 ‘See now the vile treachery of Greeks in that time’.

#### 4.4.5.6. *Action: Fact*

While OBEDIENCE and OBEISAUNCE could be used interchangeably (see  
 above) to express the moral quality attendant on obeying, the first appearance of an  
 alternative OBEIAUNCE (c1450[?a1400]) has an overtone of legal obligation rather  
 than moral quality:

To *zar* honoure with *obeyaunce*  
 Me ane I comaunde  
 Wars Alex. 5106, *MED*  
 ‘In obedience I dedicate myself only to your honour’.

CONTINUAUNCE (a1425[a1349]), ALLOUAUNCE (1400[c1378]), APARAUNCE  
 (c1450[c1380]), HERITAUNCE (1532 rev. [c1385]), RESEMBLAUNCE (a1393)  
 and DISTROUBLAUNCE ‘disturbing’ (1398) first appear with general action/fact

meanings. However, CONTINUAUNCE in its first context might also be seen as verging on a quality :

In *continuaunce* of good lyuyng  
 Rolle, M.PASS.(2) 35/28, *MED*  
 ‘Persisting in living rightly’.

The base is neutral, but the context is moral.

4.4.5.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

RESTORAUNCE (a1400[a1325]) and DECEIVAUNCE (a1400[a1338]) first appear as specific acts with the verbs ‘make’ and ‘do’:

- (1) If mi aght be stolen wit chaunce,  
 Dou sal me mak *restoraunce*  
 Cursor 6772, *MED*  
 ‘If anything should be stolen from me by any chance, you will restore it to me’;
- (2) Here ... of a *desceyvaunce* þei conseild him to do  
 Mannyng Chron. Pt. 2 p. 133, *MED*  
 ‘Hear ... about an act of deception they advised him to commit’.

RENOVELAUNCE (c1450[c1380]) is first used by Chaucer in the plural:

Thou shalt here ...  
 Of Loves folk moo tydynges ...  
 And also moo *renovelaunces*  
 Of olde forleten aqueyntaunces  
 Chaucer HF (2) 164-186, *MED*  
 ‘You shall hear ... more news of lovers ... And also [about] more instances of renewing old relationships’.

ATTENDAUNCE (?a1425[c1380]) also first appears in Chaucer’s *Boethius* in the context of a specific instance:

Thei wolden refuse the *attendaunce* of hire advocatte  
 Chaucer, Bo. 4. Pr. 4, 312, *MED*  
 ‘They would refuse to allow their advocate to attend’.

ENTENDAUNCE (a1393) first appears in Gower with the sense of ‘service’:

I syh hem springe and dance,  
 And do to love her *entendaunce*

Gower CA 8. 2488, *MED*

‘I see them leaping and dancing and doing their acts of service for love’.

DISCONTINUAUNCE (a1398) is first used in a scientific context:

Schinyngē comeþ of liȝt wiþoute wanyngē of liȝt and wiþoute  
*discontenuaunce* þerof

\*Trev. Barth 120a/b, *MED*

‘Shining is caused by light when the light does not wane and does not discontinue’.

#### 4.4.5.8. *Summary*

The 14th-century sample differs from that for the earlier period both in mode of integration and in semantic profile. Whereas the period 1150-1300 saw a high incidence of holistic borrowing with few analysable nouns, the sample for the 14th century has more analysable than unanalysable nouns (52 to 35). The 14th-century semantic profiles both differ markedly from that for the early unanalysable borrowings, which shows a majority of instrumental contexts. In the 14th century unanalysable instrumental meanings have dropped almost to the level of agentive case, with only six occurrences. However, there is also a distinction within the 14th century between the semantic profiles of unanalysable and analysable nouns. In each there is a majority of first appearances across the category of action, almost all with bases denoting moral qualities. However, among analysables there are 12 first appearances in contexts expressing result/state, four times as many as among unanalysables.

#### 4.4.6. *The 15th century: unanalysable nouns*

There are 28 unanalysable nouns in the sample for the 15th century.

##### 4.4.6.1. *Instrument*

Six unanalysable nouns first appear in this period with instrumental meanings.

They are TRESAUNCE ‘crossing’ (1405), PARDONAUNCE ‘pardon’ (1405),

DEMONSTRAUNCE (a1420), ASSISTENCE (1424), the legal term DEFESAUNCE

‘condition by which an obligation is nullified’ (1428) and MEMORANCE ‘memorial’ (1480).

#### 4.4.6.2. *Object*

JACTAUNCE ‘boasting’ (c1430[a1410]), a French borrowing, appears in a nonce occurrence as a synonym for *boste* ‘things boasted of’:

Sche ... chese rathere to be holde as wickid ... than sche wolde ... telle  
things that my *z̄te* seme to hir preisyng boste or *iactaunce*

Love Mirror 42, *MED*

‘She ... would rather be considered wicked ... than tell things that might seem boasted of in order to praise herself’.

#### 4.4.6.3. *Result/state*

Nine unanalysable nouns come into this class. COVENAUNCE ‘contract’ (1407) is the practical result of convening. TREPIDAUNCE ‘trepidation’ (a1500[?c1425]) is an active state:

... with greet *trepidaunce* or tremelyng he a-boode tyl the morowenyng  
Spec. Sacer. 46/5, *MED*

‘... in [a state of] great trepidation or trembling he waited till morning’,

as are CONGAUDENCE ‘[state resulting from] mutual rejoicing’ (a1475) and COMBUSTAUNCE ‘conflagration’ (a1500):

Ðat water may causen a temperence ...  
To saue þe erth fro brennyng *combust[a]nce*  
Add. Hymnal 485/19, *MED*

‘That water may cause a dilution ... To save the earth from its burning state [the result of being set on fire]’.

ADOLESCENCE (c1439) and DEFICIENCE (1543[1464]) are states derived from active participles in Latin which became adjectives in French.

INSPIRAUNCE ‘divine inspiration’ (?c1400) is a passive state, the result of being inspired. TRIBULAUNCE (a1450), deriving ultimately from a Latin verb

meaning ‘to afflict’ is also a passive state ‘being afflicted’, as is OBLIAUNCE ‘being forgotten’ (c1450).

#### 4.4.6.4. *Action: Quality*

BENEVOLENCE ‘goodwill’ (c1460[?c1400]) first appears in a rhyming educational treatise:

That *z*erd makith vertu and *benevolence*  
 In Childhode for to growe  
 Beryn 1060, *MED*  
 ‘That garden causes virtue and goodwill to develop in childhood’.

The same word is rhymed with INSIPIENCE ‘foolishness’ by Hoccleve c1412:

But yit truste I þ[a]t his benevolence  
 Complyne wole myn *insipience*  
 Hoccleve Bedford 17, *MED*  
 ‘But yet I trust his goodwill to have pity on my foolishness’.

PUISSAUNCE (a1450[c1410]) ‘power’ is an attribute of the Trinity:

But on deyete And on *pusance*  
 Haue they thre with Owten variaunce  
 Lovel Grail 17. 321, *MED*  
 ‘But those three have one godhead and one power without exception’.

Like the words previously quoted, TOLERAUNCE (c1425[a1420]) and

UNPERSEVERAUNCE (c1449) also appear in the context of other listed qualities:

- (1) For as to a fole it was pertynent  
 To schewe his foly, ni *z*t so convenient  
 Is to þe wyse, softly, with suffraunce,  
 In al his port to haue *tolleraunce*  
 Lydgate TB 2. 7014, *MED*  
 ‘For though it is part of a fool’s nature to show his folly, it is not so easy for the wise man quietly to show forbearance and tolerance in every way’;
- (2) Peter ... meaneth for to remove bi the former words al vnstable  
 vnconstaunce and variaunce and *vnperseueraunce*, which peple happily  
 wolde haue in leuyng the lawe of God for persecucioun  
 Pecock Repr. 177, *MED*  
 ‘Peter ... means by the former words to remove all unstable inconstancy and changeableness and lack of persistence, which people might show in

deserting the law of God because of persecution’.

HUMILIAUNCE ‘humility’ (c1460[a1449]) first appears in a translation of the *Te Deum* by Lydgate. LACHAUNCE (a1475) is defined by the MED as ‘sloth’, but appears in a nonce occurrence as a variant of French *lachesse* ‘cowardice’.

VOILLAUNCE ‘will’ (a1500[1422]) appears in a moral context, qualified as ‘goodwill’:

Governe ye hame wyth good *woillaunce* and bonerte  
Yonge Ssecr. 123/6, *MED*  
‘Govern them with goodwill and kindness’.

#### 4.4.6.5. *Action: Fact*

NAVIGAUNCE, ADJUVAUNCE and ARTILAUNCE (a1460) are respectively the art of sailing, act of helping and the art of using arms.

#### 4.4.7. *The 15th century: analysable nouns*

There are 62 analysable nouns in the sample for the 15th century, almost twice the number of unanalysable borrowings.

##### 4.4.7.1. *Instrument*

14 analysable nouns first appear with instrumental senses. These are the legal term ALLEGAUNCE ‘allegation [means of alleging]’ (c1475[?c1400]), CONTRARIAUNCE and VERIFIAUNCE ‘opposition [means of opposing]’ and ‘verification [means of verifying]’ (c1450[1410]), SEVERAUNCE ‘difference [means of differing] (a1500[1422])’, ACHEVISAUNCE ‘alms’ (c1430), HINDRAUNCE (a1450-a1500[1436]), EXORBITAUNCE ‘means of exceeding’ (1449), ADHERENCE ‘political support’ (1450), SOJOURNAUNCE ‘lodging’ (c1450), COMMANDAUNCE ‘military position [means of commanding]’ (1452), ENTRAUNCE ‘right [means] of entering’ (1473), SOCOURAUNCE ‘means of

helping' (?a1475), STOPPANCE 'means of blocking' (1493) and the theological term PREFIGURAUNCE 'prefiguration [means of prefiguring]' (a1500).

#### 4.4.7.2. *Agent*

DEPENDAUNCE (1414) first appears with the agentive sense of 'that which follows':

We beseche *zow* ... that alle other Commissions brought or pursued ... with alle the processe, circumstance, and *dependance*, mowen alle utterly ben repeled and adnulled

RParl. 4. 586, MED

'We beseech you ... that all other commissions brought or pursued ... with all process, circumstance and consequences ... should all be entirely repealed and annulled'.

#### 4.4.7.3. *Object*

AFFERENCE 'amount assessed for payment' (1433) and CONSIDERAUNCE 'matter to be considered' (?1440) first appear in this category. PRINCIPAUNCE 'principality' (a1460) is the object of rule:

Here is puissaunce Archangelik in ooste and legioun

And it gouerneth Dukys *Principaunce*

With myght, power, and dominioun

Vegetius (2) 2009, MED

'Here is the Archangelic power in hosts and legions, and it governs the Duke's principality with might, power and dominion'.

#### 4.4.7.4. *Result/state*

ESPERAUNCE (1422), DISACORDAUNCE (c1436), PROSPERAUNCE (a1460) and RECREANCE (a1500) express the experiential states of hoping, disagreeing, prospering and having recovered. PERTURBAUNCE (c1450[?a1405]), SONDERAUNCE (1435), RECOVERAUNCE (c1500[?a1437]), ABAISSHAUNCE (a1450), ALLEVIAUNCE (1451), PREFERRAUNCE (1456) and FORYEVENAUNCE (c1475) respectively express passive states of being perturbed,



divided, recovered, embarrassed, relieved, promoted and forgiven. PARAUNCE (a1475) is the adjectival state of being high-born ('of the peerage').

#### 4.4.7.5. *Action: Quality*

UNREPENTAUNCE (c1400), UNTEMPERAUNCE (?a1425) INCONVENIENCE (a1460[?c1400]) and IMMODERAUNCE ((a1500) express the negative of pure qualities, one of which, MODERAUNCE (a1460), also dates from this period. INCONVENIENCE (a1460[?c1400]) first appears in a rhyming educational treatise as the negative characteristic of inconsistency:

Ye must declare yeur maters to myne intelligence  
That I may the bet perseyve al *inconvenience*,  
Dout, pro, contra, and anbiguite.  
Beryn 2576, *MED*

'You must present your material for my examination, so that I can more easily identify any inconsistency, doubtful argument on either side, and ambiguity'.

The intriguing nonce formation PROUISSAUNCE (c1440) is according to the *MED* a blend of *prouesse* and PUISSAUNCE. The spelling might also suggest a link with PROVIDENCE:

The requeste ... mekely requered unto our highe noblesse, to make strong by force of oure *provissaunce* thys said libertes whiche ye han herd expresse

Lydgate Charters p. 235, *MED*

'The request ... humbly required of our high nobility to strengthen by means of our [power? ability? provision?] these same liberties which you have heard expressed'.

MILITAUNCE (a1460) first appears in the same text as a personification, nicely distinguished from the more prosaic equivalent in *-ation* :

O Jesse flour ...  
Mankyndis lyfe is mylitacioun;  
And she, thi wife, is named *Militaunce*  
Vegetius (2) 97, *MED*

'Oh flower of Jesse, the life of mankind is fighting, and she, your wife, is called Militance'.

VAUNTAUNCE first appears in the text *Vices and Virtues* (c1450[c1400]) as an abstract quality, but is glossed in the same text by the verbal gerund *bostynge* ‘boasting’. The later MISUSAUNCE (1543[1464] ‘misbehaviour’) is another example of action defined as a moral characteristic.

#### 4.4.7.6. *Action: Fact*

REPUGNAUNCE (c1450[?a1422]) is first used in scientific and later in philosophical contexts:

Nature withoutyn any stryfe  
Of *Repugnaunce* or any resistence, etc  
Lydgate LOL 6. 72, *MED*  
‘Nature without any conflict caused by mutually repelling  
or resisting [forces], etc’.

AVOIDAUNCE (a1425) was first a variant of *voidaunce* ‘act of emptying’. Shortly afterwards (1450[c1430]) it was also used in the modern sense ‘escape’.

FECUNDAUNCE ‘fertility’ (?1440) first appears in Palladius, who writes about estate management, with the practical sense of ‘reproducing’.

DURAUNCE (1443) and ENDURAUNCE (1494) first appear with the sense ‘fact of continuing’:

- (1) As þe lizt which we haue of þe sunne haþ his *duraunce* and continuaunce bi presens of þe sunne  
Pecock, Rule, 59, *MED*  
‘As the light we get from the sun lasts and continues while the sun is there’;
- (2) Some accompt ye *enduraunce* thereof to the laste yere of Burdredus  
Fabyan cxxxix. iii, *MED*  
‘Some calculate that it lasted until the last year of Burdredus’ reign’.

ENDURANCE in modE now signifies a moral quality (the earliest entry for this sense is OED 1667). We might consider this development in the light of the first context for its earlier synonym CONTINUAUNCE (a1425[a1349], see 4.4.5.6. above).

MILITAUNCE (a1460, quoted above), appears later in the same text in the same sense as MILITACIOUN:

Was sworn by theim ...  
 Fro *mylitaunce* that thei shal neuer fle  
 Vegetius (2) 702, *MED*  
 ‘They swore ... that they would never run away from fighting’.

RESONAUNCE ‘resounding’, MINISTRAUNCE ‘administering’,

FREQUENTAUNCE ‘practising’ and FAVOURAUNCE ‘favouring’ all appear in general contexts in the same text, Vegetius (a1460) on military practice.

MAINOURAUNCE (1468) and JOUISSANCE (1483) are respectively the legal rights to administer and enjoy a possession:

That your seid Suppliaunt be barred ... of all maner Accions for th’occupacion and *mannerance* of any of the seid premissez  
 RParl. 6. 231b, *MED*  
 ‘That your said petitioner should be barred ... from bringing any kind of action for the right of occupying and administering any of the said premises’.

He may not be peasyble to the reame ne haue the *ioysaunce* of it.  
 Caxton, G. De la Tour E vj6, *MED*  
 ‘He cannot come in peace to the realm nor enjoy it legally’.

#### 4.4.7.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

CONCURRENCE (?a1475[?a1425]) is first used with its modern meaning and in a specific context:

... the concurrente [L. *concurrentia*] of the yeres of Criste and of kynges  
 Higd. (2) 4.271, *MED*  
 ‘The concurrence [running concurrently] of the years of Christ and the kings’.

. TARIAUNCE ‘delaying’ (a1450[c1410]), UTTERAUNCE ‘bringing out’ (1436), LAUDAUNCE ‘praising’ (c1460[a1449]), SPORTAUNCE ‘entertaining’ (a1450), QUERAUNCE ‘inquiring’ (c1450), ASSEMBLAUNCE ‘gathering illegally’ (1455.), REVERTENCE ‘returning’ (?1457), REPLIAUNCE ‘replying’ (a1475) and PARFOURMAUNCE ‘carrying out’ (1494) all first occur in specific contexts.

ASPIAUNCE ‘act of investigating’ (c1475[c1445]) appears first in a scholarly text, in a specific if theoretical context:

Which *aspiaunce* y committe to hi *z*er consideracioun þan is pertynent to  
þis symple present book  
Pecock Donet 142/17, *MED*  
‘Which investigation I leave to more specialised consideration than is  
pertinent to the present elementary study’.

FESTAUNCE (c1475) is a nonce formation, the context of which is not quite clear:

Ye [Vices] may not endure withowt my meyntenaunce  
That ye bought with a bribe of owur *festance*  
Wisd. 765, *MED*.

It appears to mean ‘You cannot carry on without my support, which you bought with the bribe of feasting us’. This would make the reference specific.

#### 4.4.7.8. *Summary*

The sample for this period overall shows a recovery in the score for instrumental meanings, although among analysable nouns (which greatly outnumber unanalysables) these are almost equalled by result/state and outnumbered by action as a whole. Across both categories, all but one of result/state nouns express mental or experiential states. However, among the 44 action nouns in the total sample for this period, a surprising development is that only 16 have bases denoting moral qualities. Furthermore, of those on neutral bases, 11 occur in contexts of specific instance.

#### 4.4.8. *Conclusions*

Marchand’s view of the semantics of this suffix, that deverbal nouns in *-ance/-ence* simply express ‘the idea of action’ (1969: 249, 4.9.2.), seems to need some qualification. His point is made partly in order to contrast words in *-ance -ence* with variants in *-ancy/-ency* (see 4.4. above): ‘The sense differentiation has ... in the main kept to the original principle of coining, which is that substantives in **-ance/-ence** are

deverbal nouns, expressing the idea of action, whereas substantives in *-ancy*, *-ency* are deadjectival nouns expressing the idea of state or quality' (1969: 249-50, 4.9.2.).

However, as we have seen, many substantives in *-ance* *-ence* also express the idea of state or quality. In the following 20 pairs of doublets with *-ancy/-ency*, the semantic categories of first attributions are as follows:

**Table 3: Semantics of doublets in *-ance/-ence* and *-ancy/-ency***

	<i>-ance/-ence</i>	<i>-ancy/-ency</i>	
(?a1200)	penitence > state(+instrum.)	penitency > state	
(c1230)	inobedience > quality	inobediency > instance	(?a1425)
a1250	observance > instrumental	observancy > instance	1567
c1300	violence > quality(+fact)	violency > quality	1545
(c1303)	arrogance > quality	arrogancy > quality	1529
(1340)	prudence > quality	prudency > quality	
(?a1350)	diligence > quality(+fact)	diligency > quality	1494
	abundance > state	abundancy > state	1620
(c1378)	absence > state	absency > state	1590
c1380	prescience > state	presciency > state	1572
(c1384)	incontinence > quality	incontinency > instance	(?a1425)
a1400	eminence > agent	eminency > agent	1602
(c1400)	inconvenience > quality	inconveniency > agent	(1429)
(a1450)	innocence > state (+quality)	innocency > state (+quality)	
(c1450)	patience > quality	patiency > state	1697
	preeminence > agent	preeminency > quality	1560
	ignorance > state	ignorancy > quality	1526
	obedience > quality	obediency > quality	1614
(1464)	deficiency > state	deficiency > state	1634

In only three of these pairs does the *-ency* form introduce a new state or quality sense.

These are *preeminency*, expressing a quality and formed on an initially agentive noun in *-ence*; *ignorancy*, expressing a quality and formed on a stative noun; and *patiency*, expressing a state and following a quality noun. In 11 out of 20 pairs the doublets have identical meanings of quality or state (though in three of these the *-ence* form appears simultaneously in instrumental or action/fact senses). In the others, the *-ancy* *-ency* variant has no state or quality sense. One pair has identical action/fact and another

identical agentive senses. In three others, nouns in *-ence* with quality senses are followed by variants in *-ency*, two of which first denote specific instance, while one has an agentive sense. The pair OBSERVAUNCE '*observancy*' has an instrumental sense in *-ance* followed by specific instance in *-ancy*.

In only seven of these 20 pairs does the *-ancy/-ency* version appear within the ME period. All are later than the *-ance/-ence* form, and all but two at least a century later. All but one are now obsolete. Marchand's examples all date from the 16th and 17th centuries, and it is possible that his distinction developed after the ME period. However, four of my identical state or quality pairs acquired the *-ancy/-ency* variant within the ME period; and overall my small sample above suggests that the *-ancy/-ency* variant was more likely to develop where state or quality meanings already existed for the noun in *-ance/-ence*. Marchand points out, however, that some surviving variants in *-ency* have acquired concrete meanings, which in my classification would have agentive sense: *dependency* 'that which depends', *constituency* 'that which constitutes', *emergency* 'that which emerges [i.e. an unforeseen combination of circumstances]' (1969: 250-51, 4.9.6.). He also remarks that 'in a number of cases the form in *-ance/-ence* has prevailed without any apparent reason' (i.e. with state or quality meanings), quoting ABSENCE, PATIENCE and VIOLENCE (1969: 250, 4.9.5.). He suggests that there might have been phonetic considerations, pointing out that forms in *-lence* are more usual than forms in *-lency*, (1969: 250, 4.9.5.). However, it is hard to see what phonetic consideration this could serve. Such considerations might certainly have been applied to stem-final /s/ or /ʃ/, but there are several counter-examples to this, e.g. *deficiency*, *proficiency*, *excrescency*.

In *ance -ence*, the majority of unanalysable borrowings in the early period of my sample (1150-1300) entered the language with instrumental meanings. However,

most were formed on bases in the moral and religious fields, and were usually extended later to express moral and religious states and qualities. In the 14th century the semantic profile for borrowings certainly changes: the number of instrumental meanings drops, and the action area becomes prominent. However, a notable majority of unanalysable action nouns are also formed on bases denoting moral qualities, and first appear as such, either defining a virtue (or vice) absolutely, or referring to an act in its moral context. As we have seen, it is sometimes difficult to draw a line between qualities (here defined as connected with actions) and states (connected with being and experience). It could be argued that a few of the unanalysable borrowings, such as **PRUDENCE** and **SAPIENCE**, should not be classified as action nouns at all, since no related verbs exist in ME, only adjectives (though all but one of the adjectives are later than the nouns). However, a de-adjectival noun may not strictly be classifiable as an action noun, yet may appear in a context suggesting action, as with **INNOCENCE** (see 4.4.1. above). My feeling is that such words may have influenced the interpretation of deverbal nouns in *-ance*, whether the latter were borrowed holistically from French or formed in ME on borrowed verbs.

There is, however, a distinction in the 14th century between the semantics of unanalysable and analysable nouns. Result/state is not especially prominent as a first meaning for unanalysable nouns in the 14th century sample, but among analysables it outnumbers all categories except quality. Among unanalysables in the 15th century quality meanings still dominate, but among analysables they are clearly outnumbered in this period by most other categories. Among analysable nouns the field of passive and experiential mental state is in fact dominant across the total ME period, despite exponents being slightly outnumbered in the 15th century by those with instrumental meaning. In all periods of the sample instrumental nouns have abstract bases (compare

the many concrete instrumentals which were found in *-ment*). But by the 15th century a majority of instrumental nouns across the sample have legal and political, rather than mental or moral, bases, which are reflected in the contexts in which they first appear.

Of the 33 words which at present seem most likely to have been formed in ME, 14 appear in contexts of mental or moral action or state, and 7 in contexts of specific instance. The rest are fairly evenly divided among the other semantic categories. Some of this might certainly suggest that by the end of the ME period *-ance* was drifting towards the action area, or at least was seen by coiners as an undifferentiated alternative to *-ment* and *-ation*. However, the overall figures for specific instance contexts are low (20 in a total sample of 210).

Across the total sample for all periods, quality senses are in a clear majority of 58, followed by 44 each for instrumentals and result/state (omitting ambiguous SUFFERAUNCE from the categories both of quality and of result/state). A majority of result/state nouns, and more than half those in the total action area, fall in the mental/moral field. It seems, then, that Marchand's (1969) view (that *-ance* is primarily an action suffix) is true overall only if 'action' is frequently qualified as 'moral action or the quality connected with it'. It does, however, reflect a later tendency towards more specific or neutral action which set in as the suffix became analysable. Nevertheless, throughout the analysable sample this tendency is to a certain extent counter-balanced by a substantial proportion of examples in the field of mental and moral states. In my sample the majority of occurrences of this suffix are in fictional texts, which also claim the highest percentage of occurrences in relation to the number of texts quoted (see Appendix 2).



**Note**

1. Guy de Chauliac, ?a1425, *Chirurgia Magna*. The *MED* gives citations from two versions, which in the stencils appear as \**Chauliac* (1) and \**Chauliac* (2). *Chauliac* (1) uses latinate vocabulary which in *Chauliac* (2) is often replaced by native equivalents.

## Chapter 5

THE SUFFIX *-ation* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

## 5.1. History and Morphology

5.1.1. *History*

Marchand tells us that the suffix *-ation* ‘anglicizes Latin *-atio* as well as (learned) French *-ation*’. He adds that most English words in *-ation* (i.e. presumably in all periods) have counterparts in both Latin and French (1969: 259, 4.18.1); Miller makes the same observation of *-ation* nouns found in Chaucer (1997: 241). The suffix in ME is usually spelt *-acioun*.

5.1.2. *Morphological types*

The four types found in my sample correspond to those given by Marchand (1969: 259-261). The last two are the most prominent in my sample.

5.1.2.1. *Type 1*

This type, e.g. SIGNIFICACIOUN, is formed on verbs in *-ify*, either borrowed from French or formed on the pattern of borrowed pairs such as *edify*/EDIFICATION.

5.1.2.2. *Type 2*

This type, e.g. MARTIRIZACIOUN, is associated with verbs in *-ize*, the verb suffix deriving from Greek. Marchand suggests that this pattern did not become productive until the 17th century and that in ME these words are borrowings, from medieval Latin rather than from French, as they are either absent from French dictionaries or are ‘recorded later than their English counterparts’ (1969: 260: 4.18.3).

5.1.2.3. *Type 3*

This type, e.g. PERFORACIOUN, is formed on a Latin verb stem and may be borrowed holistically from French or translated from Latin using the French suffix. Later verbs may be back-formed in *-ate*.

#### 5.1.2.4. *Type 4*

This type is formed on a French verb stem, is borrowed holistically from French or possibly derived from an earlier ME verb borrowed from French. An example is ACCUSACIOUN.

#### 5.1.3. *Co-occurrences*

The suffix *-ation*, like *-ment* and *-ance/-ence*, may attach to words with the prefixes *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n/m)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *pre-*, *per-*, *in(m)-*, *pro-*, *e(x)-* and *en(m)*. In ME it does not co-occur with the native prefix *mis-*. The stem suffixes *-ize* and *-ify* are not restricted to *-ation* in ME, but are more common before this suffix than before *-ment* and *-ance*. *-Ify* before *-ation* is usually followed by <c>.

#### 5.1.4. *Transparency*

Dalton-Puffer finds only about a quarter of her sample in ME *-ation (-acioun)* ‘ideally transparent’ (Dalton-Puffer, 1996:110). Elsewhere she places nouns in *-acioun* at the low levels 4 and 6 on her scale of morphotactic transparency: that is, as observing rules of stem fusion (*conclude/conclusion*) and weak suppletion (*corumpen/corupcion*) respectively (1992: 476ff). However, these rules seem to apply only to nouns in *-tion*, which she includes with *-ation* under the general heading *-acioun*. In my sample, which includes only nouns in *-ation*, most can be classed at her level 2, observing extrinsic allophonic rules leading to resyllabification (see 5.2.1. below). Nouns on bases in ME *-ifien* can also observe the morphological rule of stem variability (her level 5), as in *signifien / SIGNIFICACIOUN* (compare the earlier SIGNIFIAUNCE, which would be at level 2).

## 5.2. Phonology

### 5.2.1. *Stress*

ModE stresses the /ei/ of *-ation*, with a weak secondary stress on the first syllable of four (<sup>1</sup>RECRE<sup>1</sup>ATION) and on the second of five (AD<sup>1</sup>MINI<sup>1</sup>STRATION). In ME *-acioun* would have been pronounced /<sup>1</sup>asi<sup>1</sup>un/ and the stress would have fallen almost equally on the first and last syllable, as in French. In view of the tendency of Germanic speakers to hit stresses more strongly than French speakers (Jespersen, 1948: 96, 105), this probably meant that the word-stress in ME already varied from that of the verb in many cases, as in *ac<sup>1</sup>cusen*/ACCU<sup>1</sup>SACI<sup>1</sup>OUN.

### 5.2.2. *Phonetics*

The suffix attaches to both C- and V-final stems. Both spelling and verse metre in ME suggest that *-acioun* was trisyllabic, with a long final vowel, perhaps until after Shakespeare's time. However, the fact that stem-final /f/, /ʒh/, /dʒ/ and /j/ do not appear in the sample suggests that the /si/ of *-acioun* may sometimes have been palatalised during the ME period.<sup>1</sup> As with *-ance*, /r/ and /t/ are common among stem-final consonants, and /i/ among stem-final vowels. Any single vowel except /ɔ/ and /a/ may precede the suffix, but my sample has no diphthongs in that position. Many CC clusters appear, as well as the CCC clusters /mpl/, /mpt/ and /str/.

## 5.3. Integration

### 5.3.1. *Productivity*

To Dalton-Puffer, this like other Romance suffixes is 'completely unproductive' in ME (1993: 189, 4.2). Indeed, 'It is only in [the] sense of having "possible verbs" as derivational base that ACIOUN can be coherently described as a deverbal affix in ME' (1996: 95). This she attributes partly to its low level of morphotactic transparency: 'a

state of affairs which does not suggest that ACIOUN is very likely to become productive in ME or soon after' (1996:110).

I have suggested in 5.1.4. above that ME nouns in *-ation* (as distinct from *-tion*) may be more transparent than Dalton-Puffer's analysis allows. Many nouns in *-ation*, also, are chronologically analysable, entering the language later than related ME verbs. Marchand claims that Types 3 and 4 are loans in ME, but that from the 14th century onward substantives of Type 1 were derived in English on the pattern *-ify/-ification* in older borrowed pairs: 'The derivational character of the English substantives is not impaired by the fact that almost every word has a Latin or French counterpart as well' (1969: 259, 4.18.2.). It is hard to see why he would have made an exception for this type. SIGNIFICACIOUN (1340), for example, follows the pair *signifien/ SIGNIFIAUNCE* (c1275), adopted in the preceding century, and could certainly have been formed in ME as an alternative to the earlier borrowing. But it may also have been borrowed separately from OF, AN, or Latin. Conversely, a noun of Type 4 entering the language later than a related ME verb could in theory be derived from that verb.

The sample includes no coinages on native stems, and Marchand quotes none for the ME period. However, there are other signs of productivity in my sample. First, 66 out of the 210 words in *-ation* appear to be direct derivations from Latin: that is, conversions of Latin forms in *-atio* into French forms in *-acioun* rather than borrowings from French. (See Appendix 3.) This seems to me in itself to be an indication that the French suffix was analysed and understood. Two of these words, COGITACIOUN and TRANSMIGRACIOUN, are dated earlier than 1300, but the rest occur in the 14th century or later. In addition, 28 nouns form later or simultaneous alternatives to nouns in other suffixes on the same stem. 21 of these are analysable,

excluding two where the dates are doubtful (see Appendix 1, Table 55). Only one is earlier than the 14th century. Finally, although most of the nouns in my sample have counterparts in OF or Latin, and many in both, there is a small group of six words on Romance bases without recorded counterparts. These are DELIBERACIOUN (c1390), PREAMBULACIOUN (c1395), GOVERNACIOUN (c1410), ADDICACIOUN (c1450), DALIACION (c1475) and AMIGRACIOUN (1449). Two appear in the 14th century, the rest in the 15th. DALIACION is a later variant of DALIAUNCE (a1425 [a1349]), which was probably borrowed from AN (see 4.3.1.). AMIGRACIOUN has no related ME verb, but the *MED* suggests that it was formed in ME from a known ML verb.

Taken together, these indications suggest to me that *-ation* may have begun to be productive in the course of the 14th century.

### 5.3.2. *Analysability*

Following Pattison's (1975) criterion of chronological analysability, the total sample of 210 words in *-ation* is almost equally divided between analysable and unanalysable nouns, but with slightly more unanalysable (108 to 102). There are only a few of either in the sample for the early period, most of these being unanalysable borrowings. The 14th century is the most prolific period overall. Here they are almost equally divided, with a small majority of unanalysable nouns (60 to 54). In the 15th century the overall score for neologisms is still high, but the ratio is reversed, with 46 new analysables to 41 unanalysables. From this pattern the suffix would appear to have become analysable, and perhaps productive, in the course of the 14th century. Given the presence in late 14th century religious texts of Type 3 nouns derived directly from Latin, it seems clear that *-acioun* was by then analysed and understood. Marchand (1969: 259, 4.18.2.) believes that the pattern *-ify* *-ification* became productive during

the 14th century. This is not contradicted by my sample, where verbs and nouns in this pattern appear in the 14th or 15th centuries, the nouns all appearing later than the verbs.

### 5.3.3. *The sample in -ation*

In Table 4 there follows a complete list of the sample of 210 ME nouns in *-ation*, together with forms on the same stem. Forms later than the nouns are given in square brackets. Where double dates are given, the first indicates the date of the MS and the second the putative date of the original text. An asterisk indicates doubtful analysability status, due to dating uncertain within a margin of 25 years on either side of both noun and simplex form.

**Table 4: NOUNS IN *-ation* IN 3 ME PERIODS WITH FORMS ON THE SAME STEM**

#### **The early period (1150-1300)**

##### *Unanalysable nouns of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200) cogitacioun		
commendacioun	[a1382 V commenden]	[c1385 N commendement]
contemplacioun	[c1450 V contemplen]	[(c1395) N contemplanee]
meditacioun		
indignacioun		
tribulacioun		
1297 transmigracioun	[1430-40 V transmigraten]	

##### *Analysable nouns of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200) temptacioun*	c1230(?a1200) V tempten	
salvacoun	c1230(?a1200) V saven	[ c1330(?c1300) N savement]

#### **The 14th century**

##### *Unanalysable nouns of the 14th century*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1325(c1300) incarnacioun	[a1400 V incarnen]	
a1400(c1303) revelacioun	[a1500(c1400) V revelen]	
inspiracioun		
a1400(a1325) annunciacioun	[1430 V annuncien]	[c1375 pp annunciat] [(1430) N annuncion]
generacioun	[a1450(a1338)V gendren]	
conspiracioun	[c1390(a1376) V conspiren]	[(1357) N conspiracie] [a1393 N conspirement]

a1333 (1340)	administracioun conversacioun simulacioun	[?a1425(c1380) V administren] [?a1425(c1380)V conversen] [(a1420) V simulen]	[(1455) N conversement]
a1500(c1340) c 1350 ?a1390(?c1350)	obstinacioun abhominacioun delectacioun	[c1450(?c1400) V abhorren] [?a1425 V delecten]	
(1350-4) c1390(?c1350) c1440(?c1350) c1374	reputacioun determinacioun interpretacioun consideracioun speculacioun mutacioun	[c1475(c1399) V reputen] [?a1425(c1380) V determinen] [(c1384) v interpreten] [?a1425(c1380) V consideren]	
(1375) c1400(a1376) ?a1425(c1380)	estimacioun mitigacioun demonstracioun	[c1430(a1410) V estimen] [a1475 V mitigaten]	[(a1420) N demonstraunce]
c1430(c1380) (a1382)	perturbacioun* replicacioun observacioun	[(c1385) V perturben] [a1382 V replien] [c1390 V observen]	a1250 N observaunce [1567 N observancy] [?a1500 N prefiguraunce]
	prefiguracioun lamentacioun	[a1500(?c1425)V prefiguren] [a1500(a1450) V lamenten]	
c1386 (a1387) 1389 c1390	interrogacioun resignacioun exaltacioun preparacioun altercacioun	(a1387) V resignen] [c1430(a1410) V exalten]	[1464 N resignation]
(c1390) c1475(1392)	arbitracioun pronosticacioun prolongacioun* relaxacioun*	[(1425) V arbitren] [?a1425 V pronosticaten] [c1450(?c1408) V prolongen] [(a1398) V relaxen]	1532rev(c1385) N arbitrement
(a1393)	stipticacioun exalacioun recreacioun invocacioun	[?a1425 V stiptiken] [a1400 V exalen] [c1425 V recreaten]	[a1500 N recreance]
(c1395)	calcinacioun albificacioun fermentacioun	[(c1395) V calcinen] [(a1398) V fermenten]	
a1450(a1397) (a1398)	anticipacioun elevacioun denominacioun modulacioun lineacioun	[1533 V anticipate, OED] [(c1422) V elevaten] [(c1454) V denominen]	[?a1474(?a1425) N lineament]
a1425(a1400)	augmentacioun aspiracioun* exacerbacioun separacioun hesitacioun illustracioun imitacioun	[a1400 V augmenten] [a1450(a1400) V aspiren] [?a1425 V separaten]	
a1400	suffocacioun inflacioun adulacioun coagulacioun opilacioun melioracioun	[?a1425 V suffocaten] [?a1425 V inflaten] [?a1425 V coagul(at)en] [?a1425 V oppilaten]	



*Analysable nouns of the 14th century*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1400(c1303) visitacioun	a1250 V visiten	
a1325 occupacioun*	a1325 V occupien	
a1400(a1325) significacioun	c1275 V signifien	c1275 N signifiounce [a1400 N signifaunce]
c1330 taxacioun*	c1300 V taxen	
(1340) imaginacioun	a1500(c1340) V imaginen	
a1500(c1340) translacioun*	a1400(a1325) V translaten	
(1345-6) excusacioun*	c1350(a1333) V excusen	
c1390(?c1350) edificacioun*	a1450(a1338) V edifiën	
reconciliacioun*	c1390(a1350) V reconcilen	
c1440(c1350) multiplicacioun	a1275(?c1150) V multiplien	
c1450(c1370) desperacioun	a1500(c1340) V despeiren	a1250 N desperaunce [c1385 N accusation]
c1380 accusacioun	c1300 V accusen	
transmutacioun	c1374 V transmuwen	
conjuracioun		
?a1425(c1380) supplicacioun*	?a1425(c1380) V supplicaten	
continuacioun	a1425(c1340) V continuen	a1425(a1349) N continuaunce
declaracioun	?a1400(a1338) V declaren	
1450(c1380) duracioun	c1325 V duren	[c1443 N duraunce]
c1450(c1380) dissimulacioun*	(c1380) V dissimulen	
reparacioun	?a1425(?a1350) V reparen	
?a1430(?1383) presentacioun	c1400(?a1300) V presenten	a1400(c1303) N presentement c1330 N presence
(c1384) condempnacioun	(1340) V condempnen	
salutacioun	(a1382) V saluten	
c1384 acceptacioun*	c1430(c1380) V accepten	c1384 N accepcioun
1532rev(c1385) usurpacioun	a1325 V usurpen	
a1425(c1385) deliberacioun*	a1425(c1385) V deliberen	[c1450(c1400) N deliberaunce]
1390 adjuracioun	1425(a1382) V adjuren	(a1382) N adjurement
(c1390) supportacioun	c1384 V supporten	[c1450(?a1422) N supportaile]
examinacioun	a1400(c1303) V examinen	(1389) N examenement
mortificacioun	(a1382) V mortifiën	
(a1393) supplantacioun	a1500(c1340) V supplanten	
congelacioun	a1393 V congelen	c1385 N congelement
calculacioun*	c1400(c1378) V calculen	
distillacioun*	a1500(?c1378) V distillen	
sublimacioun*	c1475(1392) V sublimen	
fixacioun	c1450(c1370) V fixen	
lineacioun		c1300(c1225) N line ?a1475(?a1475) N lineament]
restoracioun	c1325(c1300) V restoren	a1400(a1325) N restoraunce [a1500(c1400) N restorement]
a1425(c1395) alienacioun	c1350 V alienen	
inclinacioun	a1400(a1325) V enclinen	
declinacioun	a1376 V declinen	
(c1395) mollificacioun	c1475(1392) V mollifiën	
preambulacioun*	[(1402) V preamblen]	(c1395) N preamble
?a1475(a1396) illuminacioun	a1450(?1348) V illuminen	
(a1398) alteracioun	a1425(c1385) V alteren	[a1500(c1425) N alterite] [a1500(1413) N alterment]
applicacioun	?a1475(?a1350) V applien	
recordacioun	c1230(?a1200) V recorden	
(1399) renunciacioun*	?a1425(c1380) V renouncen	
a1425(a1400) comunicacioun	a1400(?a1325) V comunen	(a1382) N communioun

	gloriacioun	(1340) V glorifien	
	sanctificacioun*	a1400 V seinten	[a1500(?a1475) V sanctificaten]
a1400	ulceracioun*	a1400 V ulceren	
?a1425(a1400)	reservacioun	1357 V reserven	
a1500(?a1400)	representacioun*	c1400(1389) V representen	

### The 15th century

#### *Unanalysable nouns of the 15th century*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1475(?c1400) sophisticacioun		
c1450(?c1408) computacioun	[(1449) V computen (pp)]	
a1500(c1410) veneracioun		
a1450(1412)	nominacioun	
?a1425	prefocacioun	
	perforacioun	
	indicacioun	
	medicacioun	?1400 medicament
	claudicacioun	
	debilitacioun	
	fatigacioun	
	infiltracioun	
	obfuscacioun	
	moderacioun	
	reduplicacioun	
	palpitacioun	
	appodiacioun	
	approximacioun	
	ablacioun	
	pregnacioun	a1425(c1385) A prenaunt [1529 N pregnancy] 1546 N pregnance]
?a1475(?a1425)	admiracion	
	narracioun	
a1500(?c1425)	evitacioun	
	peregrinacioun	
	ablactacioun	
a1475(?a1430)	frequentacioun	[c1450 A frequent] a1425(a1400) N frequence [(1460) N frequentaunce]
c1475(c1445)	invitacioun	
(1449)	amigracioun	
(c1449)	vituperacioun	
a1450	perambulacioun	
a1500(a1450)	radiacioun	[1601 N radiance] [1646 N radiancy]
c1450	evocacioun	
	dubitacioun	
	perpetracioun	[c1475(1459) V perpetren]
c1475(1459)	confutacioun	
a1460	militacioun	(a1460) N militaunce
a1475	precipitacioun	
1490	deploracioun	
a1500	radicacion	

*Analysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1400	coronacioun	a1225(?OE) V corounen	a1121 N coroune
c1460(?c1400)	vexacioun*	1460(?c1400) V vexen	
c1460(?c1400)	molestacioun	a1425(c1385) V molesten	
c1475(?c1400)	sequestracioun	(c1384) V sequestren	
a1450(1408)	recommendacioun	c1375) V recommenden	
		c1380 V recommaunden	
c1410	affirmacioun	?a1400(a1338) V affermen	
	governacioun	c1375(?c1280) V governen	c1450(c1370) N governaunce
c1430(a1410)	transfiguracioun	a1400(a1325) V transfiguren	
c1450(1410)	transformacioun	?a1425(c1380) V transformen	
a1500(?c1415)	perseveracioun	a1425(c1385) V perseveren	(1340) N perseveraunce
c1425(a1420)	relegacioun*	1425(a1420) V relegaten	
?a1425	reversacioun	(a1333) V reversen	1394 N reversion [1457 N revertence] [1488 N reversall] [(1451) N alleviaunce] (1340) N magnificence c1384 N magnificence
	alleviacioun*	?a1475(?a1425) V alleviaten	
	magnificacioun	a1382 V magnifien	
	abbreviacioun*	1607(?a1425) V abbreviaten	
	derivacioun	(c1385) V deriven	
	denudacioun*	?a1425 V denuden	
	cancellacioun	(1399) V cancellen	
	maturacioun	a1400 V maturen	
	infrigidacioun*	?a1425 V infrigiden	
	aggregacioun	c1400(a1349) V aggreggen	
	spasmacioun	c1475(1392) V spasmen	?a1425(1373) N spasme
	suppuracioun*	?a1425 V suppuren	
	transpiracioun*	?a1425 V transpiren	
	carminacioun*	?a1425 V carminen	
	quassacioun		
?a1475(?a1425)	denunciacioun	a1325 V denouncen	
	pronunciacioun	(a1338) V pronouncen	
	martirizacion	a1225(?a1200) V martiren c1450 V martyrizen	OE N martyr c1175(OE?) N martirdom (1340) N martirement a1400(c1300) N marterie c1475(?c1400) N allegaunce ?a1425(a1400) N gloriacioun 1389 N assignement
c1425	allegacioun	c1300 V alleggen	
a1500(?c1425)	glorificacioun	(1340) V glorifien	
(1432)	assignacioun	c1300 V assignen	
?1440	ablaqueacioun*	?1440 V ablaqueaten	
(?1440)	inoculacioun*	?1440 V inoculaten	
(1440)	defraudacioun	c1390(a1376) V defrauden	
(c1443)	alternacioun	c1450(1410) V alternen]	
	argumentacioun	?a1425(c1380) V arguen (c1390) V argumenten	a1333 N argument
c1475(c1445)	reportacioun	a1425(c1385) V reporten	
1447	solemnisacioun	(a1382) V solemnisen	
1447/8	allocacioun	a1325 V allouen	c1400(c13780) N allouaunce
(a1449)	deformacioun	a1425(c1400) V deformen	
(1450)	adnullation	(1395) V annullen	[1491 N annulment]
	contentacion	a1425(?a1400) V contenten	1437 N contentement
c1450	addicacioun	?a1425(c1380) V adden	(a1388) N addicoun a1400 N additament

(a1464)	annotacioun	a1475(?a1425) V annoten	
c1475	daliacion	c1330(?a1300) V dalien	a1425(a1349) N daliaunce
a1500	anterioracioun	c1425 V anterien	

#### 5.4. Semantics

Kastovsky states that *-ation* ‘is the only loan suffix that derives action nouns on a large scale [i.e. in modE], since it is the only option for verbs ending in *-ize*, *-ate* and *-ify*’ (1985: 224, 2.2.6). In Chapters 3 and 4, however, we have seen that in ME *-ment* and *-ance* could also attach to stems in *-ize* and *-ify* (see Tables 2 and 3). In his table, Kastovsky adds ‘factitive’ (resultative) occurrences to action (1985: 226, 2.2.1.). Marchand remarks that substantives in *-ation* do not have concrete meanings; otherwise, he says only that ‘**-ation** falls into the group of impersonal deverbal substantives with their various semantic possibilities’ and refers especially to *-ment* for comparison (1969: 261, 4.18.6.). I shall, however, attempt to show that, as Marchand himself says, the ‘totality of combinations’ for this suffix, as for others, ‘cannot be the same as that of any other sign’ (1969: 227.8).

##### 5.4.1. 1150-1300: *unanalysable nouns*

There are seven unanalysable nouns in the sample for the early period, six appearing with definitions in *Ancrene Riwle* (c1230[?a1200]). They are variously distributed across three semantic areas.

###### 5.4.1.1. *Instrument*

TRIBULACIOUN (c1230[?1200]) and TEMPTATION first appear in a context suggesting instrumental meanings for both:

Nane wattres þe beoð worldliche *tribulatiuns* nane *temptatiuns* ... ne mahen  
þis luue acwenchen

Ancr. 205/5, *MED*

‘No floods [by which I mean] worldly means of trouble or temptation can quench that love’.

#### 5.4.1.2. *Result state*

CONTEMPLACIOUN and INDIGNACIOUN are defined in *Ancrene Riwe* as mental states.

#### 5.4.1.3. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

The other four all occur in the area of specific instance. .

MEDITACIOUN and COGITACIOUN are explained or glossed in general terms, but as plural instances of thinking. The former has three entries in the *MED* from *Ancrene Riwe* alone; all are in the plural, e.g:

Hali *meditaciuns* beoð bicluppet in a verse ... ‘þenche ofte ... of þine sunnen ... of hellewa ... of þine ahne deað’

Ancr. 123/16, *MED*

‘Holy meditations are called in a verse: “think[ing] often ... of your sins ... of the pain of hell ... of your own death.’

COGITACIOUN, translated from Latin, seems to have meant ‘passing thoughts’:

*Cogitaciuns* beoð fleoinde þahtes þe ne lasteð nawt

Ancr. 786, *MED*

‘Cogitations are passing thoughts that do not last’.

COMMENDACIOUN is the occasion of the office of the dead, though later it appears in Chaucer with the modern instrumental meaning ‘expression of approbation’ (CT. Pars.I. 473-4, *MED*). TRANSMIGRACIOUN (c1325[c1300]) appears in the *Gloucester Chronicle* as the ‘transmigration of Babylon’, glossed by the *OED* as the ‘removal [removing] of the Jews into captivity at Babylon’.

#### 5.4.2. *1150-1300: analysable nouns*

There are only two analysable nouns in the sample for this period, both also from *Ancrene Riwe* (c1230[?a1200]). SALVACIOUN is a passive state.

TEMPTACIOUN first appears in the same instrumental context as *tribulacioun* quoted above, but also occurs in the same text as a general act or fact:

I þe *temptatiun* he [God] haved i set to þe feond a mearke

Ancr. 118/110, *MED*

'In [the act of] temptation God has given the devil something to aim at'.

#### 5.4.2.1. *Summary*

There are only nine nouns in the total sample for this period, seven being unanalysable. A small majority of five are in the action area.

#### 5.4.3. *The 14th century: unanalysable nouns*

The number of unanalysable borrowings rises to 60 in the sample for this period.

##### 5.4.3.1. *Instrument*

10 nouns first appear with instrumental meanings. These are INTERPRETACIOUN 'meaning [by which to interpret]' (c1390[?c1350]), PERTURBACIOUN 'stimulant' (?a1425[c1380]), REPLICACIOUN 'matter for [by which to] reply' (c1430[c1390] ), OBSERVACIOUN 'religious observance [means of observing religion]' (a1382), PREFIGURACIOUN 'words by which an event is prefigured' (a1382), ARBITRACIOUN 'faculty or power of judging' (c1390), STIPTICACIOUN 'astringent medication' (c1475[1392]), PRONOSTICACIOUN 'symptom'(c1475[1392]), INVOCACIOUN 'words by which to invoke' (a1393) and EXACERBACIOUN 'provocation.[means of provoking]' (a1425[a1400]).

##### 5.4.3.2. *Object*

GENERACIOUN (a1325), DETERMINACIOUN (1350-4) and EXALACIOUN (a1393) have the objective meanings 'things generated', 'things decided' and 'things exhaled'.

##### 5.4.3.3. *Result/state*

INCARNACIOUN (c1325[c1300]) signifies the Incarnation of Christ, a passive state. Other passive states are PROLONGACIOUN 'being prolonged' (c1475[1392]),

OPIIACIOUN ‘being obscured’ (a1400) and MELIORACIOUN ‘being improved’ (a1400), all quoted in medical contexts. REPUTACIOUN (c1390[?c1350]) in its first context means ‘being well thought of’:

Rihtwys men in þis liuyng.  
Schul not beo of *reputacioun*,  
But rapur euer beo put adoun  
Svrn. Leg. 79/1017, *MED*  
‘In this way of living, upright men will not be well thought of, but rather will always be put down’.

DELECTACIOUN (c1390[?c1350]) and ABHOMINACIOUN (c1350) are experiential states, the former active:

... þat luttel *delectaciun* þat he feled in his etyng  
SVron.Leg. 74/730, *MED*  
‘... that little pleasure that he took in his food’.

while the latter is translated from the passive verb *abhominabitur*:

Our Lord shal haue in *abhominaciun* ... þe treccherous  
MP Psalter 5.7., *MED*  
‘Our Lord shall hold the wicked ... in a state of abomination’ [i.e.  
‘The wicked shall be abominated by the Lord’].

Two more express the results of action. They are RECREACIOUN ‘state of recovery’ (a1393):

Phisque of his conserve  
Makith many a restauracioun  
Unto his *recreacioun*  
Gower CA 6.638, *MED*  
‘Medicine of his making up effects many a cure leading to his recovery’,

and DENOMINACIOUN ‘drawing’ (a1398), which first appears in the plural:

... aungels beþ I peint in bodilich liknes ... But by *denominaciouns* of lymes  
þat beþ I seye, vnseye worchinges of hevenliche inwittis beþ vndirstonde  
Trev.Barth. 13a/a, *MED*  
‘... angels are painted in the likeness of bodies ... But by drawings [drawn representations] of visible limbs we understand the invisible workings of heavenly minds’.

5.4.3.4. *Action: Quality*

The rest of the unanalysable sample for this period falls into the action area.

SIMULACIOUN (1340) first appears as a pure (negative) quality:

... þerof wexep uele Zeunes ase ... lozengerie, *simulacion* ...

Ayenb. 23/6, *MED*

‘... from this come many sins, such as ... lying, dissimulation ...’

OBSTINACIOUN (a1500[c1340]) first appears with a definition:

... *obstynacioun* when thai dwell in thaire synn aye til thaire ded

Rolle Psalter 13.5, *MED*

... ‘obstinacy, when they persist in their sins until their death’.

INSPIRACIOUN (a1400[1303]) is the divine influence leading to conversion, while

ILLUSTRACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) is the quality of divine brightness:

Anticrist ... oure lord ... schal destrye with þe *illustracion* of his comyng

Paul Epist. 2 Thes. 2.8., *MED*

‘Our Lord ... shall destroy the Antichrist ... with the brightness of his coming’.

MITIGACIOUN (c1400[a1376]) is the quality of leniency:

But for þi muchel mercy, *mytygacioun* I beseche,

Dampne me no *ȝt* at domisday for þat I dede so ille

PPI A (1) 5.243, *MED*

‘But by your great mercy, I beg you to be lenient. Do not condemn me at Doomsday because I did such evil’.

ADULACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) is defined c1400 as the vice of flattery; however, its

first, slightly earlier appearance refers to the practise as well as the vice:

We han not ben in þe woord of *adulacion* any tyme as *ȝee* knowe

Paul Epist. 1 Thes. 2.5., *MED*

‘As you know, we have never been given to flattering by words’.

These are all moral or religious terms. An exception is the first attribution for

CONSPIRACIOUN (a1400[a1325]), which refers to a secular act in its moral context:

O nith cums bitternes o thoght ...

And *conspiraciun*

Cursor 27662, *MED*



‘At night comes bitterness of thought and [the act of] conspiracy’.

#### 5.4.3.5. *Action: Fact*

Most unanalysable action nouns in this period come into the field of general fact. Six are theological terms. REVELACIOUN (a1400[1303]), CONSIDERACIOUN ‘meditation’ (c1440[?c1350]), IMITACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) and SEPARACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) first occur with general definitions or glosses in theological contexts, as does SPECULACIOUN (c1374), referring specifically to

*þe speculacioun* or lokynge of þe deuyne þouȝt  
Chaucer Boeth. V.pr.ii (1868) 153, *OED*  
‘meditating or looking on the divine intellect’.

ANTICIPACIOUN ‘anticipating an event in a narrative’ (a1450[a1397]) is first defined in Wyclif as a term in Biblical exegesis.

Most of the rest are learned, scientific or alchemical terms. ALTERCACIOUN (c1390) was also first used by Chaucer, in the context of formal university debate:

In scole is greet *altercacioun*  
In this matere and greet disputisoun  
Chaucer CT NP. B. 4427, *MED*  
‘At university there is much debating and arguing on this subject’.

ASPIRACIOUN (a1398) is first used as a phonetic term with its modern meaning, and AUGMENTACIOUN (a1398) is first listed in a scientific context as one of the processes of change. CALCINACIOUN (a1393) is an alchemical term, defined in the *MED* as ‘the process of reducing a substance to powder ... by heating it’.

APPROBACIOUN ‘proving [metal]’ makes its first appearances in the same context, Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* (4.2518 ), while ALBIFICACIOUN, CITRINACIOUN and FERMENTACIOUN all appear in an alchemical context in Chaucer’s *Canon Yeoman’s Tale* (c1395, G.807, 817), meaning respectively the whitening, yellowing

and effervescing of metal. RELAXACIOUN ‘breaking’ (c1475[1392]) and SUFFOCACIOUN (a1400), translated from Latin, first appear in medical contexts.

ADMINISTRACIOUN (a1333) first appeared with its modern meaning, CONVERSACIOUN ‘behaviour’ (1340) and PREPARACIOUN ‘organising’ (1340) also first occur in general contexts.

#### 5.4.3.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

ANNUNCIACIOUN (a1400[a1325]) and EXALTACIOUN (1389) denote occasions in the Christian story, the annunciation of the Virgin and the exaltation of the Holy Cross. DEMONSTRACIOUN (?a1425[c1380]) is a scientific term, and ELEVACIOUN (a1398) an astronomical term. The less specialised MUTACIOUN (?a1425[c1380]), INTERROGACIOUN (c1386) and HESITACIOUN (c1475[a1400]) all first appear in the plural, suggesting separate instances of activity.

LAMENTACIOUN (a1382) is first used as a specific action noun with *maken*:

We han maad *lamentacioun*, and *ze* han not wept  
WBible (1) Luke 7. 32, *MED*  
‘We have lamented, and you have not wept’.

RESIGNACIOUN ‘the act of resigning an office’ (a1387) first appears in a hypothetical context, but illustrated by a specific example:

He reserved to hymself þe firste benefice þat voyded by deef, by *resignacioun*,  
oper by translacioun  
Trev. Higd. 8.309, *MED*  
‘He reserved for himself the first benefice that should fall vacant by death, by the holder resigning or by his being transferred’.

#### 5.4.4. *The 14th century: analysable nouns*

There are 54 analysable nouns in this period, slightly fewer than unanalysable borrowings.

#### 5.4.4.1. *Instrument*

EXCUSACIOUN ‘excuse’ (1345-6) is the means of being excused.

IMAGINACIOUN (1340) and RECORDACIOUN (a1398) are the mental faculties of imagining and remembering. SALUTACIOUN ‘greeting’ (c1384), PREAMBULACIOUN ‘preamble’ (c1395), DECLARACIOUN ‘statement’ (?a1425[c1380]), SUPPORTACIOUN ‘words of support’ (c1390) and RENUNCIACIOUN (1399) signify verbal means of greeting, declaring, supporting and renouncing.

#### 5.4.4.2. *Result/state*

LINEACIOUN (a1398) is a denominal synonym of the Latin borrowing LINIAMENT ‘feature [product of line]’ (see 3.4.7.3.). INCLINACIOUN ‘state of being inclined’ (a1395) has connections with astrology and is first used by Chaucer to mean ‘preordained disposition’:

I folwed ay myn *inclinacioun*,  
By vertu of my constellacioun  
Chaucer CT. Fkl. F.1033, *MED*  
‘I always followed my disposition according to my star sign’.

The others in this category are all theological terms. Five are passive.

CONDEMPNACIOUN ‘being damned’ (c1384) first occurs as a theological state in the *Wyclif Bible* (Rom. 5/18), as does ALIENACIOUN ‘being estranged from God’ (a1425[c1395]), *Wyclif Bible* [2], Job 31.3), while Rom. 6.19 in the same version has SANCTIFICACIOUN as the opposite state to sin. EDIFICACIOUN ‘being instructed’ (c1390[?a1350]) and RECONCILIACIOUN ‘being reconciled’ (c1390[c1350]) also occur in theological contexts. The other three are experiential: DESPERACIOUN (c1450[c1370]) is the theological state of despair, an alternative form to the older

borrowing DESPERAUNCE (a1250), while GLORIACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) is the reverse:

Mych is my trist at *zow*; myche is my *gloriacioun* for *zow*  
 Paul. Epist. 2. Cor. 7. 4., *MED*  
 ‘Great is my trust in you; great is my glorying in you.’

COMMUNICACIOUN (a1400) occurs for ‘communion’ (both a state and an occasion) in the Pauline Epistle (2 Cor. 13.13).

#### 5.4.4.3. *Action: Quality*

CONTINUACIOUN (?a1425[c1380]) first expressed the verbal action in its moral or qualitative context:

That it schal be cause of *contynuacioun* and exercisyng to gode folk  
 Chaucer Bo. 4. Pr. 6. 350, *MED*  
 ‘So that it should be the cause of perseverance and practice in good people’.

SUPPLANTACIOUN (a1392) is first defined as a vice:

The vice of *Supplantacioun* ...  
 Ful ofte time hath overthrowe  
 The worschipe of an other man  
 Gower CA 2. 2327, *MED*  
 ‘The vice of usurping has very often overthrown respect for another man’.

DURACIOUN (1450[c1380]) is the fact of lasting and also the quality of lastingness:

Fame ... yaf hem eke *duracioun*  
 Chaucer HF 2214, *MED*  
 ‘Fame ... thus gave them lastingness’.

#### 5.4.4.4. *Action: Fact*

MULTIPLICACIOUN (c1440[c1350]) seems to bear an action sense in its first context:

A hundrethe thousande er dyssayued with *multyplycacioun* of wordes and  
 of orysouns  
 Mirror St. Edm. 37/1, *MED*  
 ‘A hundred thousand are deceived by multiplying words and prayers’.

ACCEPTACIOUN (c1384) ‘act of accepting’ appears in the Wyclif Bible.

A trewe word and worthi al *acceptacioun*

W.Bible (2) 1 Tim. 4.9., *MED*

‘A true word and worth everyone’s accepting’.

APPLICACIOUN (a1398) is given by the MED as ‘influence’ or the act of influencing:

Bicause of bindinge & onynge þat þe soule hap wip þe body, disposicions  
& passions þat sprengiþ of þe body reboundiþ in þe soule by a maner  
*applicacioun* of þe fleisch

Trev. Barth. 78a/6, *MED*

‘Because of the bond and union of the soul with the body, moods and  
passions that arise from the body are reflected in the mind, by a kind of  
influencing of the flesh’.

OCCUPACIOUN (a1325) and PRESENTACIOUN (?a1430[?1383]) first appear in  
generalised legal contexts, signifying respectively the illegal possession of property and  
the recommendation of a clergyman to a benefice. ACCUSACIOUN ‘prosecution’  
(?a1425[c1380]) is first recorded in Chaucer’s *Boethius*, in a passage giving advice to  
lawyers:

... yif the office of advocates wolde betre profiten to men, it scholde be  
torned into the habyt of *accusacioun* ... That is to seyn, thei schulden accuse  
schrewes, and not excusen hem

Chaucer, Bo. 4. pr. 4.300, *MED*

‘... the advocate’s job would do more good to humanity if it were  
customarily that of prosecuting ... That is to say, they should prosecute  
criminals, not defend them.’

SUPPLICACIOUN ‘praying’ (?a1425[c1380]) appears in a theological passage in the  
same text:

This is oonly the manere (that is to seyn, hope and preieris) for which it  
semeth that men mowen spekyn with God, and by resoun of *supplicacioun*  
be conjoynded to thilke cleernesse

Chaucer, Bo. 5. pr. 3.224, *MED*

‘This is the only way (that is to say, hope and prayers) by which it seems that  
men may speak with God, and through their praying be conjoynded to this  
clarity.’

TRANSMUTACIOUN (c1380) also first appears in a theological context:

... at God is not *transmutacioun*

Wyclif Sel. Wks II. 297, *OED*

‘... there is no changing in God’.

MORTIFICACIOUN [of sin] first appears in the *Parson's Tale* (c1390), in a mimicry of theological language. ADJURACIOUN (1390) also first appears in the same source:

Thilke horrible sweryng of *adiuracioun* and coniuracioun, as doon thise false enchauntours

Chaucer CT. Pars. 1. 603, *MED*

'These hair-raising oaths of adjuring and conjuring [spirits], such as these fake magicians utter'.

ILLUMINACIOUN (?a1475[a1396]) makes a first appearance in a genuinely theological text, Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*:

Dis is þe *illuminacion* of vnderstandyng in delicis of lofyng

Hilton SP 1.9.5b, *MED*

'This is the enlightening of the intellect by the delights of love'.

Finally, SIGNIFICACIOUN (a1400[a1325]) near the beginning of the century, and REPRESENTACIOUN (a1500(?a1400)) at the end, both mean the fact of symbolising a theological or Biblical truth.

The other analysable nouns in this sub-section are all learned terms. Five terms first appear in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* (a1393, Book 7: 182, Book 4: 2513, 2514, 2517, 2518), in passages expounding mathematics (CALCULACIOUN) and alchemy (FIXACIOUN 'solidifying', SUBLIMACIOUN 'refining', DISTILLACIOUN and CONGELACIOUN). MOLLIFICACIOUN (c1395) appears in Chaucer's *Canon Yeoman's Tale* (G.852) also in an alchemical context, while DECLINACIOUN (c1395) is an astronomical term used by Chaucer in the *Franklin's Tale* (F. 1033) and also to be found in grammatical, medical and surgical texts (see *MED*).

ALTERACIOUN (a1398) is a translation of Latin *alteratio* 'making other', and first appeared in a list of different kinds of change:

Ðere beþ sixe maner meovingis þat ben i-clepid generacioun, corrupcioun, *alteracioun*, etc.

Trev. Barth. 121 a/b, *MED*

'There are six kinds of changing, which are called generation, corruption, alteration, etc.'

ULCERACIOUN (a1400) is a medical term.

5.4.4.5. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

VISITACIOUN (a1400[c1303]) and EXAMINACIOUN (1389) both first occur in specific contexts with the meaning ‘inspection’. TAXACIOUN (c1330) first appears as a specific example in a hypothetical context:

If þe king in his lond makeþ a *taxacioun* ...  
 Hit shal be so forpinched, etc  
 Why werre 88/301, *MED*  
 ‘If the King taxes his country ... it will be so badly squeezed, etc.’

TRANSLACIOUN (a1500[c1340]) first appears with its modern meaning ‘act of translating [a text]’. CONJURACIOUN (1380) appears in Chaucer in a specific reference to a conspiracy:

A *conjuracioun*, which I clepe a confederacye, that was cast ayens this  
 tyraunt  
 Chaucer, Bo. 2 .pr. 6.61, *MED*  
 ‘An act of conspiracy, which I call a confederacy, that was aimed at this  
 tyrant’,

though later he uses it as a generalised synonym of ADJURACIOUN ‘swearing’ (1390, see 5.4.4.4. above). DISSIMULACIOUN (c1450[c1380]) is first used by Chaucer in the plural:

Moo *dissymulacions*  
 And feyned reparacions  
 Chaucer HF 687, *MED*  
 ‘More acts of dissimulating and of pretended making up’.

USURPACIOUN (1532rev(c1385)) first appears with specific reference to false gods:

Diuels ben goddes ... But neither ben they trewe ne everlastinge; and their  
 name of godliheed th[e]y han by usurpacion  
 Usk TL 41/117, *MED*  
 ‘Devils are gods ... but they are neither true nor everlasting; and their godly  
 status was achieved by an act of usurpation’.

DELIBERACIOUN (c1390) appears in Chaucer with its modern meaning:  
 It hadde ben necessarie mo conseilours and moore *deliberacioun* [vr  
 deliberacions] to parfome youre emprise

CT.Mel. B 2443, *MED*

‘More advisers and more deliberating would have been necessary to perform your enterprise’.

RESTORACIOUN (a1393) was first used by Gower in *Confessio Amantis* to mean ‘act of curing’. RESERVACIOUN (?a1425[a1400]) is a legal term. Though its earliest context is generalised, the plural reference is to hypothetically specific cases:

De King sent certeyne embassetours to þe Pope, preying hem þat he sholde leue of and melle not in his court of þe kepynges & *reservaciouns* of benefeces in Engelond

(Corp-C) 326/30, *MED*

‘The King sent certain ambassadors to the Pope, urging them that he should leave off meddling in his court with cases of keeping back and reserving benefices in England’.

Finally, COMMUNICACIOUN (a1425[a1400]) in the Epistle to the Corinthians meant both the experiential state of communing (see 5.4.4.2.) and the occasion of the communion service.

#### 5.4.4.6. *Summary*

The 14th-century semantic profiles are very similar for analysable and unanalysable nouns, with a majority for both in the action area (38 unanalysable, 37 analysable). Most of these first occur in contexts of general fact (19 unanalysable, 21 analysable). Only seven unanalysable and three analysable nouns express qualities, but (omitting ambiguous COMMUNICACIOUN) 12 each of unanalysable and analysable nouns occur in contexts of specific instance or occasion. Instrumental and result/state senses are equally divided among unanalysables, while among analysables (again omitting COMMUNICACIOUN) result/state slightly outnumbers instrumentals by nine to eight.

#### 5.4.5. *The 15th century: unanalysable nouns*

There are 41 unanalysable nouns in the sample for this period.



#### 5.4.5.1. *Instrument*

INDICACIOUN (?a1425) first appears in Chauliac in the medical sense ‘sign of treatment to be given’, which also occurs today. INVITACIOUN (c1475[c1445]) and CONFUTACIOUN ((c1475[1459]) have their modern meanings of words by which to invite or confute. AMIGRACIOUN (1449) is a legal term, possibly ME in origin, meaning permission for a religious to move to another monastery.

#### 5.4.5.2. *Result/state*

FATIGACIOUN ( a1425), OBFUSCACIOUN, glossed as ‘darkness or blackness’ and DEBILITACIOUN (?a1425) are also passive states, as are ABLACTACIOUN ‘being weaned’ (a1500[?c1475]) and RADICACIOUN ‘rootedness [being rooted]’ (a1500). ADMIRACIOUN (c1425) and DEPLORACIOUN (1490), which are active mental states, as well as PREGNACIOUN (?a1425), a physical one, also appear in this category.

#### 5.4.5.3. *Action: Quality*

MODERACIOUN (?a1425) has its modern meaning. SOPHISTICACIOUN (c1475[?c1400] ‘sophistry’), though originally denominal, has a sense which involves action (speaking) as well as a moral attribute.

#### 5.4.5.4. *Action: Fact*

COMPUTACIOUN (c1450[?c1408]) first appears as a synonym for CALCULACIOUN in a generalised context:

... Mercurius  
 Hath also gret experience  
 In crafte of calculacioun  
 And eke of *computacioun*.  
 Lydgate RS 1698, *MED*  
 ... Mercury has also great experience in the skills of calculating and working with numbers’.

VENERACIOUN ‘act of showing reverence’ (a1500[c1410]) and VITUPERACIOUN (c1449), its near opposite, are also generalised:

- (1) Dis wurshepe and *veneracioun* is no seruyse ne subieccioun of hym þat doth it to þe thyng þat he doth it to  
Dives & P. 1. 108, *MED*  
‘This worshipping and showing reverence is no slavery or subjection to the object of it on the part of the man who does it’.
- (2) Whanne vpon eny thing spechis or writingis be maad bi way of commendacioun or bi way of *vituperacioun*, tho spechis ... be myche favorid bi figuris excusing what ellis in hem schulde be vntrewe and defauti  
Pecock Repr. 72, *MED*  
‘When speeches or writings are made on anything by way of commending or abusing it, those speeches ... are much graced with rhetoric to gloss over what is lacking or dishonest in them elsewhere’.

PREFOCACIOUN ‘suffocating’, ABLACIOUN ‘surgically removing’, LAPIDIFICACIOUN ‘hardening’, APPROXIMATION ‘nearing’, PALPITACIOUN and PERFORACIOUN (the last two with their modern meanings) all appear in Chauliac (?a1425) in lists of medical terms with their definitions. INFILTRACIOUN in the latinate *Chauliac* (1) appears in the native version *Chauliac* (2) as ‘tying together of the bones and ligaments’, and REDUPLICACIOUN as ‘doubling again’.

MEDICACIOUN, given in *Chauliac* (2) as ‘leching’ (leaching), appears in *Chauliac* (1) as the act of treating disease.

NARRACIOUN (?a1475[?a1425]) in its first context means the act of telling stories, and PERAMBULACIOUN (a1450) is the walking of boundaries, first appearing in a generalised legal context. EVOCACIOUN is explained as a grammatical term in the *Battlefield Grammar* (c1450), and RADIACIOUN (a1500[a1450]) in its first context is the general rather than specific shining of the sun:

The mone is brighter than other sterres and, thurgh the good *radiacion* of the sonne, more shynynger  
Ashmole SSecr. 18/5, *MED*  
‘The moon is brighter than other stars and, through the sun’s helpful radiating, shines more’.

MILITACIOUN (a1460) is neatly distinguished from a variant on the same base in *-ance*, the former being used as an action noun and the latter as a name for the personified quality:

Mankyndes lyfe is *mylitioun*;  
 And she, thi wife, is named Militaunce  
 Veg. (2) 97, *MED*  
 ‘The life of mankind consists of fighting; and this lady, your wife, is named Militance’.

(See 4.4.7.5., 4.4.7.6.).

5.4.5.5. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

NOMINACIOUN (c1425) first appears in a specific context where it seems to mean ‘mentioning’ :

Arispus ... Made more waymentacioun  
 Than I can make of *nominacioun* [vr. now mensioun]  
 Hoccl. RP 3561, *MED*  
 ‘Arispus ... did more lamenting than I can mention here’.

PEREGRINACIOUN (a1500[?c1425]) is perhaps distinguished as an action noun from a variant in *-age*:

Who-soever schall plese me with his pilgrimage, he must firste make confession to his preste and after in his *peregrinacioun* punyssh his trespasses  
 Spec. Sacer 177/16, *MED*  
 ‘Anyone who wants to please me with his pilgrimage must first make confession to his priest and afterwards in his journeying do penance for his sins’.

It is possible to read PILGRIMAGE here as the completed, perhaps collective, experience, and PEREGRINACIOUN in its modern sense as the specific act in progress.

FREQUENTACIOUN ‘act of gathering’ (a1475[?a1430]) first appears in the plural, indicating discrete occasions:

But in their cloystres ... Have their *frequentaciouns* in prayer and in orisouns  
 Lydgate Pilgr. 23517, *MED*

‘But in their cloisters ... hold their meetings in prayer and orisons’.

PERPETRACIOUN (c1450) first appears as the specific committing of sins:

The garment of innocency Was goon away be *perpetracioun* of syn  
De CMulieribus 332, *MED*

‘The garment of innocence departed with the committing of sin’,

while EVITACIOUN (a1500[?c1475]) refers to the avoidance of damnation:

... for the redempcion of his sowle and for *evitacion* of everlastyng deþe  
Spec. Sacer 66/13, *MED*

‘... for the redemption of his soul and for the avoiding of everlasting death’.

PRECIPITACIOUN (a1475) first occurs as the casting out of the evil angels from heaven:

After the *precypitacion* of the fendes, God ... made man  
Rev. St. Bridget 65/33, *MED*

‘After the casting out of the evil angels, God ... made man’,

although it appears soon afterwards in a generalised action/fact context as an alchemical term meaning the separation of solid substances from a solution.

#### 5.4.6. *The 15th century: analysable nouns*

In the 15th century, the 46 analysable nouns slightly outnumber the total for unanalysables in this period.

##### 5.4.6.1. *Instrument*

SEQUESTRACIOUN (c1475(?c1400]) in its first context is the means of isolating someone:

We speke of curse oiper it þat is dedly ... or it þat is *sequestracioun* of þe  
iust man fro comyn

Wycl. Apol. 20, *MED*

‘We speak of a curse, either one that is deadly ... or one that is the means of isolating the just man from the community’.

RECOMMENDACIOUN (a1452[1408]), AFFIRMACIOUN (c1410),

DENUNCIACIOUN (?a1475[?a1425]) and ALLEGACIOUN (c1425),

REPORTACIOUN (c1475[c1445]) and ALLOCACIOUN (1447-8) have the

instrumental meanings of ‘polite regards’, ‘confirmation’, ‘declaration’, ‘argument in evidence’, ‘record’ and ‘document in authorisation’: that is, denoting the words by which these are conveyed. The number of analysable nouns remains high, with 80 in the sample for this period.

ANNOTACIOUN (a1464) refers to a calendar system:

... The *annotacion* of Olimpias  
Capgrove Chron. 36, *MED*  
‘The calendar of Olympias’.

#### 5.4.6.2. *Object*

ADDICACIOUN (c1450) has the objective meaning ‘added statement’ in its earliest context.

#### 5.4.6.3. *Result/state*

TRANSFORMACIOUN (c1450(1410) denotes the passive state of having been transformed:

They weyled of *paire transformacioun*  
Lydgate TB 5. 1972, *MED*  
‘They moaned about being transformed [by Circe]’.

RELEGACIOUN (c1425[a1420]) in its first context means the state of exile.

ALLEVIACIOUN, ABBREVIACIOUN, INFRIGIDACIOUN, SPASMACIOUN, QUASSACIOUN and MAGNIFICACIOUN (?a1425) are modelled on Latin and appear in *Chauliac* (1), with native versions in *Chauliac* (2) The first four appear in the latter respectively as ‘li *z*tnyngē’ (‘[state of] relief’), ‘shortenesse’, ‘coldenesse’ and ‘crampe’, while the last is given as a synonym of INFLACIOUN in the same text.

QUASSACIOUN ‘quashing’ is given as the active ‘bresynge and fruschinge [bruising and crushing]’, but in context all denote passive physical states resulting from action.

GLORIFICACIOUN ‘being glorified’ (a1500[?c1425]) is defined by its context as the opposite state to damnation:

... the state ... of the dampnacioun of the evel and *glorificacion* vnto the goode

Spec. Sacer. 11/24, *MED*

‘... the state ... of damnation [being damned] for the evil and [of] glorification [being glorified] for the good’.

DEFRAUDACIOUN (1440) in its first context is a resulting state:

The seide Cardinale ... delivered the king of Scottes ... whiche was to greet *defraudacion* to youre highness

Wars France in RS 22/2 444, *MED*

‘The said Cardinal ... released the King of Scots ... as a result of which your highness was greatly defrauded’.

#### 5.4.6.4. *Action* : Quality

PERSEVERACIOUN (a1500[?c1415]), an alternative to the unanalysable *perseveraunce* (1340) is first defined (in a metaphor) as a theological grace:

He most be fed of Cryst with v louys ... The v is *persavaracyon* on God  
Mirk Fest. 103/32, *MED*

‘He must be fed by Christ with five loaves ... The fifth is perseverance in God.’

#### 5.4.6.5. *Action*: Fact

VEXACIOUN (c1460[?c1400]) is the fact of causing distress:

Wrong, harm, & trespas, & vndewe *wexacioun*

Beryn 3551, *MED*

‘Cheating, damage and trespassing, and undue harrassing’.

MOLESTACIOUN in the same text has a similar meaning. GOVERNACIOUN (c1410) is a synonym of GOVERNEMENT and GOVERNAUNCE in the sense ‘fact of governing’.

TRANSPIRACIOUN ‘leaking’, SUPPURACIOUN, DERIVACIOUN ‘draining [evacuation]’, CANCELLACIOUN ‘crossing [eyes]’, AGGREGACIOUN ‘gathering’, MATURACIOUN ‘coming to a head’, CARMINACIOUN ‘dispersal of

wind', REVERSACIOUN and DENUDACIOUN 'stripping off a layer' appear in *Chauliac* (1) (?a1425) as medical or pathological processes. PRONUNCIACIOUN (?a1475[?a1425]) occurs in an interesting comment on the English and French languages:

Hit is to be hade in mervayle that the propur langage of Englische men scholde be made so diverse in oon lytelle yle in *pronunciacion*, sythe the langage of Normannes is oon and vnivocate allemoste amonge theym alle. Higden [2] 2. 161, *MED*

'It is a matter for wonder that the native language of the English should in one small island have become so diverse in pronunciation, when the language of the Normans is spoken in almost the same way by all of them'.

INOCULACIOUN 'grafting' and ABLAQUEACIOUN 'removing soil from the roots of vines' appear as general processes in Palladius (?1440), a text on gardening.

#### 5.4.6.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

CORONACIOUN ((c1400) is a synonym of the occasion noun *corounement*, and of course became the standard variant in modE. MOLESTACIOUN (c1460[?c1400]) appears as a hypothetical instance in the same text as its instrumental context in 5.4.6.1. above:

For a molestacioune There was noon othir remedy but a consolacioune Beryn 1101, *MED*

'The only remedy for an act of harrassing is an act of consoling'.

TRANSFIGURACIOUN (c1430 [a1410]) first refers to a Biblical occasion:

... The *transfiguracioun* of oure lorde Jesu in the hille Love Mirror 149, *MED*

'The transfiguring of our Lord Jesus on the mountain',

and SOLEMNISACIOUN (1447) is the occasion of dedicating a church.

DERIVACIOUN 'draining [evacuation]' also appears in the plural, expressing discrete occasions, in the Chauliac text quoted above:

Wip þis oweþ to be done euacuacionz & *deriuacionz* Chauliac (1) 41a/a, *MED*

'Acts of evacuating and draining need to be done at the same time as this'.

ASSIGNACIOUN (1432) occurs as an alternative to *assignment*, both being used in the same text:

Dassignement by auctoritee of parlement ... to tharchebissop of Canterbury ... of diverses grete sommes ... Al þe lordes wol, þat þe saide auctoritee of þe saide *assignacioun* stande fully in his force

Proc.Privy C. 4. 143, *MED*

‘The assigning by the authority of Parliament ... of various large sums to the Archbishop of Canterbury ... All the lords wish the said authority for the said assigning to stand in full force’.

MARTIRIZACIOUN (1432) appears at the same date:

After the *martirizacioun* of Seynte Thomas of Canterbury

Higden [2] 1. 381, *MED*

‘After the martyring of Saint Thomas of Canterbury’.

ARGUMENTACIOUN (c1443) first occurs in a hypothetically specific religious context:

His bringing forþ of þo effectis into oure wil may not be maad by nakid rehercel of þi dignitees and of oure wrecchidnes, wiþout ... breef or large *argumentacioun* maad þerupon ...

Pecock, Rule 372, *MED*

‘His bringing forth of the effects into our will may not be done by bare repetition of your dignities and of our unworthiness, without ... brief or copious arguing of the question’.

ALTERNACIOUN (c1443) and DEFORMACIOUN (a1449) first occur in the plural:

Suche *alternaciouns* or chaungis ...

Pecock, Rule 479, *MED*.

Difformacyouns of Circe and meede ...

Lydgate SSecr. 500, *MED*

‘Transformations performed by Circe and Medea ...’

ADNULLATION (1450) is a legal term, first occurring in a specific context:

Provided also, that this present ... *Adnullation* ...extende not, ne in eny wyse be prejudiciall to John Hunt ... in eny Graunte

RParl. 5. 194b, *MED*

‘Provided also that this present ... act of annulling [a royal grant] ... does not extend to or is not in any way prejudicial to John Hunt ... in respect of any grant’.



CONTENTACIOUN (also 1450) appears in the *Rolls of Parliament* with the sense ‘making up a sum’:

Withoute payement of the said somme for the *contentacion* of the said  
souldeours of theyre wages  
Rparl. 5. 206a, MED  
‘Without payment of the said sum in making up the said soldiers’ wages’.

ANNOTACIOUN (a1464) is first used in the plural:

In this *zere* ... Was that Frere bore which mad these *Annotaciones*  
Capgrove Chron. 259, MED  
‘In this year ... That friar was born who made these calculations’.

DALIACIOUN (c1475) is a variant of the objective DALIAUNCE, but with an Action sense:

I be-sech yow hertyly ... Leue yowur chaffe ... Leue yowur *dalyacyon*! Yowur  
wytt ys lytyll  
Mankind 46, MED  
‘I beg you fervently ... Stop your jokes ... Stop your chatting up! ... You’re  
not very witty.’

Finally, ANTERIORACIOUN (a1500) refers to a general mathematical process, that of moving numbers to the right in multiplication. However, it first occurs in a specific example:

If no digit for the *anterioracioun* may be founde, than put there a cifre  
vndir the thirde figure  
Art Number 51/1, MED  
‘If no digit can be found for performing the anterioration, then put a symbol  
under the third figure’

#### 5.4.6.7. *Summary*

In the 15th century there is some difference between the profiles of analysable and unanalysable nouns. In both the majority still falls into the area of general action/fact, but this predominance is less marked among analysables. A majority of 21 unanalysable nouns falls into the general action area, with only two quality meanings and four specific instance contexts. Among analysable action nouns there are many more first appearances in specific contexts, almost equalling general contexts at 14 to

15. Among unanalysable nouns, result/state senses notably outnumber instrumentals, but among analysables the numbers are almost equal.

#### 5.4.7. *Conclusions*

Kastovsky characterises *-ation* as specialising in action nouns, though with special reference to verb stems in *-ize*, *-ate* and *-ify* (1985: 224, 2.2.6.; see 5.4. above). In my sample the majority of nouns based on *-ate* are unanalysable, the verb usually being a back-formation. Even outside these stems, however, the predominance of action nouns in this suffix is very apparent in my sample, and arises with the comparatively late integration of the suffix in ME. The few occurrences in the early period are mostly unanalysable and are mainly divided between action and result/state, though even here there are twice as many action nouns as those expressing result/state. In the 14th century a majority both of unanalysable borrowings and analysable nouns first appears in the action area, of which most are found in generalised contexts. Of the remaining action nouns, almost twice as many unanalysable and four times as many analysable express specific instance as express quality. The rest are almost equally divided in the 14th century between result/state and instrument. The picture remains essentially the same in the 15th century, but with more differences between the unanalysable and analysable profiles. Among unanalysable borrowings the predominance of general fact is still marked, while result/state senses exceed instrumental by 10 to four. Among analysable nouns the numbers are much more even across categories. Here eight and nine nouns respectively first appear in instrumental and result/state senses, while 15 general contexts are now closely rivalled by 14 specific contexts among analysable action nouns.

The increased use of learned terms in specific contexts may be partly due to a development in the fields in which such terms were adopted. Of the 66 nouns in the

sample which were adopted directly from Latin, 52 are specialised or learned words. 20 appeared in the 14th century, of which 11 are religious terms and eight scientific or alchemical. Only one has a general, non-learned application. Of the 42 adopted in the 15th century, however, only three are religious. Eight are non-learned and 19 are medical, the rest being almost equally distributed over the areas of science, mathematics, alchemy, gardening and law. In all these practical areas it seems clear that a general name for a process, such as DEMONSTRATION or RADIATION, would be likely also to appear in contexts of specific examples. It also appears that analysable nouns in the 15th century became more widespread in their textual application as the suffix became productive

Marchand's likening of *-ation* to *-ment* (1969: 261; see 5.4. above) is probably based on the preponderance of action nouns formed in both, and on the fact that nouns in both suffixes often express specific instance. My sample in *-ment*, however, shows a majority of specific contexts, with comparatively few generalised contexts for the action nouns. The sample in *-ation*, on the other hand, shows an overall majority of generalised contexts for action nouns. In addition, there is a difference in textual distribution between nouns in *-ment* and nouns in *-ation*. Where the majority of *-ment* forms appear in legal or administrative texts, *-ation* is, and was, predominantly a learned and scientific suffix. Merk points out that OF *-ation* hardly ever appeared in verse (Merk, 1970: 215). This is probably also true of *-ation* in modE, though not in ME, where learned and religious texts themselves were often in verse for easy consumption (see Salter, 1983). In my sample, in fact, the majority of texts to which the suffix is attributed by the *MED* is almost equally divided between fictional and religious genres, though not all of these are in verse. The ratio may partly reflect the range of texts used by the *MED*. It will be seen in Appendix 2, Table 57, that if we

consider relative percentages rather than absolute figures, the score of occurrences of *-ation* per genre in my sample is actually higher for religious texts than for fictional, and highest of all for learned and scientific texts, although the number of learned and scientific texts quoted is relatively low.

### **Note**

1. Another indication of this may be that stem-final /ks/ appears several times before ME *-acioun*, but never before *-ance*. However, this may not have been for reasons of sibilance, as *-ance* can appear after /s/.

## THE SUFFIX *-age* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

### 6.1. History and Morphology

#### 6.1.1. *History*

Marchand (1969) states that the suffix *-age* came into the language through loans from French and derived mainly from the Latin suffix *-aticum*, forming both denominal and deverbal derivatives. Some borrowings also derive in French from the Latin noun class ending in *-ago*. Marchand points out that the suffix gave rise to many medieval Latin (ML) words in *-agium*, such as *scutagium*, and that several of these were ‘for a long time quoted in Latin form only’ (1969: 234, 4.4.1).

#### 6.1.2. *Morphological types*

I have classified words in *-age* in my ME sample according to four main morphological types.

##### 6.1.2.1. *Type 1*

In this type the suffix is a spelling of the Latin noun ending *-ago*, which appeared in ME in such forms as *CARTILAGE*. This noun has no AN or OF equivalent and seems to have been borrowed directly from Latin using *-age* as a spelling for *-ago*. The type has of course no simplex form in English. In Latin the nominal suffix is *-go*, occurring on a variety of stems of which <-a-> is only one.

##### 6.1.2.2. *Type 2*

This type is borrowed into English from French, where it derives from the Latin and ML noun in *-aticum*. It has no simplex form in English or French. Examples include *VIAGE*.

### 6.1.2.3. *Type 3*

This type, e.g. deverbal MARIAGE, is borrowed from French or formed in English on latinate nominal, adverbial and verbal bases. Examples are respectively MARIAGE, BARONAGE and AVAUNTAGE. A categorial exception is the nominalised adjective OUTRAGE. The suffix is attached directly to the stem with no intervening vowel.

### 6.1.2.4. *Type 4*

Type 4, , e.g. WHARFAGE, is formed in English on native nominal or verbal bases. As with Type 3, the suffix is attached directly to the noun or verb stem. A further example of the denominal type is FALDAGE, and an example of the deverbal type is STERAGE ‘steerage’.

### 6.1.3. *Co-occurrences*

Nouns in *-age* may attach to the latinate prefixes common to all five suffixes: *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n/m)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *pre-*, *per-* and *in(m)-*. They are not found in ME on bases in *pro-*, *e(x)-* or *en(m)-*, or the native prefix *mis-*.

### 6.1.4. *Transparency*

The suffix *-age*, like *-ance/-ence*, is placed by Dalton-Puffer at Level 2 on Dressler’s scale of transparency (1992: 475ff). In her sample, however, she finds only the analysable data transparent, while the unanalysable is ‘completely opaque’ (1996: 116). This is true of most of my sample, but not all: several of the unanalysable nouns are related to French nouns and verbs which later appeared in ME. An example is the de-adverbial form AVAUNTAGE, which might have been transparent to French speakers, though chronologically unanalysable in that *avaunt* was not a preceding form in ME.

## 6.2. Phonology

### 6.2.1. *Stress*

Jespersen tells us that ‘In early loanwords [in *-age*] from F[rench] the stress was on the suffix’, citing ‘rime and rhythm in Chaucer’ as evidence (1942: VI.438, 24.3[7]. Marchand remarks that recent loans in *-age* from French, such as MASSAGE, are ‘no longer incorporated in the suffix group’ (1969: 236, 4.4.11.). Such recent loans in *-age* have a secondary stress on the first syllable, as they do in modern French. This stress was probably also present in ME. Jespersen points out that ‘French words with more than one syllable before the [end] stress had a rhythmic secondary stress: in Chaucer's verse it is impossible to know which of the two accents was the stronger, see the following examples in the beginning of the C[anterbury] T[ales]: <sup>1</sup>MELOD<sup>1</sup>YE, <sup>1</sup>PILGRIM<sup>1</sup>AGE ... etc. (In the end of the verse end-stress is more likely)’ (1942: I. 164, 5.6.1.).

The suffix *-age*, then, like *-ment*, was attached at the level of the word and retained existing stress. In modE the stress is on the second syllable in such words as PER<sup>1</sup>CENTAGE where the stem already carries a prefix; otherwise it is on the first.

### 6.2.2. *Phonetics*

I can find no examples of the suffix being attached to stem-final /j/ or /dʒ/. Otherwise there are no restrictions on the stem-final consonant. Stem-final /r/ is especially common. Stems ending in CC (as in COSTAGE, AVAUNTAGE) are common, and CCC also appears in this period. Stem-final /i/ appears in borrowings of my Type 2 (VIAGE) and is frequent in deverbal nouns of Types 3 and 4, on both latinate and native stems (examples are MARIAGE, CARIAGE and FERIAGE). Stem-final /ɔu/ appears in the native noun STOWAGE.

### 6.3. Integration

#### 6.3.1. *Productivity*

Marchand says that this suffix ‘was very strong in Old French and Anglo-Norman and exercised a great influence on Medieval Latin’ (1969: 4.4.1., 234). Forms appear in my sample in Latin from 1135 and in AN from 1200. However, the earliest forms in ME also appear before 1200, in the earliest text of *Ancrene Riwe* (C.Corp.).

The suffix was well integrated by the end of the 14th century, but as a denominal rather than deverbal formative. Only seven out of 58 unanalysable nouns, and not quite half of the 117 analysables, are associated with ME verbs across my total sample. Many of these are also associated with nouns, from which the verbs themselves often apparently derive, though both may precede the formation in *-age*. An example is CARTAGE (1428), following a verb *carten* (c1400[?a1387]), which itself follows the native noun *cart* (a1150[OE]).

Compared with other French suffixes there is a considerable body of native coinages, 19 overall, of which all but four are at least partly denominal. In addition there are three on Dutch bases. Seven appear first in ML form, as do 11 of the 39 Romance denominals which also appear in AN. It is suggested in the *MED* that an additional 20 words on Romance or unknown bases were also formed in ME. All but one of these appear in the 15th century, the exception being PEREGRINAGE (1340). Nine of them are deverbal, more than twice the number of pure denominals. Two follow both nouns and verbs, and one, OUTRAGE, is de-adverbial, while the derivation of TARAGE is obscure. RAMAGE is a nominalisation of a French adjective. This list excludes DISUSAGE, REPASSAGE and REPOISAGE, prefixal forms in ME on existing suffixed words which have counterparts in French.



10 nouns in the sample follow earlier formations in different suffixes on the same stem. (See Appendix 1, Table 57).

The rise of *-age* as a deverbal suffix is barely glimpsed in my sample until the 15th century. Four borrowings unanalysable in ME, HERITAGE (1230[?a1200]), RIGOLAGE (a1400[c1300]), PORTAGE (1423) and FROLAGE (a1605[?a1340]) are associated with verbs in French, the verbs *heriten* and *rigolen* being adopted later into ME. Four analysable nouns, PASSAGE, USAGE, SERVAGE and RIVAGE, follow the adoption of related verbs in the early period. RIVAGE, however, also follows the noun *rive* 'bank', and was first used almost simultaneously as an action noun 'landing' and as the locative 'shore' (the action meaning later attaching only to the prefixed form ARRIVAGE in the 14th century). The sample includes only three purely deverbal analysable nouns in the early period, seven in the 14th century, and 12 in the 15th century: a total of 22 out of 117 analysable nouns.

### 6.3.2. *Analysability*

There are more unanalysable than analysable nouns in the early period, but in the 14th and 15th centuries analysable nouns clearly outnumber unanalysable. The profile shows the usual surge of analysable forms in the 14th century, the most prolific period for French vocabulary in ME, in which many new related forms also appear. As with *-ance*, however, the increase continues and is even surpassed in the 15th century, due here to a relatively high number of late coinages derived not only from 14th century French verbs or nouns, but from much earlier English nouns.

### 6.3.3. *The sample in -age*

In Table 5 there follows a complete list of the sample of 175 ME nouns in *-age*, together with forms on the same stem. As with the suffixes previously considered, forms later than the nouns are given in square brackets. Where double dates are given,

the first indicates the date of the MS and the second the putative date of the original text. An asterisk indicates doubtful analysability, due to uncertain dating within a margin of 25 years on either side of both noun and simplex form.

**Table 5: NOUNS IN *-age* in 3 PERIODS OF ME WITH FORMS ON THE SAME STEM**

**The early period; 1150-1300**

*Unanalysable nouns of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200) heritage	[c1400(?a1300)] V heriten]	[c1300(?c1225) N heir] [1532rev.(c1385) N heritaunce]
1300(?c1225) image		
c1275 homage		
c1290 truage		
a1325(c1280) tallage*	[c1460 V tallagen]	[a1300 N taille] [a1400(a1338) N lange]
(?a1300) langage		
c1325(a1300) corage		
c1330(?a1300) viage		
damage	[c1330 V damagen]	
avauntage	[a1333 V avaunten]	c1400(?a1300) N avauncement [c1400 Adv. avaunt] 1123 N messe [a1400(c1303) A outrage]
c1400(?a1300) message		
outrage	[1450(a1400) V outren]	
visage		
tapinage		
silvage		

*Analysable nouns of the early period*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1230(?a1200) potage*		c1230(?a1200) N pot
c1300(?c1225) passage*	c1230(?a1200) v passen	
c1250 parage		a1400(c1250) N par
1300(c1250) baronage		a1225(?a1200) N baroun
1268 faldage	c1230(?a1200) V folden	a1200(OE) N fold
c1400(?c1280) servage	c1175 (?OE) V serven	
c1330(?a1300) linage		c1300(?c1225) N line
usage	c1250 V usen	
c1400(?a1300) rivage	c1300(?a1300) V riven	c1300(?c1225) N rive
hostage*	[a1425(a1400) v hostagen]	c1330(?a1300) N hoste

**The 14th century**

*Unanalysable nouns of the 14th century*

	<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300 pelrinage		[c1325 N perlerin]
beverage		
a1400(c1300) rigolage	[(c1375) V rigolen]	
a1400(c1303) sacrilage		
vassalage		[(1443) N vassal]
a1325 vesinage		
1325 companage		
socage		

(1340)	peregrinage	
(1374)	cariage	[(c1375) V carien]
a1500(?c1378)	senage	
c1425(c1380)	pannage	
	village	
(a1382)	pedage	
1475(1392)	muscilage	
(a1393)	presage	
	artemage	
	morgage	
(c1395)	plumage	
a1400	suffrage	
	savage	a1250 A savage

*Analysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300	hermitage		a1225(?a1200) N eremite
c1325(c1300)	mariage	c1325(c1300) V marien	
	menage		c1300(c1250) N meine
a1400(c1303)	bondage		a1225(?a1200) N bonde
a1315	stallage		a1225(?a1200) N stalle
a1325	vileinage		a1325 N vilein
	arrerage		c1300 Adv. arrere
	costage	a1400(a1325) V costen	c1225(?c1200) N cost
	tronage		?a1325 N trone
a1333	disparage		a1400(c1250) N par
?a1400(a1338)	spousage	a1225(c1200) V spousen	a1225a1200 N spouse
			c1330(?c1300) N spousaille
a1500(c1340)	cosinage		c1300(?a1200) N cosin
(1342)	dennage	a1250 V dennen	c1175 N den
1377	parsonage		c1250 N parson
a1400(c1378)	brokage	1330 V brochen	c1230(?a1200) N broche
c1380	coinage	?a1400(a1338) V coinen	
c1400(?c1380)	dotage	a1225(?a1200) V doten	
	barnage		c1150(OE) N barn
?c1425(c1380)	pavage	c1325 V paven	a1300(c1270) N pavement
c1450(c1380)	arivage	a1225(?a1200) V ariven	[(a1393) N arivaille]
c1430(?1382)	auterage		a1225(?a1200) N auter
1425(?c1384)	disavauntage		c1330(?a1300) N avauntage
c1386	lodemanage		c1000(OE) N lodeman
(a1387)	herbergage	a1150(c1125) V herberwen	a1150(c1125) N herberwe
c1410(a1387)	hidage		a1225(OE) N hide
1387	lastage		1377-99(OE) N last
1389	quarterage		1290 N quarter
(1390)	cotage		a1200(OE) N cot(e)
(c1390)	mesuage		a1450(?a1350) N mes
c1390	hountage		c1330(?a1300) N hounte
(a1393)	herbage		c1330(?a1300) N herbe
	gainage	c1230(?a1200) V gainen	
	pillage	c1230(?a1200) V pillen	
(1395)	patronage		c1300 N patroun
a1425(c1395)	concubinage		c1325(c1300) N concubine
(1395-6)	windage	a1150(OE) V winden	
a1400	savage		a1250 A savage
c1540(?a1400)	terrage	?a1325 V teren	(1393) N terre-mote
			c100(?a1300) A terrene

**The 15th century***Unanalysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
1400	nounage		
c1400	boscage		
c1450(?c1408)	tarage		
(1415)	overage		
(1422)	garbage		
	portage		
a1525(?a1423)	murage		[c1475 N mur]
?a1425	cartilage		
	vintage		
c1475(?a1430)	umbrage		
a1605 (?a1430)	frolage		
(1433)	aunage		
	farrage		
(1447)	ulnage		
c1450	pontage		
(1451)	relage		
1453	arrage		
c1460	scutage		
a1475	summage		
1481-90	ullage		
1486	sorage		
a1500	stramage		

*Analysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1500(?c1400)	bagage	[c1450(c1412) V baggen]	c1230(?a1200) N bagge
(1405)	pickage	c1225 V piken	OE N pike
	ankerage	c1230(?a1200) V ankeren	a1225 (?a1200) N anker
c1450(c1405)	coilage	c1230(?a1200) V coilen	
c1450(?c1408)	surplusage		(a1382) N surplus
(1420)	bailliage		?a1425(c1280) N baillie
1422	tonnage		c1205(OE) N ton
(1422)	poundage		1150(OE) N pound
c1450(?a1422)	paiaage	a1225(?a1200) V paien	1390 N paiement
(1425)	vicarage		a1400(c1300) N vicar
c1450(c1425)	peisage	a1400(c1303) V peisen	
(1427-8)	cranage		(1299) N crane
(1428)	cartage	c1400(?a1387) V carten	a1150(OE) N cart
(1429)	repassage	c1230(?a1200) V passen	c1300(?c1225) N passage
(c1430)	navage		a1375 N navei
c1450(c1430)	sterage	a1150(OE) V steren	a1150(OE) N ster
(1431)	garbilage	(1393) V garbelen	(1431) N garbel
(c1432)	plankage	(1432) V planken	a1400(c1303) N plank
(1434)	discorage		(?a1300) N corage
c1436	garnerage	[(c1475) V garneren]	a1225(?OE) N garner
1437	porterage		c1300(c1250) N porter
(1438)	rouclage	c1230(?a1200) V reulen	c1230(?a1200) N reule
c1440	keyage		(1432) N keie
(1442)	correctage	1345-6 V correcten	
	fraughtage		c1390(c1350) N fraught
(1444)	seigneurage		c1330(?a1300) N seigneur
(1447)	repoisage	a1400(c1303) V peisen	c1450(c1425) N poisage
(c1447)	foilage	?a1425 V foilen	c1325 N foil

(1449) c1450	parkage feriage alliage partage groundage guidage apparage	1123 V ferien c1330(?c1300) V allien c1330(?a1200) V parten a1325(1265) V grounden a1425(c1385) V giden c1450 V paren	a1300(?OE) N park c1360 N ferie 1297 N alliaunce c1300(c1250) N part OE N ground  c1250 N parage a1400(c1250) N par c1330(?a1300) N apparail a1500(c1340) N pressour
(?c1450) a1475(1450) 1475(?a1451) a1475(?c1451) (1455) ?1457 (c1460) (1460-1) (1462) 1465 (1466) (1466) 1469-71 1470-85 (1471) 1472-3 (?1473) 1474 a1475 (?a1475) c1475 (c1475) 1480 a1486 c1489 1490	presserage borwage barrage labourage disusage hostilage scourage personage mesurage coverage stoppage average brokerage wharfage mockage despoilage batellage soundage chevage procurage falsage taxage couperage arbitrage furnage parentage leakage cordage	c1330 V pressen c1230(?a1200) V borwen  c1400(a1376) V labouren c1250 V usen c1330(?a1300) V hostelen c1230(?a1200) V scouren  a1400(a1325) V mesuren a1275(?c1150) V coveren c1000(OE) V stoppen    a1475(?a1430) V mokken c1230(?a1200) V despoilen  a1425(c1385) V sounden  c1330(?a1300) V procuren c1230(?a1200) V falsen c1300 V taxen  (1425) V arbitren  1420 V lekken a1475 V corden	a1225(?OE) N barre c1300 N labour c1330(?a1300) N usage a1325(c1250) N hostel  c1230(?a1200) N persoun a1225(?a1200) N mesure 1346 N cover  1125-8(OE) N aver c1400(c1378) N broker OE N wharf c1425 N mokke  ?a1400(a1338) N batel  c1300 N chef  a1225(?OE) A fals  c1400(a1376) N couper 1532rev.(c1385) N arbitrement a1225(?a1200) N furneis c1430(A1410) N parent  c1330(?a1300) N corde 1483 N cordaille c1250 N boteler c1000(OE) N toll c1175(?OE) N gavel c1300 A ramage (1395) N ambassade c1230(?a1200) N trusse
1491 1494 a1500	butlerage tollage gavelage ramage	c1350 V tollen c1400 V gavelen	c1250 N boteler c1000(OE) N toll c1175(?OE) N gavel c1300 A ramage
1534(?a1500) c1500	ambassage trussage	c1230(?a1200) V trussen	(1395) N ambassade c1230(?a1200) N trusse

#### 6.4. Semantics

For ‘personal substantives’ such as BARONAGE, Marchand notes senses such as ‘condition, state, rank, office of’ and also ‘abode of’ as in HERMITAGE (1969: 234, 4.4.3.), while ‘with derivatives from non-personal substantives we find the sense ‘collectivity, system, material’ as in BAGGAGE’ (1969: 235, 4.4.3). He points out that

‘Many Old French words had the meaning ‘liberty, privilege’ or ‘toll, duty connected with the privilege’, and that ‘many of these occur also in Medieval Latin as words in *-agium*’. He also notes English coinages such as POUNDAGE and GROUNDAGE (1969: 235, 4.4.5.). Dalton-Puffer remarks that the sense ‘tax’ is ‘inhérente au suffixe’ and that this sense in ME is ‘suffisamment distincte pour permettre les formations des bases germaniques’, e.g. BONDAGE (1993: 4.4., 190).

Marchand lists verb/noun pairs such as *arrive*/ARRIVAGE, *coin* COINAGE and *carry*/CARRIAGE, claiming for the nouns that ‘originally we find only the sense “act, fact, mode of”’. These are senses which I would differentiate, as Marchand does in fact differentiate the category ‘result’. This he suggests is ‘very frequent’, though his examples are all later than ME (1969: 236, 4.4.9.). Merk finds few action nouns around 1300 (1970: 208). Dalton-Puffer, however, suggests that the ‘action’ sense is widespread in ME (1993: 190).

#### 6.4.1. 1150-1300: *unanalysable nouns*

There are 15 unanalysable borrowings in the early period

##### 6.4.1.1. *Collective nouns*

Of the five collectives, one has a personal concrete meaning: HOMAGE ‘body of men’ (1330[?c1225]), one an impersonal concrete meaning: SILVAGE ‘woodland’ (c1400[?a1300]), and one an abstract meaning: LANGAGE (a1325[c1280]). Two more belong to the special class with financial senses, in this case taxes: TRUAGE ‘tribute’ (c1275) and TALLAGE, a general tax (c1290).

##### 6.4.1.2. *Instrument*

AVAUNTAGE (c1300[?a1300]) and OUTRAGE (c1400[?a1300]), though deriving ultimately from adverbs rather than verbs, seem in their first attributions to

have the instrumental senses ‘means of getting ahead’ and ‘means of exceeding [the bounds]’ :

- (1) *Avauntages* þai hauen þare,  
 Freynsch and Latin euer ay whare  
 Arth. & M. 17, *MED*  
 ‘French and Latin have means of getting ahead everywhere’.
- (2) Ðou hast wiþholde my trowage  
 And ydon me more *outrage* ...  
 Brent myne tounes, myne men yslawe  
 KAlex. 720, *MED*  
 ‘You have withheld my tribute and subjected me to  
 further excesses ... burnt my cities and killed my men’.

#### 6.4.1.3. *Object*

HERITAGE (c1230[?a1200]) has the objective sense ‘things inherited’.

IMAGE ‘thing imitated’ (c1225[?c1200]), MESSAGE ‘message, embassy [things or people sent]’ and VISAGE ‘thing seen’ (c1400[?a1300]) are Latin-derived words borrowed from French and opaque in ME, with institutionalised concrete meanings.

#### 6.4.1.4. *Result/state*

DAMAGE ‘being damaged’ (c1330[?a1300]) and TAPINAGE ‘being disguised’ (c1400[?a1300]) are of opaque derivation in English. DAMAGE is possibly a denominal collective in French, which has a related noun *demme*.

#### 6.4.1.5. *Action: Quality*

CORAGE (?a1300) is the only noun in this part of the sample which signifies a quality.

#### 6.4.1.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

VIAGE (c1325[a1300]), though denominal in origin, is an action in ME, first appearing in a specific context:

- Ðe king hom het ... þat hii ... þes *veiage* nome  
 Glo. Chron. A, 4112, *MED*  
 ‘The king ordered them ... to make this voyage’.

#### 6.4.2. 1150-1300: *analysable nouns*

There are only 10 analysable nouns in the sample for this period. Their first appearances show a similar though not identical variety of meanings to those of unanalysable nouns.

##### 6.4.2.1. *Collective nouns*

Of the four collective nouns, three have concrete meanings, both personal and impersonal: POTAGE ‘soup’ (c1230[?a1200]), BARONAGE ‘body of barons’ (c1300[c1250]) and LINAGE ‘ancestors’ (c1330[?a1300]). The other is financial: FALDAGE ‘rent for a sheepfold’ (1268).

##### 6.4.2.2. *Instrument*

PASSAGE (c1300[?c1225]) first appears in the instrumental senses ‘way through’.

##### 6.4.2.3. *Object*

USAGE (c1330[?a1300]) has the objective sense ‘custom observed’. HOSTAGE (c1400[?a1300]) was used with its modern objective meaning ‘person held’ but derivationally is simply an intensive of the word for ‘guest’.

##### 6.4.2.4. *Result/state*

PARAGE (c1250) is the state of high rank..

##### 6.4.2.5. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

SERVAGE (c1400[c1280]) is the act of doing service:

Ðat folk cried on hym a day, þat he a-legge scholde þe servage þat his fader hem made

SLeg.OT Hist. 114, *MED*

‘The people called on him one day to acknowledge the service that his father had done them’;



though it appears soon afterwards (c1400[a1300]) with its more usual meaning ‘state of servitude’. RIVAGE (c1400[?a1300]), later a locative ‘shore’, also first appears as an action noun in the context of a specific instance:

Kyng Alisaunder and his baronage  
Herberwe taken, gode *ryvage* ...  
KAlex. 6069, *MED*  
‘When King Alexander and his barons had made port and a good landing ...’

#### 6.4.2.6. *Summary*

In the sample for the early period, unanalysable nouns outnumber analysable by one third. The first appearances of both are spread across all the meanings we have previously encountered for nominal suffixes, with the addition of collective senses. Collective senses in fact dominate slightly for both analysable and unanalysable nouns. Among the first appearances of analysable nouns the only action sense is a specific instance.

#### 6.4.3. *The 14th century: unanalysable nouns*

##### 6.4.3.1. *Collective nouns*

Seven of the 21 unanalysable nouns in this period have collective senses. Four are concrete: COMPANAGE ‘food to accompany bread’ (1325), PANNAGE ‘animal fodder’ (c1425[c1380]), MUSCILAGE ‘mucus’ (c1475[1392]) and PLUMAGE ‘feathers’ (c1395).

Three denote taxes. CARIAGE (?a1425[c1380]) first appears in Chaucer as a synonym of ‘tribute’:

The fortunes and the riches of the peple of the provinces ben harmed ...  
by comune tributes or *cariages*  
Ch. Bo. 1. Pr.4. 29, *MED*  
‘The fortunes and wealth of the people of the provinces is impaired ...  
by universal tributes or taxes on transport’.

SENAGE (a1500[?c1378]) is glossed by the *MED* as ‘synodal dues paid at Easter’, while the unspecified PEDAGE (a1382) is linked with ‘tribute’ in Wyclif’s Bible (1), with a variant ‘tol’ in *WBible* [2].

#### 6.4.3.2. *Locative*

There are two locatives, VESINAGE (a1325) ‘neighbourhood’ and VILLAGE (c1390).

#### 6.4.3.3. *Instrument*

VASSALAGE (a1400[c1303]) ‘means of doing service’ first appears in an instrumental context, though later it more usually means a state of servitude. Other instrumentals are PRESAGE (a1393) ‘means of foreknowledge’ and SUFFRAGE (a1400), a prayer.

#### 6.4.3.4. *Object*

BEVERAGE (c1300) ‘something drunk’ has objective meaning.

#### 6.4.3.5. *Result/state*

MORGAGE (a1393) is the state of being pledged on pain of a penalty. It is first used metaphorically in English in a personal context:

Forthi schulde every good man knowe  
                                   ... hou that in mariage  
 His trouthe plight lith in *morgage*  
 Gower CA 7. 4228, *MED*  
 ‘Therefore every well-meaning man should know ... that in marriage his  
 fidelity is pledged on pain of a penalty’.

#### 6.4.3.6. *Action: Quality*

SACRILAGE (1400[c1393]) is the attribute of blasphemousness.

#### 6.4.3.7. *Action: Fact*

SOCAGE ‘[the fact of] tenure’ (1325), and ARTEMAGE ‘the craft of magic’ (a1393) appear in general factual contexts.

#### 6.4.3.8. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

Three of the six action nouns appear in specific contexts. The earliest is  
PELRINAGE (c1300)

Gilbert ... and ... Richard ... to Ierusalem com; There he dude here  
*pelrynage* in holi stedes faste  
SLeg. Becket p.1, *MED*  
'Gilbert ... and ... Richard ... arrived in Jerusalem; there they made their  
pilgrimage fasting in the holy places'.

PEREGRINAGE (1340), a synonym of *pelrynage*, first occurs in the plural:

Vele men makeþ to God sacrefices of uestinges, of *peregrinages*, of  
ssarpnesses of bodye  
Ayenb. 187/17, *MED*  
'Many men make sacrifices to God, such as going on quests [?] and  
pilgrimages, or mortifying the flesh'.

Though RIGOLAGE 'fooling' (a1400[c1300]) first appears in a passage of general  
application, its occurrence is given a specific context:

Riueli se we him that drawes,  
Til *recolage* of ille felawes  
Falle als fol in fele folies  
N. Hom. (1) Gosp. p. 110, *MED*  
'We see the rough fellow drawing [ale] until the fooling of louts descends like  
madness into countless idiocies'.

#### 6.4.4. *The 14th century: analysable nouns*

##### 6.4.4.1. *Collective nouns*

16 of the 38 analysable nouns in this period first appear with collective senses.  
Of these, eight have personal or impersonal concrete meanings: MENAGE 'members  
of a household' (c1325[c1300]), COSINAGE 'members of a family' (a1500[c1430]),  
COINAGE 'currency' (c1380), DENNAGE 'dunnage [boards placed under a ship's  
cargo]' (1342), LASTAGE 'ship's ballast' (1387), MESUAGE 'estate' (c1390),  
HERBAGE 'grass' (a1393) and TERRAGE 'lands' (c1540[?a1400]). The other half  
are financial. These include STALLAGE 'rent for a stall' (a1315), ARRERAGE

'arrears [of debt] (a1325)', and COSTAGE 'expense' (a1325). TRONAGE (a1325) is a toll on commodities weighed at the trone [scale], AUTERAGE (?a1330[?1382]) dues paid to a clergyman [i.e. at the altar], HIDAGE (c1410[a1387] a royal land tax assessed by the hide, QUARTERAGE (1389), a charge payable every quarter, and WINDAGE (1395-6) a payment for haulage or hoisting a windlass.

#### 6.4.4.2. *Locative*

Four of the analysable nouns are locatives. These are HERMITAGE (c1300), PARSONAGE (1377), HERBERGAGE (a1387 'inn') and COTAGE (1390).

#### 6.4.4.3. *Instrument*

DISAVAUNTAGE (a1425[?c1384]) first appears with an instrumental meaning:

Whoso synneþ for avantage of himself, his synne makip *disavauntage* of þat þat he wenep turne to good  
 Wycl. Church 351, *MED*  
 'If anyone sins for his own advantage, his sin makes a means of disadvantage out of the thing that he hopes will do him good.'

PATRONAGE (1395) is the office by means of which the holder has power to elect clergy.

#### 6.4.4.4. *Object*

PAVAGE (?c1425[c1380]) is an alternative to PAVEMENT, with the objective sense 'paved area'. GAINAGE (a1393) is the profit gained from agriculture.

#### 6.4.4.5. *Result/state*

10 analysable nouns in this period denote states. Six of these signify social or legal status: MARIAGE (c1325[c1300]), BONDAGE (a1400[1303]), VILEINAGE (a1325), DISPARAGE (a1333) 'degradation' (from PARAGE 'high birth' [1250]), SPOUSAGE (?a1400[a1338]), a synonym of MARIAGE, and CONCUBINAGE

(a1425[c1395]) its opposite. BARNAGE ‘childhood’ (c1400[?c1380]) denotes a natural state, but DOTAGE at the same date signifies drunkenness rather than old age:

Wyne ... al waykned his wyt ..  
Denne a *dotage* ful depe drof to his hert  
Cleanness 1425, *MED*  
‘Wine ... stimulated his brain ... Then a deep stupefaction  
overwhelmed him to the core’.

HOUNTAGE ‘shame’ (c1390) signifies a mental state. SAVAGE, which entered the language as an adjective a1250, appeared a1400 with the meaning ‘distraught state’:

Bot quen I raxed vp in sauage  
I ne wist bot walaway  
Cursor 24351, *MED*  
‘But when I worked myself up into a state, I knew nothing but Woe is me!’

#### 6.4.4.6. *Action: Fact*

The occupations of BROKAGE ‘marriage-broking’ (c1400[c1378]) and LODEMANAGE ‘piloting’ (c1386) are first referred to in general contexts:

Moche is suche a mayde to lovie ...  
More þan a mayden is þat is married þorw *brocage*  
P.Pl.B (Ld.) 14.267, *MED*  
‘Such a girl is to be loved very much ... More than a girl is if she is  
married through broking’.

But of his craft to rekene wel his tydes  
... His herberwe and his mone, his *lodemenage*  
Ther nas noon swich from Hulle to Cartage  
Chaucer Prol. 401 - 4, *MED*  
‘But for knowledge of his craft and his tides ... His harbour and his  
moon, his piloting, there was no one like him from Hull to Carthage.’

PILLAGE (a1393) is also first referred to in a general context.

#### 6.4.4.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

The only action noun in this section is ARIVAGE (c1450[c1380]), a variant of the earlier RIVAGE (c1400[?a1300]), used in the same sense and with the same construction:

Ther saugh I how ... he wente,

And prively tok *arryvage*  
 In the contree of Cartage  
 Chaucer HF 223, *MED*  
 ‘There I saw how ... he went, and landed secretly in the country of  
 Carthage.’

#### 6.4.4.8. *Summary*

In the sample for the 14th century, analysable nouns outnumber unanalysable by 38 to 21. The dominant category for both is clearly the collective. However, while a slight majority of the unanalysable collectives has concrete meaning, the 16 analysable collectives are equally divided between concrete senses (personal and impersonal) and financial senses such as ‘tax’, ‘rent’ or ‘debt’.

Among unanalysable borrowings, the total number of action nouns is higher than any other category except the collective. Surprisingly, however, action and instrumental meanings are no more frequent among analysables in this century than are the minor categories of locative and objective meaning. On the other hand the sense ‘state’ makes a substantial showing among analysables, with 10 examples, mainly denoting social or legal status.

#### 6.4.5. *The 15th century: unanalysable nouns*

##### 6.4.5.1. *Collective nouns*

11 of the 22 unanalysable nouns borrowings here are collective nouns, of which five have concrete impersonal meanings. These are BOSPAGE ‘bushes’ (c1400), GARBAGE ‘refuse of birds or fowls’ (1422), CARTILAGE (?a1425), VINTAGE (?a1425), FARRAGE ‘fodder’ (?1440) and STRAMAGE ‘seed’ (a1500). Another five have financial meanings. These are AUNAGE (1433), a fee for the inspection of cloth, PONTAGE (c1450), a toll paid for the use of a bridge, RELAGE (1451), uncollected debts, ARRAGE (1453), rent due to a feudal lord, and SCUTAGE (c1460), a royal tax on land in lieu of military service.

6.4.5.2. *Object*

OVERAGE (1415), an anglicisation of French *ouvrage*, is ‘work accomplished’.

6.4.5.3. *Result/state*

NOUNAGE ‘nonage’ (1400) and SORAGE (1486) mean the youth of humans and hawks respectively.

6.4.5.4. *Action: Quality*

TARAGE ‘[sweet or bitter] taste’ (c1450[?c1408]) and UMBRAGE ‘shade’ (c1475[?a1430]) are the only quality or ‘attribute’ senses among analysable nouns in this period.

6.4.5.5. *Action: Fact*

There is no known verb connected with TARAGE ‘taste’ (c1450[?c1408]), but it occurs also in what appears to be a general action context in the same text as in

6.4.5.4. above:

Ther ben ... applys ... bitter in tasyng ... Every man be war therfore that he eschewe the *tarage*

Lydgate RS 3943, *MED*

‘There are ... apples ... which taste bitter ... So everyone should be careful to avoid tasting them’.

The first context of MURAGE (a1525[?a1423]) is slightly ambiguous: it appears to mean primarily a general action ‘walling’, but could also mean collective ‘walls’:

Ɔat Mold Lichefeld pay to þe *murage* of this cite aftur þe lond ... þat she holdithe

Cov. Lect. Bk. 59, *MED*

‘That Maud Lichfield should pay towards the walling of this city according to the land ... which she holds’.

ULNAGE (1447) and ULLAGE ((1481-90) also first occur in financial contexts, but appear to refer to the activities or facts involved. ULNAGE is ‘the official

measurement and inspection of cloth' (*MED*) and ULLAGE the falling short of a full measure of wine, both of which incurred charges. SUMMAGE (a1475) is a duty, the service of providing carriage by pack animals. The only general action noun with a non-financial or official sense is FROLAGE 'blow' (a1605[?a1430]), which first occurs in a specific reference to a horse, but in a general context:

Of nature that he be nat wood, nor that he, by no *frolage*, be nat fallen into rage

Lydgate, Pilgr. 23107, *MED*

'Not of a wild character, or with his temper spoilt by any hitting'.

#### 6.4.5.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

PORTAGE (1423) first occurs in a financial context, but in apparent reference to the specific activity involved:

Item, to John Smyth, laborer, for *portage* of tiles, j.d.

Doc. Brewer in Bk. Lond. E. 153/388, *MED*

'Item, to John Smith, labourer, for carrying tiles, one penny'.

#### 6.4.6. *The 15th century: analysable nouns*

##### 6.4.6.1. *Collective nouns*

29 out of the 69 analysable nouns in this period have collective senses. Of these, six have concrete meanings: BAGAGE (a1500[?c1400]), FOILAGE (c1447), a kind of decoration, ALLIAGE 'allies' (c1450), CORDAGE (1490) and TRUSSAGE 'belongings' (c1500). One, SURPLUSAGE (c1450[?c1408]), has an abstract sense.

The rest are financial terms. Many have to do with shipping. ANKERAGE (1405) was a charge for anchoring ships, CRANAGE and WHARFAGE (1427-8) charges respectively for the use of cranes and wharves, NAVAGE (c1430), MESURAGE (1460-1) and BATELLAGE (1472-3) tolls levied on shipping, PLANKAGE (c1432) a toll for the use of a gangplank at a wharf, KEYAGE (c1440) quay-dues, and FRAUGHTAGE (1442) a freight charge. Life was also expensive on



land. PICKAGE (1405) was a toll for breaking ground, CARTAGE (1428) a charge for carting away the stones dug up and COVERAGE (1462) a charge for having used a booth or stall at a fair. FURNAGE (a1486) was a charge for the use of an oven, and BUTLERAGE (1491) a fee paid to a butler. GUIDAGE (c1450) was a fee for guide-service, while GROUNDAGE at the same date was an apparently unknown tax first listed with several others. TONNAGE and POUNDAGE (1422) were respectively a payment of so much per ton and a subsidy of twelve pence in the pound granted by Parliament to the king. SEIGNEURAGE (1444) was the king's deduction from coinages. BARRAGE (a1475[1450]) is defined in its first context simply as 'a newe subsidie' (Scrope DSP 280/2, *MED*); later it meant 'tollgate' (a1460, *MED*). CHEVAGE (c1475) was a tax paid annually to a superior, and GAVELAGE (a1500) rent for a holding. TOLLAGE (1494) was simply an alternative word for 'toll'.

#### 6.4.6.2. *Intensive*

PERSONAGE (c1460) in its first attribution is a synonym for 'person' (rather than 'important person'):

... Not oonly of al maner *personages* of our obeisaunce, but also of many a  
straunger

Proc. Privy C. 6. 336, *MED*

'... Not only of all kinds of people subject to us, but also of many foreigners'.

#### 6.4.6.3. *Locative*

VICARAGE (1425) first appeared with its modern meaning, a clergyman's residence.

#### 6.4.6.4. *Instrument*

There are six instrumentals. Three are offices or positions by which certain paid functions are exercised: BAILLIAGE (1420), the office of a bailiff, GARBILAGE (1431) the office of removing refuse from spices, and PORTERAGE, the right to

porter fish (1437-8). The last two were said to be worth respectively 21 shillings and 5 shillings and 8 pence a year (Grocer Lond. 202; 5th Rep. Hist. Comm. 541/1, *MED*).

Concrete instrumentals are STERAGE ‘steering apparatus’ (c1450[c1430]), FERIAGE ‘water transport’ (1440) and APPARAGE ‘accoutrements’ (c1450).

#### 6.4.6.5. *Object*

PEISAGE (c1450[c1425]) in its first context meant ‘cargo [that which is weighed].’ By 1455, however, it had become yet another duty to pay for weighing commodities. PARTAGE (c1450) occurs in one entry in the *MED*, misspelt as *portage*, but apparently with the objective sense ‘portion [something shared]’;

Worche wisly though ye be yong of age  
That ye may haue a plesaunt hool *portage*  
?Cd’Orl. Poems 125/3732, *MED*

‘Go about things sensibly, even at a young age, so as to get an attractive good-sized share’.

AMBASSAGE (1534[?a1500]) is a variant of *ambassade* ‘embassy [persons sent]’.

#### 6.4.6.6. *Result/state*

The nouns in this category are all passive states. DISCORAGE ‘being discouraged’ (1434) is a mental state, and BORWAGE ‘being pledged’ (?c1450) a legal one. DISUSAGE ‘not being used’ (c1475[?c1451]) is also a passive state, though negative. PRESSERAGE ‘being compressed’ (c1450), a physical one, first occurs in an ambiguous metaphorical context, where several meanings may be intended simultaneously:

... the distresse and the anguish ... so herde presseth troubel herte that it thinketh it is streyned in a pressour. Wher of men haue seyn wel ofte bi the condyt bi which it descendeth a gret *presserage* of teres, that of the sorwe is messangere

Pilgr. LM 184, *MED*

‘... distress and anguish ... weigh so heavily on a troubled heart that it feels it has been strained in a press. So that we have often felt a great pressure of tears [state of being pressed by tears? tears which have been pressed?] in the tear ducts, which is the messenger of sorrow’.

The suggested meanings are those of both state and object. However, an agentive sense is also implied: ‘tears which press’, the latter having a further collective function.

#### 6.4.6.7. *Action: Quality*

Quality nouns are FALSAGE ‘deceitfulness’, also implying ‘deceitful action’ (a1475) and RAMAGE (a1500), glossed in the dictionary *Promptorium Parvulorum* as ‘corage: Coragium’. The *MED* gives this as an ME back-formation from an adjective *ramageous* (a1398), itself an ME version of a French adjective *ramage* (c1300).

Two others are qualities connected with actions, or actions referred to in a moral or qualitative context. MOCKAGE (1470-85) first appears in Malory, where it seems to mean both the general act of mocking and the spirit of mockery:

In *mockage* ye shal be called la cote male tayle  
Malory, Arthur ix. I. 338, *MED*  
‘In mockery you shall be called the ill-fitting coat’.

Similarly the earliest context of PARENTAGE (c1489) suggests both the act and the quality of nurturing:

Our fader ... sholde have slayne vs ... Sore harde *parentage* dyd he shewe to  
vs  
Caxton, Sonnes of Aymon iv. 123, *OED*  
‘Our father ... should have killed us ... He showed us bitterly harsh parenting’.

#### 6.4.6.8. *Action: Fact*

COILAGE ‘collecting[ taxes]’ (c1450[c1405), CORRECTAGE ‘making a transaction by broker’ (1442), REPASSAGE ‘returning’ (1442), PARKAGE ‘enclosing livestock’ (1449), HOSTILAGE ‘providing compulsory lodging’ (1455), AVERAGE (1466), the peasant’s obligation to transport goods, and PROCURAGE ‘undue influence’ or ‘bribery’ (a1475) all first appear in general legal contexts. The activities DESPOILAGE ‘pillaging’ (1471), SCOURAGE ‘living off the land’ (?1457).

SONDAGE ‘water sounding’ (?1473) and COUPERAGE ‘barrel making’ (c1475) also first occur in generalised contexts.

ROUELAGE (1438), related to N *reule* ‘rule’ and V *reulen* (c1230[?a1200]), in its first context appears to mean ‘[fact of] jurisdiction’:

In the name of alle myghte God ... and to the *rowelage* of alle christen puple,  
I Richard Edy ... have maad my testament  
Will Norwich on Nrf. Archaeol. 4. 329, *MED*  
‘In the name of Almighty God ... and [subject] to the jurisdiction of all  
Christian people ... I, Richard Edy ... have made my testament’.

TAXAGE ‘taxation’ (?c1475) first appears in a dictionary with a gloss in Latin.

#### 6.4.6.9. *Action*: Specific instance/occasion

Eight action nouns first appear in the context of specific instances. Five occur in financial contexts, but in the sense of the specific activities involved:

PAIAGE (c1450[?a1422])

Fro yere to yere makyng a *payage*  
Of a tribute ... To the Empyre  
Lydgate LOL 3. 1323, *MED*  
‘From year to year paying a tribute ... to the Empire’;

GARNERAGE (c1436):

... the merchautz payen not for the *garnerage* of the same ship  
Ipswich Domesday (2) 195, *MED*  
‘... the merchants do not pay for storing this ship’s goods’;

REPOISAGE (1447)

A commissioun was made to certeyn persones for *repoisage* of woll at the  
staple of Caleys  
Proc. Privy C. 6. 61, *MED*  
‘A commission was given to certain persons to re-weigh wool at the staple  
of Calais’.

LABOURAGE (1475(?a1451), usually a general synonym for ‘labour’, occurs in its earliest text in a specific plural context:

Marcus Actilius ... Yave hym to *labouragis* ... of londis and pastures  
Bk. Noblesse 65, *MED*

‘Marcus Actilius ... set him tasks on the land’.

STOPPAGE (1465), though not in itself a financial term, still appears with reference to finance:

I told hym that ... I wold pay hym his dewte without any *stoppage*

Paston Lett. II. 221, *OED*

‘I told him that ... I would pay him what I owed him without interrupting [the payments]’.

BROKERAGE (1466), a variant of BROKAGE:

Item, for *brokerage* ixd. Flem.

Acc. Howard in RC57 361, *MED*.

‘Item, ten Flemish pence for broking’.

Others are ARBITRAGE (1480):

Parys sayd, I shall thynke and trewly determyne this *arbytrage*

Caxton, Ovid’s Met. xi. ii, *OED*

‘Paris said, I shall consider and accurately carry out this [task of] judging’.

LEAKAGE (1490):

Alle maner auenturs fortunes perilles and iopardies of alle the sayd wyne,  
*lecage* forst and egirnesse of the same oonly exepte

Arnolds Chron. (1871) 112, *MED*

‘All kinds of accidents, chances, hazards and jeopardies of all the said wines, only excepting the first spilling and fizziness of the same [i.e. on opening]’.

#### 6.4.6.10. *Summary*

As in earlier periods, the dominant semantic category for both analysable and unanalysable nouns is the collective. Among unanalysable nouns this is almost equally divided between financial and other senses, but for the first time among analysable nouns a large majority of collectives (23) consists of financial terms. Analysable action nouns are also for the first time prominent, with 25 examples. Most of these (13) are in the generalised category of fact, many being connected with rights or obligations incurring payment. Six deverbal analysable nouns, and two denominal, occur in the context of specific actions. Half of these are also connected with rights and payments.

#### 6.4.7. *Conclusions*

Marchand concludes his discussion of *-age* by remarking that ‘Derivatives in *-age* ... bear the mark of a special milieu ... in which they were coined. This does not, however, prevent the words from having general currency’ (1969: 236, 4.4.12).

Marchand is referring here to modern English; but most of these characteristics and tendencies can be seen in my sample almost from the beginning of ME. Even in the early period, where a range of meanings is spread almost equally across the sample, specialised collective senses dominate slightly. However, the characteristic financial subgroup is not prominent before 1300, and the figures are too low to tell us much, especially for the small number of analysable nouns. As usual, a pattern emerges more clearly in the 14th century, where there are almost twice as many analysable nouns as unanalysables in the sample. It is among the analysable nouns that the financial subgroup now arises, while the unanalysables still include more collectives than any other sense. It is also at this time that the ‘state’ category begins to make a more substantial showing among analysable nouns, mainly in words denoting social and legal status.

However, the majority of nouns with ‘state’ meanings in my ME sample are denominal, as in *VILEINAGE* ‘state of being a villein’, or *PARAGE* ‘state of being a peer’. These senses seem related to those of denominal collectives such as *BARONAGE* ‘barons’ and *COSINAGE* ‘family’. The high proportion of collective meanings must of course reflect the high proportion of denominal derivatives in this suffix. Indeed, in some denominal collectives the suffix appears to add little to the meaning, as in the uncountables *HERBAGE* ‘grass’, or *TOLLAGE* ‘toll’; with countable nouns there is sometimes a plural sense, as in *CORDAGE* ‘cords’.

Marchand mentions but does not dwell on the sense ‘place of [N]’ (1969: 236, 4.4.8.), while Dalton-Puffer finds the locatives in her sample of doubtful derivation, i.e. opaque (e.g. VILLAGE) and unlikely to be productive (1993:190). However, my sample contains a few transparent denominal derivatives with locative meanings, such as HERMITAGE and PARSONAGE. The category is small but typical, in that among French abstract nominal suffixes it appears to be restricted to *-age*.

I remarked in 6.3.2. above that the sample for the 15th century has a higher incidence of new analysable nouns than for the 14th century in this suffix. The ratio of analysable to unanalysable is of course usually higher in the 15th century, due to the influx of French forms in the 14th century, including many related to suffixed words; but here the figures are also higher absolutely. The majority of new 15th-century nouns in *-age* consists of denominal collectives, and most of these are coinages on native bases signifying charges or taxes on goods or uses. The suffix was therefore highly productive as a denominal formative by the 15th century, primarily in the field of collective and especially financial terms.

Dalton-Puffer claims that action meanings are widespread for this suffix in ME (1993: 190). Action meanings are not prominent among first attributions in my sample before the 15th century, but during that period there is a considerable increase of this sense among analysable nouns, linked to a similar increase in possible deverbal derivatives. Purely deverbal derivation had of course been present from the beginning of the ME period; my sample includes PASSAGE (c1300[?c1225]) and SERVAGE (c1400[?c1280]). However, in its first attribution PASSAGE has an instrumental meaning. In marked contrast to the previously considered suffixes *-ment*, *-ance* and *-ation* (which are almost exclusively deverbal), action meanings make few appearances among early and 14th-century analysable nouns in *-age*. Marchand lists 14th-century

noun/verb pairs such as *arrive*/ARRIVAGE, *coin* COINAGE and *carry*/CARRIAGE (1969: 235, 4.4.7.). Yet of these three clearly deverbal nouns, only ARRIVAGE first appeared in ME with an action meaning; the others first had collective and (in the case of CARRIAGE), financial senses. Later in its history ARRIVAGE acquired the locative meaning ‘port’ (a1500[?c1450]), by which time it had been superseded as an action noun by ARRIVAL (1393). Elsewhere, deverbal nouns may take over the functions of denominal collectives. GUIDAGE in the 15th century, like CARRIAGE in the 14th, is a financial term of deverbal origin, both signifying charges for services.

In the 15th century, nouns associated with verbs increase to just over half the analysable sample in *-age*. Two thirds of these are also associated with nouns, and have concrete or financial collective meanings. Of the 12 purely deverbal derivatives in this period, however, 10 are first recorded with action meanings. There is also a slight increase in the first appearances of denominal nouns such as COUPERAGE and BROKERAGE in action contexts. Among unanalysable nouns, the first appearance of denominal MURAGE ‘walling’ shows ambiguity between collective and action senses (see 6.4.5.5. above). Among possible ME coinages, action/fact is the majority sense, especially among those with Romance bases, though it is closely followed by financial collectives, most of which have native bases.

As might be expected, most words in *-age* first appear in administrative texts (see Appendix 2). However, there are also widespread first attributions of words with this suffix in fictional literature, due perhaps to their concrete or personal meanings and social connotations.



## Chapter 7

**THE SUFFIX *-al* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH****7.1. History and Morphology****7.1.1. *History***

Jespersen states that *-al* in English substantives derives from Latin third declension neuter endings *-al/-alia*, or from the adjectival ending *-alis -ale -alia*, pointing out that many nouns such as CAPITAL and PRINCIPAL were originally adjectives (1942: VI.383, 22.2.[1]). Marchand's account omits the nominalised adjectives. According to him, the nominal suffix '*-al* (type arrival) forms sbs [substantives] of action chiefly from verbs of Latin or French origin'. He adds that 'Neither the OED nor the grammars say anything convincing as to how *-al* became an English formative' (1969: 236, 4.5.1.). Malkiel, however (1944: 80ff) traces the English suffix to three Old French endings, *-al*, *-ail* and *-aille*, which are included in my own categorisation below.

**7.1.2. *Morphological types***

If the nominalised adjectives are included, my ME sample in *-al* falls into 6 main morphological types. In addition to these main types back-formations appear, as in ASSAILE, formed on the verb *assailen*.

**7.1.2.1. *Type 1***

This type, e.g. CARDINAL, is a nominalisation of the Latin adjective in *-alis/-ale*, which itself was formed on a Latin noun of the 1st or 3rd declension, the adjectival suffix being attached to the stem of the oblique cases. The stem therefore does not correspond to any simplex English form.

#### 7.1.2.2. *Type 2*

In this type, e.g. SACRAMENTAL, the adjectival suffix is added to a latinate noun in French or English. In ME the type may be an adjective which is later nominalised (e.g. SACRAMENTAL) or a noun which later develops an adjectival use (e.g. MENIAL).

#### 7.1.2.3. *Type 3*

This type, e.g. VITAILLE, entered ME through French. The ending derives from Latin *-alia*, the neuter plural of the adjectival suffix *-ale* (see Type 1 above). The base is Latin and corresponds to no simplex English form. The ending is variously spelt in ME as *-ail(le)* or *ayl(e)*, while *-eil(le)*, *eyl(e)* and *-el(le)* are shared with suffixes of other derivations. Malkiel (1944: 82) distinguishes *-ail* from *-aille* in OF, deriving the former from the Latin diminutive *-aculum*; however, there seems little semantic reflection of this distinction in ME forms, which according to Malkiel reflected inconsistencies also existing in OF (1944: 83). These nouns sometimes take a plural form in both French and English, as in FUNERELLES.

#### 7.1.2.4. *Type 4*

In this type, e.g. BRUSHAIL(L)E, the ending is as in Type 3, but the base is a French noun which may or may not occur in ME.

#### 7.1.2.5. *Type 5*

This type, e.g. ARRIVAILE, is formed, perhaps by analogy with Types 3 and 4, on a French or ME latinate verb stem. According to Malkiel (1944:81), some exponents of this type had an *-al* ending in OF. Here also the spelling is variable, using all forms available to Type 3 and in some cases the modE form *-al(l)*, which perhaps reflects a phonological change (see 7.2.1. below). This type tends to attract stems with prefixes, especially *re-*.

### 7.1.2.6. *Type 6*

This type, e.g. SPRINGAL, is formed on a native nominal or verbal stem. The type seems to be rare and in the two best-known cases, BRIDALE and BURIEL, the suffix also has a native origin. (See Jespersen, 1954: VI.386, 22.2[4]).

### 7.1.3. *Co-occurrences*

Like the other suffixes, *-al* may attach to bases with the prefixes *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n/m)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-* and *pre-*. It does not appear in ME with *per-* and *in(m)-*, but in one formation, MISGOVERNAILE, it follows the native prefix *mis-*.

### 7.1.4. *Transparency*

Dalton-Puffer places *-al* at Level 2 on Dressler's scale of morphotactic and morphophonological transparency, or 'naturalness' (1992: 475ff). However, she finds 'such a small number of exponents in the Helsinki Corpus ... that a naturalness rating is not really justified' (1996: 116).

## 7.2. Phonology

### 7.2.1. *Stress*

Until the 15th century the stress was probably on the suffix (Jespersen, 1942: VI.438, 24.4). In Types 3, 4 and 5, end-stress may be indicated by spellings such as BATAILLE, ARRIVAILE. Jespersen, Marchand and Malkiel all point out that deverbal nouns in *-al* were formed on end-stressed verbs, which may have contributed to the later loss of stress on the suffix; although Marchand also comments that the end-stress does not seem significant in suffix choice, mentioning end-stressed verbs such as *consist* which form nouns in *-ence/-ance* (Jespersen, 1942: VI.386, 22.2[3]; Marchand, 1969: 237, 4.5.3; Malkiel, 1944: 85). Malkiel also mentions a preponderance of later coinages in *-al* where the stressed syllable has the diphthong /ai/, as in RECITAL (1512). If the base-final vowel were a diphthong after the Vowel

Shift, intuition suggests that this might tend to weaken the stress on the last syllable. In two late 15th century analysable nouns of Type 5 in my sample the suffix has the spellings *-el* and *-all*, which suggest that by then the suffixal diphthong had shortened to /ɛ /, / /, or perhaps simply schwa. Malkiel suggests the dropping of final <e> from late ME bases as an explanation of this (1944: 83), though it might also reflect a return to the original Latin suffix for these deverbal nouns. The shortening of the suffixal diphthong would restore the original stress of the word, so that the suffix may have moved within the ME period from the morphemic boundary to the word boundary, or from the first to the second level of the phonological cycle.

### 7.2.2. *Phonetics*

My sample includes all stem-final consonants except /l/ and /dʒ/. Bases may end in C, CC or CCC. As with other <a>-initial suffixes, stem-final /t/ and /r/ are common, as is stem-final /i/. The vowels /ɛ / and /u/ also appear, as well as the diphthongs /ɔ i/ and /ɔ u/.

### 7.3. *Integration*

As we saw in 7.1.4. above, Dalton-Puffer places *-al* with other vowel-initial suffixes at Level 2 on her quoted scales of morphotactic and morphosemantic transparency (1992: 45-58), but otherwise finds the number of exponents of this suffix in her sample too small to discuss (1996: 110). I have in fact found only 169 noun entries in total under *-al* in the *MED*, most being of my Type 1. I have included 151 of these in my sample, excluding only a mixed set of mainly concrete nouns of heterogeneous derivation, some from Greek and Arabic.

### 7.3.1. *Productivity*

ModE makes distinctions between *-al*, *-el* and *-le*, but spelling suggests that ME did not. Nouns exist in which variants are used interchangeably to render not only the four types giving modE *-al*, but the OE nominal suffixes *-els* and *-ol*, as in BURIEL, besides Latin suffixes such as *-ilium/ilia* (e.g. MERVAILE, COUNSEIL). In some of the nouns excluded from the data, such as *coral*, *hostel* and *chapel*, the suffix reflects the Latin endings *-allum* and the diminutives *-ellum/-ella*. As a nominal formative, *-al* was therefore subject to more confusion than it was as an adjectival suffix. Furthermore the basis for analogy was largely lacking, in that a high proportion of borrowings were in fact Latin adjectives, nominalised in French or ME, which had no simplex forms in English at any time. It is probable that this lack of morphological transparency inhibited the productivity of the suffix in ME.

Nevertheless, the *MED* gives 18 nouns (a surprisingly large number) as being of possible ME derivation. 13 of these are misleading, however, being nouns such as VENIAL which have morphological counterparts in OF adjectives, and which usually first appeared as adjectives in ME. Two, ORIENTAL and PASCAL, were introduced as nouns before they were used as adjectives in ME. Most are morphologically unanalysable borrowings, where only the nominal function can be said to be of ME introduction. Another, QUIENAL, is a translation of a noun in ML, again without a preceding adjectival use. (Two more of similar origin, BIENNAL and TRIENNAL, are not apparently considered to be ME coinages). Four of five analysable nouns said to derive from ME adjectives (14th-century SUBSTANCIAL and NATURAL, and 15th-century SPIRITUAL and LINEAL) also have counterparts in OF or AN. However, in ME they follow the related nouns *substance*, *nature*, *spirit* and *line*, from which in theory they could derive. The fifth, FANTASTICAL (c1460[a1449]) has no

counterpart in French and seems to be a genuine ME coinage, possibly on the borrowed ME noun *fantastik*.

These five are all 15th or late 14th-century neologisms. There are also four late 14th-century nouns on Romance bases which appear to have no French counterparts. One is the collective noun BRIGANTAILLE ‘affairs relating to brigands’ (a1393), a nonce formation on the French noun *brigaunt*. Two are deverbal: REHERSAIL (c1395) and DEPOSAL ((1397). SUPPOWAIL (c1450[a1400]) is of obscure origin, according to the *MED* possibly Scottish. More appear in the 15th century. Two follow both nouns and verbs in ME: the collective BOTAILLE ‘boundaries’ (a1555[?a1430]) following the noun *butte* (1250) and the verb *butten* (1315), and the instrumental FIRMAL ‘rent’ (1454), following the noun *ferme* ‘farm’ (1121) and the verb *fermen* ‘to farm’ (a1150). Three more are purely deverbal. STOPPAL ‘stopper’ (a1475[?a1430]) is formed on a native verb *stoppen* (1000[?OE]). APPOSAILE ‘question’ (a1500[a1415]) and REVERSAL (1488) are formed on Romance bases, but also have no recorded counterparts in French. All these are analysable. I have also found nine examples before and during this period, that is from the mid 14th century to the late 15th, of later or (in one case) simultaneous variants in *-al* on nouns in other latinate suffixes, such as REPENTAILLE (a1450[a1338]) following REPENTAUNCE (c1300).

By the beginning of the 14th century there is evidence of reanalysis of both Latin and OE forms. Indeed, the potential for productivity might even be thought to have existed with this suffix since the beginning of the 13th century, given an apparent reanalysis of the two OE nouns *bryd gealu* ‘wedding feast’ to produce BRIDALE (c1200). Here *gealu* has come to be identified with the suffix *-al* according to the rule N+ al = N. However, it is also possible that the reanalysis did not take place until the

14th century, when SPOUSAILLE would provide an obvious analogy. Previously BRIDALE, BRIDALL etc. may simply have reflected a spelling confusion. That a reanalysis had certainly taken place by the 15th century is shown by an adjectival use in 1420, by which time most of the possible ME coinages had also appeared. It seems, then, that at least by the end of the ME period there was some consciousness of *-al* as a formative suffix. But the Latin *dies male* ‘unlucky days’ appears as early as the beginning of the 14th century as the collective DISMAL, and there is also at this time a possible native formation in SPRINGAL ‘catapult’ (c1330[?c1300]), which could as well be formed on the native verb *springen* (a1225[OE]) as on the French verb *espringuer*. Although there exists an OF noun *espringale*, the *OED* suggests that this is a back-formation from the Anglo-Latin *springaldus*, itself possibly a translation from the ME. This would make SPRINGAL an English formation which was borrowed into French, rather than the more usual reverse.

Table 59 in Appendix 1 lists eight alternatives in *-al* to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes.

### 7.3.2. *Analysability*

Nouns deriving from adjectives have been classified as unanalysable where they have counterparts in French or Latin and are morphologically opaque in ME. This means that, unusually, there are more unanalysable than analysable nouns in the sample (79 to 72). As with *-age*, there are fewer deverbal ME nouns in *-al* than those deriving from other base categories. Discounting back-formations I have found only 20 over the total period. All these, however, are analysable.

### 7.3.3. *The sample in -al*

There follows in Table 6 a complete list of the sample of 151 ME nouns in *-al*, together with forms on the same stem. Forms later than the nouns are given in square

brackets. Where double dates are given, the first indicates the date of the MS and the second the putative date of the original text. An asterisk indicates doubtful analysability status, due to dating uncertain within a margin of 25 years on either side of both noun and simplex form.

**Table 6: NOUNS IN *-al* IN 3 PERIODS OF ME WITH FORMS ON THE SAME STEM**

**The early period: 1150-1300**

*Unanalysable nouns of the early period*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1126	cardinal		[a1400(a1225) A cardinal]
c1230(?a1200)	minstral	[(1340) V ministren]	[c1300 N ministre]
	counseil	[a1325(c1280) V counseilen]	
c1275 (?a1216)	bataille	[?a1400(a1338) V bataillen]	
c1290	special		a1225 A special
	capital		c1230(?a1200) A capital
c1330(?a1300)	hospital		
	mervaille		
c1400(?a1300)	entaille	[c1340 V entailen]	
	entraille		

*Analysable nouns of the early period*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1200	bridale		c1275(?a1200) N bride
c1225	biriel		OE N byrgels
c1275	travail*	c1275 V travailen	
a1300	penitencial		c1225(?a1200) N penitence
			[a1500(?a1425) A penitencial]
c1330(?a1300)	apparail*	c1275 V apparailen	[1380 N apparailment]
			[c1411 N apparure]
c1400(?a1300)	assaille	c1230(?a1200) V assailen	

**The fourteenth century**

*Unanalysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1300	dominical		[(?1430) A dominical]
a1325(c1300)	dismal		
c1325(c1300)	principal		c1300 A principal
c1330(?c1300)	nasal		[?a1425 A nasal]
a1400(a1325)	paregal		(a1325) A paregal
c1330	animal		[c1385 A animal]
a1450(a1338)	vitaille		
	regal		[?a1425(c1380) A regal]
	frapaille		
(1338)	dial		
(1340)	chenaille		
c1390(?a1350)	trental		[1389 N trent]
c1350	venial		a1400(c1303) A venial
a1500(a1375)	emperal		[?a1425(c1380) A imperial]
c1400(a1376)	triennal		
a1425(c1380)	general		c1325(c1300) A general



c1400(?c1380) polaille (1381) corporal (c1384) temporal c1400(?c1384) quienal a1425(c1385) ordal 1387-8 remissaile (c1387-95) cordial c1390 equinoxial biennal (c1390) original			[(a1398) A corporal] ?a1425(?a1350) A temporal
(a1393) mineral moral genital (c1395) limaille c1600(?c1395) annuel braccal c1440(a1400) roial c1450(?a1400) surreal real	[c1500 V remissen]		[(a1398) A cordial] [c1400 A equinoxial]  c1450(?a1400) N origine a1325 A original [?a1425 A mineral] c1385(c1300) A moral a1425(a1382) A genital  (a1382) A annuel  a1400(c1250) A roial  a1450(?a1349) A real

*Analysable nouns of the 14th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
c1330 official  poverail		[(c1443) V officen]	[c1475(1392) A official] a1325 (c1250) N office [?c1425(c1390) N povre] a1275(?c1150) A povre
c1330(?c1300) springal spousaille a1325 ordinal		a1225(OE?) V springen a1225(c1200) V spusen c1300 V ordeinen	a1225(?a1200) N spuse c1230(?a1200) N ordre A1325(?a1300) N ordinaunce [a1425 N ordeinement] a1225(?a1200) N coroune c1225) N rive a1400(c1303) N decree [?a1425(c1380) N decret]
c1330 coronal ?a1400(a1338) rivaille decretal		c1230(?a1200) V corounen c1300(?a1300) V riven (1399) V decreen]	
a1450(a1338) repentaille (1345) aventaille c1440(?a1350) governail		c1400(?a1300) V repenten c1300 V aventen c1375(?c1280) V governen	c1380 N gouvernement c1450(c1370) N governaunce 1154 N rent ?c1250(OE) N bush ?a1400(a1338) N province [c1400(c1378) A provincial] (c1375) N orient c1325(c1386) A oriental
1362 rental* a1500(a1375) bushaille c1400(a1376) provincial		1362 V renten	
c1400(c1378) oriental			
c1380 supposal c1400(?c1380) portal a1425(c1380) material		1303 V supposen	a1300 N porte a1500(c1340) A material c1230(?a1200) N matere c1230(?a1200) N signe [c1450(?a1400) N signance] c1250 N memorie c1450(c1375) A memorial c1300(c1250) N meine [c1425(c1395) A mcinial] [c1450 A causal]
c1450(c1380) signal		a1225(OE?) V signen	
a1382 memorial			
(a1387) meinial			
(a1389) causal		c1450(c1380) V causen	

(c1390)	divinaille espiaille simonial	a1450(a1338) V divinen a1250 V espian	c1230(?a1200) N cause  c1230(?a1200) N simony c1400(c1378) N Simon a1325(c1250) N spirit a1400(c1303) A spiritual [(a1393) A spirital] c1450(c1380) N arrivage (a1387) N brigant
c1475(1392)	spiritual		
a1393 (a1393) c1395 a1450(a1397)	arrivaille brigantaille rehersail ceremonial	a1225(?a1200) V ariven  c1330(?a1300) V rehersen	a1425(a1382) N ceremonie [(a1402) A ceremonial]
(1397) (a1398)	deposal accidental  substancial	c1330(?a1300) V deposen	1386 A accidental c1450(c1380) N accident a1325(?a1300) N substance (1340) A substancial c1275 N nature [?1457 N suppowailment]
a1400	natural suppowail*	c1440(?a1400) V suppowailen	

### The 15th century

#### *Unanalysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
1400	judicial		(a1382) A judicial
?a1425(c1400)	septentrional		?a1450(1391) A septentrional
c1460(?c1400)	responsail		
(1408-17)	brachial		
a1500(1413)	suspiral	[a1500 V suspiren]	
a1500(a1415)	pascal brushail		
?a1450(1422)	pectoral		
a1425	casal commensal parietal local cubital fical dual		1532rev.(c1385) A commensal ?a1425 A parietal c1474(1392) A local [(?a1440) A cubital]
1500(?a1425)	almaille		c1330 N animal c1385 A animal ?c1425 A digital
?c1425	digital		
c1428	emoroidal tribunal		
(1432)	manuel		(?a1406) A manual
(1437)	funerelle(s)		
(1440)	journal coraille		a1400 A coral
1447	curial		
(1447)	quinquenal gradual		?a1425) A gradual (a1382) N doctrine (c1449) A doctrinal
a1456(a1449)	doctrinal		
a1450	pennoral		
c1450	resaille		

a1475 noval  
 conthoral  
 c 1475(1464) boreal  
 a1500(a1475) antiquaille

c1450 A boreal

*Analysable nouns of the 15th century*

		<u>Related verbs</u>	<u>Related nouns/adjectives</u>
a1500(c1410)	sinodal		(c1449) A sinodal a1121 N sinod c1330(a1300) N sustenaunce
a1500(1413)	sustenal	a1325(c1280) V sustenen	
a1500(a1415)	apposaile	c1330(?a1300) V apposen	
(1419)	reprisail*	a1450(c1410) V reprisen	
(1423)	disavaile	c1300 V availen a1450(1410) v disavailen	
?a1425	aneurismal*		?a1425) N aneurisma
	Mercurial		(c1395) N mercury
?a1475(?a1425)	testimonial		(1421) A testimonial (a1382) N testimonie
a1500(1426)	lineal		(a1398) A lineal c1300(c1225) N ligne
a1475(?a1430)	opposaile	(c1380) V opposen	(1250) N butte
	botaille	(1315) V butten	[1465 N stoppage]
	stoppal	c1000(?OE) V stoppen	[1493 N stoppance]
(1430)	aquitaille	c1230(?a1200) V aquiten	[a1400a1338 N aquitaunce] [(1431) N aquitement]
(1433)	finial		(c1426) A finial
(1436)	trial	c1400(?a1300) V trien	
(?a1439)	misgovernail	c1400 V misgovernen	c1375 N misgovernance c1384 N misgouvernement
c1440	proccessional		a1121 N procession
(1446)	iral		?a1425(1373) N iris
c1460(a1449)	reparaille	(a1382) V reparailen	
	fantastical		(c1385) A fantastic ?a1475(?a1425) A fantastical
(c1449)	sacramental	a1225(?OE) V sacren	a1500(1382) A sacramental a1225(?OE) N sacrament
c1450	neutral		(a1398) A neuter
	nerval		c1425(c1385) N nerve
	vestal		?a1475(?a1425) A vestal (a1387) N Vesta
c1450	piramidal		(a1398) N piramis (a1398) A piramidal
(1454)	firmal	a1150 V fermen	1121 N ferme
c1460	bestial		1532rev.(c1385) A bestial (a1200) N beste
1543(1464)	defial	c1330(?a1300) V defien	c1400(?a1300) N defiaunce
c1500(1471)	menstrual		(a1398) A menstrual ?a1425(1473) N menstrue
1474	refusel	a1400(?a1325) V refusen	
a1500(c1477)	organal		c1400(?a1300) N organe
1483	cordaille	a1475 V corden	c1330(?a1325) N corde [1490 N cordage]
1488	reversall	c1350(a1333) V reversen	

## 7.4. Semantics

Marchand claims that deverbal derivation in *-al* (my Type 5 above) ‘is made almost exclusively from resultative-transitive verbs’ and that nouns in *-al* and *-aille* from Latin *-ale/-alia* (my Types 1 and 2 above) express ‘plurality and collectivity’ (1969: 237 4.5.3., 4.5.4.). In Kastovsky’s classification, deverbal nouns in *-al* function only in action, agentive and factitive (result) senses (1985: 226).

### 7.4.1. *Multiple meanings: Attributive nouns*

Nouns of my Type 1, derived from Latin adjectives, generally signify the entity to which they are attributed, e.g. OFFICIAL (i.e. person in office). Sometimes this entity may also have an instrumental meaning, as in DIAL (i.e. ‘[daily] timepiece’).

### 7.4.2. *Intensive nouns*

Some instrumentals are formed by attaching the suffix to a noun already instrumental in meaning, such as DECRETAL < *decree*. In these cases the suffix seems to act as a marker for the instrumental sense, intensifying rather than changing it. It may, however, have been felt as attributive, indicating ‘decree-like ruling’.

### 7.4.3. *1150-1300: unanalysable nouns*

If we include the nominalised adjectives, two thirds of ME nouns in this suffix are unanalysable. In the early period there are 10, with various semantic functions.

#### 7.4.3.1. *Attributive nouns*

Four are attributive. Three of these are from Latin denominal adjectives and take over the function of implied nouns. These are CARDINAL ‘[key] cleric’ (a1126) with its modern sense, SPECIAL ‘[particular] friend’ (c1290) and CAPITAL ‘[topmost] architectural decoration’ (?a1325[a1300]), Interestingly, CARDINAL did not acquire an adjectival use in English until the 14th century, considerably later than the noun. MERVAILE (c1330[?a1300]) has the French collective ending from the

Latin *mirabilia* ‘marvellous things’, but is used in the singular to mean ‘marvellous event’.

#### 7.4.3.2. *Collective nouns*

ENTRAILLE(s) (c1400[?a1300]) has the concrete collective meaning ‘entrails’.

#### 7.4.3.3. *Locative*

HOSPITAL (c1330[?a1300] ‘charitable institution’) is originally denominal and derives in French from the Latin word ‘guest’.

#### 7.4.3.4. *Instrument*

COUNSEIL ‘advice’ (c1230[?a1200]) derives from the Latin neuter singular *concilium*.

#### 7.4.3.5. *Agent*

MINSTRAL ‘servant’ (c1230[?a1200]) is an agent noun deriving from the Latin adjective *ministerialis* (from L. *ministerium* ‘servant’).

#### 7.4.3.6. *Object*

ENTAILE (c1400[a1300]), a back formation in OF from the verb *entailler*, has the objective sense ‘worked jewellery’.

#### 7.4.3.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

BATAILLE (c1275[?a1216]) is classified by Malkiel as a collective noun in French, the interpretation of which would be ‘things pertaining to fighting’ (Malkiel 1944: 80). It occurs c1300(?c1225) with the sense ‘battalion’, but in the earliest (and in most subsequent) contexts, it has rather the function of an occasion noun:

*zif* men habbeþ *bataile* inume,  
 Ich wat hwaþer schal beon ouerkume  
 Owl & N. 1197, MED  
 ‘If they have joined battle, I know which will be defeated’

#### 7.4.4. 1150-1300: *analysable nouns*

There are only six analysable nouns in the early period.

##### 7.4.4.1. *Locative*

BIRIEL (a1225), from OE *byrgels*, was first recorded with the Locative meaning ‘grave’ or ‘burial chamber’:

Deade men he arede of here *berieles* to life  
Vsp. A. Hom. Init. Creat. 229, MED  
‘He raised dead men to life from their graves’

##### 7.4.4.2. *Instrument*

The implied noun in the attributive PENITENCIAL (a1300) is a type of religious book, with the instrumental sense ‘means of achieving penitence’.

APPARAIL (c1330[?a1300]) exists in OF and AN and is probably not a back formation from ME *apparailen* (c1275). It has the instrumental sense of ‘clothes’.

##### 7.4.4.3. *Object*

The objective TRAVAIL ‘work’ (c1275) and the related verb *travailen* first occur in the same text. The noun exists in OF and AN and is probably not a back formation in ME.

##### 7.4.4.4. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

ASSAILLE ‘act of assailing’ (c1400[?a1300]) is given by the *MED* as a back formation from the verb *assailen* (c1230[?a1200]). It first occurs in a specific context:

Leteþ hem passen wiþouten *assaile*,  
And siweþ me after my taile  
KAlex. 2137, MED  
‘Let them pass without attacking them, and follow me,  
bringing up the rear’.

The occasion noun BRIDALE (c1200) was not originally a suffixed noun at all, but was reanalysed from OE *bryd gealu* ‘wedding feast’ (see 7.3.1. above).

#### 7.4.4.5. *Summary*

Most nouns in *-al* in the early period are unanalysable borrowings. Derivations are very variable, the largest unanalysable group being attributive nouns borrowed from French but deriving ultimately from Latin adjectives. Others are scattered sparsely across case functions. The three action nouns (two unanalysable and one analysable) all occur in specific contexts. One is a back formation, and one a reanalysis of an OE compound signifying an occasion.

#### 7.4.5. *The 14th century: unanalysable nouns*

35 of the 79 unanalysable nouns appear in the 14th century.

##### 7.4.5.1. *Attributive nouns*

Almost half of the total for this period have attributive meanings deriving from Latin adjectives. They include DOMINICAL ‘book for use on Sundays’ (c1300), PRINCIPAL ‘principal person’ (c1325[c1300]), VENIAL ‘venial sin’ (c1350), GENERAL ‘general entity’ (?a1425[c1380]), MINERAL ‘stone [in alchemy]’ (a1393), ANNUEL ‘endowment for services’ (c1600[?a1395]) and the synonyms ROIAL (c1440[a1400]) and REAL (c1425[c1400]), meaning ‘royal person’. SURREAL (c1450[?a1400]) refers to the antlers below those called ‘real’.

ANIMAL (c1330) has its modern meaning, the underlying sense being ‘creature with a soul’. PAREGAL (a1400[a1325]) means ‘equal person, peer’, EMPERAL (a1500[a1375]) ‘imperial coin’, and EQUINOXIAL (c1390) ‘celestial equator’. TRIENNAL (c1400[a1376]) and QUIENAL ((c1400[c1384])) are masses said for three and five years respectively, and BIENNAL (c1390) an indulgence which runs for two years.

#### 7.4.5.2. *Collective nouns*

DISMAL ‘unlucky days’ (a1325[c1300]) is a reanalysis of the Latin *dies male* (see 7.3.1. above). TRENTAL ‘thirty masses’ (c1390[?a1350]) is a collective use of an attributive noun. The others in this group have Marchand’s regular collective ending *-aille* from the Latin plural ending *-alia*. They are VITAILLE ‘food’ (a1450[a1338]), FRAPAILLE (a1450[a1338]) and CHENAILLE (1340), both meaning ‘rabble’ (the latter literally ‘dogs’), POLAILLE ‘poultry’ (c1400[?c1380]) and LIMAILLE ‘metal filings’ (c1395).

#### 7.4.5.3. *Instrument*

Seven attributive nouns also have instrumental meanings. These include NASAL ‘noseguard [in armour]’ (c1330[?c1300], DIAL ‘[daily] timepiece’ (1338), CORDIAL ‘medicine [for the heart]’ (c1387-95), GENITAL ‘organ [of reproduction]’ (a1393) and BRACCAL ‘bandage [for the arm]’ (a1400). TEMPORAL (c1384) first appears as a timetable for church readings, though later it is usually an attributive noun meaning temporal as opposed to spiritual things. ORIGINAL (c1390) probably derives from a Latin attributive adjective, but has the nominal instrumental meaning ‘origin’. The first appearance in ME of the French noun *origine* is dated c1450(?a1400), so it is not possible to tell whether ORIGINAL is truly unanalysable. If analysable, it possibly reflects an intensive use of the suffix in ME, adding emphasis to the instrumental sense of the French borrowing.

#### 7.4.5.4. *Object*

REMISSAILE (1532rev.(c1385) has the objective sense ‘things to be sent back’:

The almoigner, that hathe drawe up in the cloth al the *remissailes*, as trenchours, and the relief, to bere to the almesse  
Usk TL 4/108, *MED*



‘The almoner, who has wrapped up in a cloth everything to be sent back, such as trenchers [loaves used as plates], and the charitable offerings to take to the almshouses’.

#### 7.4.5.5. *Action: Quality*

The attributive MORAL (c1400) meant ‘virtue’.

#### 7.4.5.6. *Action: Fact*

REGAL (?a1400[a1338]) first appears in the factual sense of ‘sovereignty’. Subsequently it is a synonym for attributive ROIAL and REAL, and means ‘royal person’.

#### 7.4.5.7. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

ORDAL (a1425[c1385]) is a spelling variant of OE *ordeal*, a form of trial.

### 7.4.6. *The 14th century: analysable nouns*

As with unanalysables, there are 35 analysable nouns in the sample for this period.

#### 7.4.6.1. *Attributive nouns*

Analysable attributive nouns in *-al* are preceded by related ME nouns. They include OFFICIAL ‘official person’ (c1330), PROVINCIAL ‘provincial head [of order of friars]’ (c1400[a1376]), ORIENTAL ‘jewel from the East’ (c1400[c1378]), MEINIAL ‘person belonging to a household’ (a1387), SIMONIAL ‘person who practises simony’ (c1390) and CEREMONIAL (a1450[a1397]), a part of the *New Testament*. Philosophical and scientific terms in this class are ACCIDENTAL ‘accidental quality or circumstance’ ([a1398]) and NATURAL ‘natural phenomenon’ (a1400). However, the first attribution of NATURAL may actually be adjectival, causing confusion by the use of the French adjectival plural ending:

Alle þese þingis bifore seid ben but *naturels*

Lanfranc 15/19-20, *MED*

‘All these things aforementioned are only natural [phenomena?]

The plural -s occasionally appears on undoubted adjectives in ME (see Kibbee, 1991, 72ff).

MATERIAL (?a1425[c1380]) and SUBSTANCIAL (a1398) are variants of *matere* (c1230[?a1200], ‘matter’) and SUBSTANCE (a1325(?a1300), where the suffix appears to act simply as an intensive.

#### 7.4.6.2. *Collective nouns*

There are four collectives with the usual ending *-ail/aille*: the concrete nouns POVERAIL ‘poor people’ (c1325[c1300]), BUSHAILLE ‘thicket’ (1500[a1375]), and the abstract BRIGANTAILLE ‘affairs of mercenaries’ (a1393). In PORTAL ‘gateway’ (c1400[?c1380]) the suffix, either in OF or ME, appears to have been added for aggrandisement (the original noun is not Latin, though a version appears in ML). Three of the five *MED* entries for this noun appear in *Pearl*, one also suggesting collectivity, as the gateway seems to involve several gates:

*De portalez*, pyked of rych platez  
 And vch *z*ate of a margyrye  
 Pearl 1036, *MED*  
 ‘The gateways, inlaid with rich metal, and each gate of pearl’

#### 7.4.6.3. *Locative*

RIVAILLE (?a1400[a1338]) usually meant ‘port’. Its first appearance is glossed by the *MED* as ‘river bank’. It could derive either from ME or OF *rive* ‘coast’ (c1300[?a1225]), or from the related ME verb *riven* ‘to arrive’ (c1300{?a1300}). Its later meaning developed in the 16th century from a latinising return to the origin *ripa* ‘river bank’: rivals were people who lived on opposite sides of a river.

#### 7.4.6.4. *Instrument*

In the 14th century there are almost as many instrumentals as attributives among analysable nouns. One, SPIRITUAL (c1475[1392]), is itself also an attributive

noun, but was first used in the instrumental sense ‘respiratory organ’. However, the word quickly acquired a ‘quality’ sense, denoting spiritual authority or areas of life.

CORONAL (c1330, ‘spearhead’), possibly an intensive of *coroune* (a1225[?a1200]) also follows a verb *corounen* (a1230[?a1200]), and later has another instrumental meaning, ‘crown’. In RENTAL (1362) the adjectival ending *-al* has apparently become attached to the non-suffixed instrumental noun *rent* (1154). ORDINAL ‘service book’ (a1325) and SIGNAL (c1450[c1380]) follow both nouns and verbs. ORDINAL apparently has no counterpart in OF. It seems more likely to have been formed on the verb *ordeinen* (a1300), with the instrumental sense ‘means of ordering’, than attributively on the noun *ordre* (c1230(?a1200)). SIGNAL follows the noun *signe* (c1230(?a1200]), which has a similar instrumental meaning, but also the verb *signen* (a1225; the *MED* suggests the verb may also have appeared in OE).

AVENTAILLE ‘lower front piece of helmet’ (1345) probably derives from the earlier verb *aventen* ‘to air’ (c1300), i.e. by raising the front piece. The adverb *avaunt* ‘in front’ is unlikely to be the base, as it is not attested until c1400. DIVINAILLE (c1390) occurs in its first context as ‘means of divining’:

Hem that beleeven on *dyvynailles* as by flight, or by noyse of briddes or of beestes, or by sort, or by nygromancye, by dremes (etc.)

Chaucer, CT. Pars. I. 605, *MED*

‘Those who believe in methods of divining such as by flight, birdsong or animal cries, or by casting lots, or necromancy, or dreams (etc.)’.

SUPPOWAIL ‘[means of] support’ (c1450[a1400]) may be a back-formation.

#### 7.4.6.5. Agent

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish indirect instruments from direct agents in inanimate nouns. Here I have followed Schlesinger (1989) in allowing agentive status to mechanisms such as SPRINGAL (c1330[c1300] ‘catapult’) which have an inbuilt

capacity of their own (unlike a helmet which cannot raise itself). GOVERNAIL

(c1440[?c1350]) is in its earliest context a human agent ‘governor’:

All ere oure brethire, cristende and vncristend men,  
For þat all of a *governaylle* hafe we a Fadyr  
Mirror St. Edm, (4) 35/10, *MED*

‘All are our brothers, christened and unchristened men, because we all have a Father for a ruler.’

However, in subsequent references it is a synonym for GOVERNEMENT and

GOVERNAUNCE referring to the general fact of governing or controlling:

Crist grauntide to worldly lordis to haue *gouernayle* of siche godis, but he  
grauntide to his prestis to governe soulis  
Wycl. Papa (a1500[c1380]) 473, *MED*

‘Christ allowed worldly lords the right of governing such [worldly] goods, but he allowed his priests to govern souls’

In CAUSAL (a1389), a nonce formation, the suffix reflects a transliteration of the

Latin neuter plural noun *causalia*. In ME it seems purely intensive, as in the

instrumental RENTAL in 7.4.6.4. above, since the noun *cause* had probably existed

before 1200:

The Taste is a witte of knowinge savoures & to make it perfite þe *causales*  
effective, material, and informative ... ben nedeful  
Trev. Barth. 25b/b, *MED*

‘Taste is an ability to recognise flavours, and effective, material and informative causes are necessary to make it perfect’.

#### 7.4.6.6. Object

In DECRETAL ‘thing decreed’ (?a1400[a1338]), as in agentive CAUSAL and instrumental RENTAL, the suffix appears to be intensive, in this case following *decree* (a1400[c1303]).

#### 7.4.6.7. Result state

REPENTAILLE (a1450[a1338]) is a synonym of REPENTAUNCE ‘state of repentance’. Its first appearance is in the plural, which could just possibly make it

instrumental, i.e. ‘means/causes of repenting’. However, the plural is probably for the sake of the rhyme:

Y trowe þei schal *ȝit* mis-bytide  
 Ffor þer couetise & þer pryde ...  
 Wonder were elles, or art me failles,  
 But þey pleye wiþ *repentailles*  
 Mannyng Chron. Pt. 1, 11838, *MED*  
 ‘I trust they shall yet come to grief for their pride and covetousness ...  
 Either my skill fails me, or it would be surprising if they are not  
 risking regrets’.

In later appearances the ‘state’ meaning is clear:

When love is evele wonne  
 Fulofte it comth to *repentaile*  
 Gower CA (a1393), 5. 6783, *MED*  
 ‘When love is wickedly obtained it very often ends in a state of  
 repentance’.

#### 7.4.6.8. *Action: Fact*

MEMORIAL (a1382) first appears as the general fact of remembering:

Ðou forsoþe, Lord, in to withoute ende abidist stille, and thi *memorial* in to  
 ieneracioun and in to ieneracioun  
 W.Bible Ps. 101. 14, *MED*  
 ‘You truly, Lord, live for ever, as does the memory [remembering] of you  
 from generation to generation’

ESPIAILLE ‘spying’ (c1390) first appears in a general context:

Thanne shal ye euere mo countrewayte emboyssementz and alle *espialle*  
 Chaucer CT. Mel. B. 2509, *MED*  
 ‘Then you will always be anticipating ambushes and all kinds of spying’

#### 7.4.6.9. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

SPOUSAILLE (c1450[c1300]) first refers to the ceremony of marriage. Shortly afterwards, however (a1400[c1303]) it is a synonym of MARIAGE, signifying the state.

SUPPOSAL (a1425[?c1380]) first appears in a specific context:

We mai seie bi *supposal*, þat we gesse þat it is so

Wyclif Sel. Wks. III. 344, *MED*

‘We may say by an act of supposing that we guess that it is so’

ARIVAILLE (a1393) and REHERSAILLE (c1395) appear in verbal phrases with *taken* and *maken*, to mean specific acts of arriving and recounting:

- (1) I charge you ...  
That ye the same Schip vitaile,  
In which that sche tok *arivaile*  
Gower CA 2. 1032, *MED*  
‘I want you ... to victual the same ship that she arrived in’;
- (2) Yet forgat I to maken *rehersaille*  
Of watres corosif or of lymaille, etc.  
Chaucer, CT. CY. G. 852, *MED*  
‘But I forgot to list corrosive waters and metal filings’

DEPOSAL (1397) also first appears in a specific context:

I was in place ther it was communed and spoken in manere of *deposal* of my  
liege Loord  
RParl. 3. 379/a, *MED*  
‘I was there when it was discussed together and agreed how to depose my  
liege Lord’

#### 7.4.6.10. *Summary*

In the 14th-century data, both unanalysable and analysable nouns are predominantly in the attributive class. Among analysables, however, this predominance is much less marked, with ten attributives rivalled by eight instrumentals. Among unanalysables, six of the seven instrumentals are also attributives, functioning as adjectives to implied instrumental nouns. This is true of only one of the analysables, SPIRITUAL. In another, RENTAL, the suffix is attached as an intensive to an instrumental noun base. Four are possibly deverbal, as are two of the agent nouns, all of which follow both nouns and verbs. A handful of other analysables follow only verbs. Most of these appear with action senses, which are rare among unanalysables. A slight majority of action nouns appear in specific contexts.

### 7.4.7. *The 15th century: unanalysable nouns*

#### 7.4.7.1. *Attributive nouns*

Of the 34 unanalysable nouns in the 15th-century data, 21 are attributive. A number of these are medical terms found in Chauliac (1) (?a1425): PARIETAL (a bone), LOCAL (a 'topical' medicine), FICAL (a 'fig-shaped' skin eruption), DUAL and CASAL (teeth, i.e. 'incisors' and 'wisdom teeth'), CUBITAL and EMOROIDAL (veins). Others are SEPTENTRIONAL 'north quarter' (?a1475]c1400]), PASCAL 'Easter candle' (a1500[a1415]), JOURNAL 'diary' (1440), DIGITAL 'number between one and ten [i.e. counted on the fingers]' (?c1425), CURIAL 'courtier' (1447), GRADUAL 'graded service book' ([1447]), DOCTRINAL 'treatise' (a1356[a1449]), BOREAL 'north wind' (c1475[1464]) and NOVAL (a1475), a field tilled yearly. COMMENSAL (?a1425) means 'table companion' and CONTHORAL (a1475) 'bed companion' or 'spouse'. A TRIBUNAL (c1428) is a kind of ceremonial cloth, the origin of which was attributed to Pilate's washing of his hands. QUINQUENAL (1447) and PENNORAL (a1450) are respectively an office held for five years and a case holding five instruments.

#### 7.4.7.2. *Collective nouns*

Collectives are BRUSHAIL 'undergrowth' (a1420), ALMAILLE (1500[?a1425]), a nonce version of L. *animalia* 'animals', CORAILLE 'chaff' (1440) and ANTIQUAILLE 'ancient times' (a1500[a1475]).

#### 7.4.7.3. *Instrument*

Four attributive nouns have instrumental uses. These are BRACHIAL 'vestment for the arm' (1408-17), SUSPIRAL 'channel for air or breath' (a1500[1413]), PECTORAL 'ornament for the chest' ([1422]) and MANUEL 'handbook' (1432). The ME verb *suspiren* is recorded later (a1500).

#### 7.4.7.4. *Agent*

RESPONSAIL ‘representative’ (c1460[?c1400]) is the only unanalysable agent noun in the 15th century.

#### 7.4.7.5. *Object*

JUDICIAL ‘ruling [thing ruled]’ (c1400) is an attributive noun with objective sense. RESAILLE ‘expense’ (c1450) is a back formation on OF *saillie*.

#### 7.4.7.6. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

The only action noun is FUNERELLE(S) (1437), the occasion of a funeral service.

### 7.4.8. *The 15th century: analysable nouns*

#### 7.4.8.1. *Attributive nouns*

There are 12 analysable nouns in this period with attributive meanings. These include SINODAL ‘decree of a Synod’ (a1500[c1410]), LINEAL ‘ancestral descent’ ([1426]), PROCESSIONAL ‘service book’ ([1440]), NEUTRAL ‘neutral person’ (c1449), SACRAMENTAL ‘sacramental object’ ([c1449]), VESTAL ‘Vestal virgin’ ([c1449]) and BOREAL ‘north wind’ (c1475[1464]). FINIAL (1433) has its modern architectural sense of ‘final feature’; it is analysable in respect of a verb *finisshen* (a1375), but could also be a variant of *final*, as the *MED* suggests. ANEURISMAL (?a1425) is a variant of *aneurisma* (which appears in the same text). MERCURIAL (?a1425) is the name of a plant, possibly ‘dog’s foot’, an earlier form of which is *Mercurius* (1150[OE]). The variant in *-al* may be an attributive noun relating to the earlier form, or an intensive form of *Mercury* (c1400[?a1300]). IRAL (c1440) is a blue stone, probably from the noun *iris* (?a1425[1373]). PIRAMIDAL (c1450) is an intensive form meaning ‘pyramid’. It reflects the oblique case of the Latin *piramis*,



which appeared as a noun in ME in the 14th century (a1398). **MENSTRUAL** (?c1500[1471]) is an alchemical term applied to metal.

#### 7.4.8.2. *Collective nouns*

In **BOTAILLE** ‘boundaries or boundary markers’ (a1475[?a1430]), **BESTIAL** or **BESTAILLE** ‘animals’ (c1460) and **CORDAILLE** ‘cords’ (1483), the suffix acts as a plural marker to *butte* ‘boundary’ (1250), *beste* ‘beast’ (c1230[?a1200]) and *corde* ‘cord’ (c1330[?a1300]). The last has a later variant in *-age* with similar semantics (see *cordage* [1490]).

#### 7.4.8.3. *Instrument*

There are eight instrumental nouns among analysables in the 15th century. All but three are, or could be, deverbal. **SUSTENAL** (a1500[1413]) is one of the many suffixed instrumentals signifying ‘means of support’, and **REPRISAIL** (1419) on its first appearance meant ‘means of compensation’. **REPARAIL** ‘fittings for repair’ (1446) is probably a back formation on the earlier verb *reparailen* (a1382). **FIRMAL** (1454) is a synonym of **RENTAL** and follows both an early verb *fermen* (a1150) ‘to farm’ and an even earlier noun *ferme* ‘farm’ (1121), which have respectively the senses ‘to farm out’ after 1415 and ‘rent’ after 1300. **FANTASTICAL** ‘imaginative faculty’ (c1460[a1449]) follows an identical adjective in ME (?a1475[?a1425]), but also a noun *fantastic* (c1385). The only purely denominal instrumental nouns are **TESTIMONIAL** ‘means of giving testimony’ (?a1475[?a1425]), **NERVAL** (c1450), a kind of ointment for the ‘nerves’, i.e. sinews, and **ORGANAL** (?a1500[c1477]) in which the suffix is added as an intensive to the instrumental noun *organ* (c1400[?a1300]).

#### 7.4.8.4. *Agent*

**STOUPAILLE** ((a1475[?a1430], more usually spelt **STOPPAL**) is the inanimate agent ‘stopper’.

7.4.8.5. *Object*

APPOSAIL ‘question [something posed]’ (a1500[a1415]) follows a verb *apposen* (c1330[?a1300]). The noun/verb pair *opposen*/OPPOSAIL (c1380/a1475[?a1430]) appear to be later spelling variants with the same meaning.

7.4.8.6. *Result/state*

DISAVAILE (1423) is probably a back formation on the earlier verb *disavailen* (c1450[1410]) and means ‘state of disadvantage’.

7.4.8.7. *Action: Quality*

AQUITAILLE (1430) in most of the *MED* entries means ‘behaving’ with an underlying sense of ‘behaving well’:

Of the Kynges *aquitaille* and of his devoir and diligence  
Proc. Privy C. 420, *MED*  
‘Of the King’s duty and diligence and quality of behaviour’.

MISGOVERNAILE (?a1439) is a synonym of MISGOVERNEMENT and

MISGOVERNAUNCE, implying action seen in a moral dimension:

... Kynges exiled for such *mysgovernaile*  
And fals outrages done to the poraile  
Lydgate FP. 2.1434, *MED*  
‘Kings exiled for such bad governing and treacherous abuses of the poor’.

7.4.8.8. *Action: Fact*

TRIAL (1436) and REVERSALL ‘restitution’ (1488) first appear in general contexts:

- (1) ... That the *Triall* of the Life and Deth, Landes and Tenementz, Goodes and Catalles, of every Personne ... by ye Lawe of the same Roiaulme, remayneth and stondesth, etc.  
RParl. 4. 5., 16, *MED*  
‘... That [the right to] trial for life and death, lands and property, goods and Chattels should remain good for every person by the law of this same realm, etc.’
- (2) The Acte of Restitution or *Reversall*, made in the said Parliament ...

Rolls of Parlt. VI. 413, *OED*

‘The legislation for restitution made in the same Parliament ...’

#### 7.4.8.9. *Action: Specific instance/occasion*

REFUSAL (1474) first appears in a specific context:

Any of the said Commyssioners or Collectours provyng the same *refusell*

Rolls of Parlt. VI. 118/2, *OED*

‘Any of the said commisioners or collectors investigating this same act of refusal’.

REVERSALL (1488) also appears in a specific context elsewhere in the text

quoted above:

Rehersyng the said *Reversall*, Repelle, Adnullation and Avoydaunce, of this said Acte

Rolls of Parlt. VI. 413, 526/2, *OED*

‘Going over the said reversing, repealing, annulling and rendering null and void of this said Act’.

#### 7.4.8.10. *Summary*

In the 15th century, 21 unanalysable nouns in this suffix have an attributive sense. Of the others, one has agentive and two objective senses, four are collective nouns and four are instrumental. Three of the four instrumentals are attributives implying an instrumental noun. The only unanalysable action noun, FUNERELLE(s), signifies a specific occasion.

A majority of analysable nouns are divided between 12 attributives and eight instrumentals. Three of the instrumentals are in fact attributive with an implied instrumental noun, as in TESTIMONIAL, while others add the suffix as an intensive to an existing unaffixed instrumental noun, as in ORGANAL. However, most are or could be deverbal formations. In the 15th century this is true of analysable nouns in all categories except attributive and collective.

#### 7.4.9. *Conclusions*

In Kastovsky's (1985) diachronic classification, deverbal nouns in the suffix *-al* function only as action nouns or in agentive and factitive (resultative) cases. Even discounting as he does the mixed origins which give rise to nominalised adjectives, collectives and miscellaneous concrete nouns, this analysis seems insufficient for ME. In my sample agentive senses are outnumbered by instrumentals, while resultative and even action senses are rare.

I have classified only two nouns under the 'factitive' heading of result/state: REPENTAILLE, expressing an active mental state, and DISAVAILE 'disadvantage', probably a back formation on the earlier verb *disavailen* rather than a true suffixed form, and also expressing a more generalised passive state. Both are analysable. There are no unanalysable result/state nouns, and I have found only five unanalysable nouns in the action area: MORAL, the quality of virtue, REGAL 'rule', expressing a general fact, and three occasion nouns, BATAILLE, ORDAL 'ordeal' (an adaptation from OE) and FUNERELLE(s). Among analysables, however, there are 14 action nouns, with a majority of nine appearing in specific contexts across the ME period. Of the specific instance nouns, two signify occasion (the reanalysed BRIDALE and its apparent synonym SPOUSAILLE, which later generally meant the state of matrimony). SPOUSAILLE could derive from either a noun or a verb in English. Another, ASSAILE 'attack' is a back-formation. The others are deverbal, as are half the instrumentals and all the agentives among analysable nouns, as well as the resultative REPENTAILLE. But here too action nouns are slightly outnumbered by instrumentals. In my sample, of course, denominal attributive nouns associated with adjectives are in a small majority even among analysables. This is true in both the 14th and 15th centuries, which resemble each other in both the analysable and unanalysable parts of the sample.

The unanalysable semantic profile, however, is different from the analysable, with a clear majority of purely attributive nouns in both centuries. Among unanalysables, action nouns are also greatly outnumbered both by collective nouns and by instrumental senses derived from attributives. Among analysables the majority of pure attributives is much smaller, collectives are less prominent and the total for action nouns is higher.

In some analysable denominal forms the suffix seems mainly intensive, to mark the sense already borne by the base noun, which may be attributive (as in MATERIAL) or instrumental (as in ORGANAL). Sometimes it seems merely to mark a plural, as in CORDAILLE. It is also noticeable that in several cases, such as SPOUSAILLE, TEMPORAL and BIRIEL, the first recorded meaning quickly disappears. The uncertainty of origin prevailing among ME nouns in this suffix seems reflected in a degree of uncertainty in the semantics. There is no clear semantic pattern either among possible coinages or among later alternatives to forms in other suffixes.

Nevertheless, English deverbal nouns in *-al* certainly became ‘substantives of action’, as Marchand says (1969: 237, 4.5.3.). In the earlier edition of his survey he goes on to suggest that ‘In contradistinction to *-ance* which is a derivative with durative verbs, the suffix *-al* is tacked on to words implying a final result’ (1960: 181, 5.1.). This is true of about half of the bases of analysable deverbal nouns in my sample. However, in considering contexts I have classified most of these under ‘action’ rather than ‘result/state’, because these first contexts seemed to me to emphasise the action (usually specific) rather than the result:

(1) DEPOSAL:

I was in place ther it was communed and spoken in manere of *deposal* of my liege Loord  
 ‘I was there when it was discussed and agreed how to depose my liege Lord’  
 RParl. 3. (1397), 379a, MED.

## (2) REFUSAL:

Any of the said Commyssioners or Collectours proving the same *refusell*  
 Rolls of Parlt. VI. (1474), 118/2, *OED*  
 ‘Any of the said Commissioners or Collectors investigating the same act of  
 refusal’.

Similarly REHERSAIL ‘account’ (c1395) might well have been classified as  
 result (something produced ) but the context with *maken* ‘to do’ seemed to me to  
 suggest specific instance:

Yet forgat I to maken *rehersaille*  
 Of watres corosif or of lymaille, etc.  
 Chaucer CT. CY. G. 852, *MED*  
 ‘But I forgot to list corrosive waters or metal filings, etc.’

AQUITAILLE (1430), which has a fact/quality meaning ‘[good] conduct’, appears  
 later with its modern sense. Again, this later quotation seems to me to emphasise the  
 original action rather than the resulting state:

That the said *acquytall* of the said Miles ap Henry ... be void and of noon  
 effecte  
 RParl. 6. (1472), 1606, *MED*  
 ‘That the said act of acquitting Miles ap Henry ... should be void and  
 without effect [i.e. Result]’

Certainly bases such as *depose*, *refuse*, *reverse* and *acquit* do suggest at least  
 the intention of finality, even if the unfortunate Miles ap Henry did not get it with his  
 acquittal. The same might be said of BRIDALE, SPOUSAILLE and even  
 ARRIVAILLE: an arrival, though not necessarily final, suggests the end of a journey  
 and therefore a completed process. (BIRIEL ‘burial’, adopted for phonological  
 reasons, fits even better into this semantic group). These are over half the analysable  
 action nouns in the total sample, and perhaps indicate already in ME a tendency to be  
 seen in formations in *-al* in later centuries, e.g. DISPOSAL (1630), DISMISSAL  
 (1806), etc. (Marchand 1969: 237, 4.5.2.).

A slight majority of first citations of words in *-al* appears in literary texts, closely followed by religious. Malkiel speculates that ‘most of the words in *-al*, whether retained or discarded by the subsequent generations, were tentatively coined in writing rather than in speaking,’ and that the ‘mystery of its origin, the inability even of the learned man to identify it with any known suffix in Latin, Greek, French or Italian’ rendered it essentially an elegant suffix, courtly rather than either vernacular or learned. He claims also that the suffix ‘lacks the atmosphere of pedantry and scholarship that weighs so heavily on *-ence*, *-ment*, *-ation* and other endings easily traceable to their Latin prototypes and hence exposed to the danger of appearing in numerous inevitably prosaic Latinisms’ (Malkiel 1944: 86-7). This of course would hardly be true of attributive nouns such as SEPTENTRIONAL. Indeed, though the highest number of citations for words in *-al* is in fictional texts, this is in any case the most prolific genre, and the highest percentage of genre share for *-al* is in scholarly texts (see Appendix 2). The unfavourable comparison of *-ence* with *-al* is also perhaps unjustified, and should certainly not extend to the more usual French variant *-ance*, which in ME has a stronger presence than *-al* in courtly fiction. Marchand suggests that the deverbal type in *-al* was developed in AN, pointing out that the ‘earliest English words’ of this type, e.g. REHEARSAL, ACQUITTAL, REPRISAL, REVERSAL, REFUSAL, are all legal terms (1969: 237, 4.5.4.).

## Chapter 8

**A COMPARISON OF 5 SUFFIXES OVER 3 PERIODS OF MIDDLE ENGLISH**

We are now in a position to consider these five suffixes in relation to each other. In this chapter I will compare some of their morphological constraints, their productivity and the extent to which their semantics diverge or overlap, and try to assess whether the divergences are coherent enough to suggest distinctions between suffixes.

**8.1. Morphology**

The suffixes can be divided into two subgroups according to whether base category or source language is considered. The mainly deverbal suffixes are *-ment*, *-ance* and *-ation*, while *-age* and *-al* are largely denominal in the ME period. However, those entering the language mainly from French (OF and AN) are deverbal *-ment* and *-ance* with denominal *-age*, while deverbal *-ation* and denominal *-al* appear mainly on Latin bases (though *-al* has various additional origins). Base category and source language have significance for semantics and productivity respectively. There is more semantic overlap among suffixes predominantly sharing a base category, while productivity is markedly greater for French derivatives than for Latin.

**8.1.1. Co-occurrences**

It will be seen in Table 7 that all five suffixes may attach to words with the prefixes *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n'm)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-* and *pre-*. All but *-al* are found on bases in *per-* and *in-*, and all but *-age* on bases with *pro-*, *e(x)-* and *en(m)-*. While *pro-* does not appear in my sample with *-ment*, or *-en(m)-* with *-ation*, the *MED* lists *PROCUREMENT* and *EMPLASTRACIOUN*. In addition, *-ment*, *-ance* and *-al* appear on bases with the native prefix *mis-*.



In the ME period the stem suffixes *-ize* and *-ify* may appear with *-ment* (ADVERTISEM<sup>ENT</sup>, PURIFIM<sup>ENT</sup>) and with *-ance/-ence* (SIGNIFIANCE, MAGNIFICENCE, RECOGNIZANCE) as well as with the more usual *-ation*. Medial *-ify* is generally followed by <c> before *-ation*. The stem suffix *-ate* is restricted to nouns in *-ation*, but in my sample 12 out of 17 are back-formations from a holistically borrowed noun. The suffix *-ment* may also be added to words already suffixed in *-al*, as in VITAILLEMENT.

**Table 7: Co-occurrences of 5 suffixes with prefixed bases across 3 ME periods**

	-ment	-ance/-ence	-ation	-age	-al
a(d)-	+	+	+	+	+
su(b)-	+	+	+	+	+
co(m)-	+	+	+	+	+
re-	+	+	+	+	+
de-	+	+	+	+	+
dis-	+	+	+	+	+
pre-	+	+	+	+	+
per-	+	+	+	+	
in(m)-	+	+	+	+	
en(m)-	+	+	+*		+
pro-	+*	+	+		+
e(x)-	+	+	+		+
mis-	+	+			+

+ Present in the sample

\* Found only outside the sample

## 8.2. Integration

### 8.2.1. Productivity

In the early period *-ment* and *-age* already show possible signs of productivity. ACOUPEMENT appears before 1300 on a Romance base but with no recorded counterpart in a Romance language, while the native coinage OUTRAGE dates from the same period. The ME status of such words on Romance bases is of course problematic and could be due simply to deficient records in the donor language. However, the numbers increase throughout the ME period, and by the end of the 15th century there

are 20 possible Romance-based coinages in *-ment*, as well as 15 in *-age*. An even higher number appears in *-ance*, which has 27, though none appears early, with five in the 14th century rising to 22 in the 15th. A clearer sign of productivity, perhaps, is the attachment of a suffix to a native base. Examples of this exist in four of the suffixes. though in all but one the numbers are lower than for Romance bases. The exception is *-age*, which has 19, four more than on Romance bases: the early OUTRAGE, formed on a preposition, is followed by six formations on native noun bases in the 14th century and 12 in the 15th. There are 10 examples for *-ment*, split equally between the 14th and 15th centuries. In *-ance* there are only six in all, none appearing before the 15th century.

In *-al*, surprisingly considering its mixed origins and low analysability, there are 12 possible Romance coinages by the end of the ME period, and a possible native formation appears early in the 14th century.<sup>1</sup>

The case of *-ation* is even more problematic. In my sample there are few examples of attachment of this suffix to an existing ME base: only six possible Romance coinages (two in the 14th and four in the 15th century), and none on native bases. From the beginning of the ME period, however, a large number of words in *-ation* are transferred directly from Latin, in which the French suffix is simply substituted for the Latin *-atio*. This seems to argue for recognition of the French suffix and understanding of its application, at least in learned circles, even in words unanalysable in ME.

**Table 8: Possible ME coinages in 5 suffixes across 3 ME periods**

	<i>-ment</i>		<i>-ance</i>		<i>-ation</i>		<i>-age</i>		<i>-al</i>	
	Eng.	Fr.	Eng.	Fr.	Eng.	Fr.	Eng.	Fr.	Eng.	Fr.
Early	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
14c.	5	6	0	5	0	2	6	1	1	4
15c.	5	13	6	22	0	4	12	14	1	8
Total	10	20	6	27	0	6	19	15	2	12

### 8.2.2. *Analysability*

As indicated in 1.2.2., I have adopted Pattison's definition (1975) of analysability, in which an analysable suffixed noun enters the language later than its related simplex form. According to this definition, the highest total ratio of analysable to unanalysable nouns (almost two thirds to one third) is found in the sample for *-ment*, which has 154 nouns analysable in ME to 56 unanalysable. This suffix also shows the largest first increase in analysable nouns, which rise from 13 to 62 in the 14th century, when unanalysables decrease from 18 to 16. The next highest overall ratio is found in *-age*, with 117 analysable to 58 unanalysable. These also show a clear increase in the 14th century, rising from 10 to 38. In *-ance*, as in *-ment* and *-age*, the 14th century shows a sharp increase in the number of analysables (from 10 to 52); however, the overall majority of analysable nouns is smaller (124 to 86). In *-ation* unanalysables outnumber analysables until the 15th century, and overall by a margin of six. In *-al*, finally, unanalysables outnumber analysables in every period of the sample except the 14th century, where they are equal; but the overall margin is similar to that for *-ation*.

**Table 9: Totals of unanalysable and analysable nouns in 5 suffixes, 1150-1500**

	<i>-ment</i>		<i>-ance</i>		<i>-ation</i>		<i>-age</i>		<i>-al</i>	
	Unan	An.	Unan	An.	Unan	An.	Unan	An.	Unan	An.
Early	18	13	23	10	7	2	15	10	10	6
14c	16	62	35	52	60	54	21	38	35	35
15 c.	22	79	28	62	41	46	22	69	34	31
Total	56	154	86	124	108	102	58	117	79	72

If we compare the percentages of all possible new formations (that is, in which the suffix is attached to an existing ME base of Romance or English origin) we find that one of the smaller samples, that for *-age*, has the highest percentage with 19.4%. This

might be accounted for by the relatively high analysability of this suffix, although the correlation between analysability and other productive signs is not invariable. Next comes *-ance* with 15.7% (although with a relatively low number of native coinages), while despite its higher analysability, *-ment* comes third with 14.2%; however, this suffix shows the earliest signs of productivity. The smallest and least analysable set, that for *-al*, is not necessarily the least productive, with 9.2% of new formations, not counting reanalyses and back-formations. If we also discount the Latin translations of words in *-atio*, *-ation* comes last with a mere 3 % of possible new formations, none of native origin. To include the latinisms, however, would place it at the top with 34%. This outcome would seem surprising on several counts, if we consider that there are no native coinages in *-ation*, that more than half the latinisms are unanalysable in ME, and that *-ation* has one of the two lowest scores for ME analysability.

### 8.2.3. *Summary*

In general high analysability seems to accompany other signs of productivity, although we can see in Table 10 that the order of analysability does not match the other productivity scores exactly.

**Table 10: Percentages of analysability and possible word formation in 5 ME suffixes**

Analysability of ME suffixes	Possible ME word formation
-ment 73.3%	-age 19.4%
-age 67%	-ance 16%
-ance 59%	-ment 14.2%
-ation 49%	-al 9.2%
-al 48%	-ation 3%

I remarked in 8.2.2. above that the highest degree of analysability, that of *-ment*, accompanies the earliest signs of productivity, though not the most prolific. The high

word formation score of *-age* may be due to its status as a denominal formative, nouns being the most frequently occurring category in language use. In the case of *-al*, denominal derivation is obscured by mixed origins and the large numbers of borrowings unanalysable in ME. We can also see from Table 10 that the top three scores in both columns belong to the three suffixes which entered the language mainly with French bases, while the last two came in with a high proportion of Latin bases. Nevertheless, even in these two least analysable and apparently least productive cases, some of the findings suggest a high degree of awareness of these suffixes among a relatively small number of users. The substitution of *-ation* for *-atio* in Latin words (see 5.3.1.) and of *-al* for OE *-els* and *gealu* (see 7.4.4.1., 7.4.4.4.), suggest an understanding or (in the latter case) at least a recognition of the French suffixes, even before they were widely attached to existing ME bases.

### 8.3. Semantics

#### 8.3.1. *Comparison of suffixes*

Semantically the suffixes fall into the two sub-groups which follow their base category: *-ment*, *-ance* and *-ation* which attach mainly to verbs, and *-age* and *-al* which throughout most of the ME period attach mainly to nouns. The three mainly deverbal suffixes therefore operate mostly in the area of action, its aspects and cases, while those still mainly denominal have mostly collective and attributive uses.

In the early period, words in both *-ment* and *-ance* show a high proportion of instrumental uses; throughout the ME period *-ment* and *-ance* tend to appear interchangeably on bases of nouns with instrumental meaning. However, viewed separately their semantics develop differently. In *-ment* the majority of unanalysable borrowings first appears with instrumental senses in all periods. In analysable nouns, however, this sense is rivalled from the earliest period by specific instance of action,

which in the 15th century overtakes instrument as the dominant sense for analysable nouns in *-ment*. The majority of possible ME coinages in *-ment* is also split between instrumental and specific instance senses. Among later alternatives in *-ment* to words in other suffixes, instrumental and specific instance senses are also high, but result/state senses are higher still. This accords with Marchand's characterisation of the modern suffix (1969: 332, 4.65.5).

In *-ance*, on the other hand, the instrumental sense of early borrowings is superseded in the 14th century by the sense of 'moral quality or attribute' among both unanalysable and analysable nouns. This sense remains dominant among unanalysable borrowings of the 15th century. Analysable nouns in the 15th century show a less clear pattern, the majority being almost equally divided across the major categories. This perhaps suggests that the use of *-ance* was becoming generalised, but without rivalry towards any more specialised suffix. It might be predicted that the preponderance of mental and moral bases which attract this suffix could in later periods bias it again either towards expressing quality or towards the category of (mental) state seen emerging with others in the 15th century. This latter sense is in fact in a small overall majority among analysable nouns, though slightly outnumbered in both the 14th and 15th centuries taken separately (in the 14th by quality and in the 15th by instrument). Result/state is also the most prominent sense for first attributions of words in *-ance* formed as later alternatives to words in other suffixes. Among possible ME coinages the semantic spread is fairly even; here, result/state shares a tiny majority with specific instance. However, over the total sample there is little rivalry with *-ment* as a formative of nouns expressing specific instance. I have noted that *-ment* attaches mainly to bases with concrete or practical senses, while *-ance* attaches only to abstract bases and frequently to those with mental or moral senses. This is perhaps reflected in the fact that the majority of words in my

sample for *-ment* first appears in administrative texts, while the majority of those in *-ance* first appears mainly in fictional texts.

Here again the third deverbal suffix, *-ation*, presents a puzzle. It has been said that 'productivity goes hand in hand with semantic coherence' (Aronoff, 1976: 45), but this suffix, whose productivity appears less marked than that of the other two, shows as much semantic coherence as either and possibly more. The few unanalysable borrowings of the early period incline towards contexts of specific instance, but thereafter the largest number of both unanalysable and analysable nouns first occurs with action/fact senses in generalised contexts, often as definitions or explanations of scientific or learned processes in learned texts. In the 15th century action/fact contexts are again rivalled, though not equalled, by specific contexts, which perhaps reflects the spread of words in this suffix to non-learned practical subjects such as war and gardening. Over half the 65 words translated from Latin first appear in contexts of generalised action/fact. Action/fact and specific instance together account equally for the earliest semantics of most of the later alternatives in *-ation* to words in other suffixes. Among the few possible coinages there is no clear semantic pattern.

The two mainly denominal suffixes, *-age* and *-al*, are less prominent in the ME period in the area of action, its aspects and cases. The majority of words in *-age*, both unanalysable and analysable, first appears with collective senses. Most of these have concrete and non-specialised meanings until the 14th century, when a subgroup with financial senses of 'tax' or 'charge' becomes prominent among analysable nouns. In the 15th century the specialised financial subgroup equals that of non-specialised collectives among unanalysables and clearly outnumbers them among analysable nouns. As might be expected from this real-world specialism, a majority of words in *-age* first appears in official and administrative texts. However, among analysables in the 15th century the

'financial collective' majority is slightly surpassed by the total number of action nouns, though it is still considerably larger than any one aspect of action. Most of the action nouns first appear in general action/fact contexts. These words remain distinct from general action/fact nouns in *-ation* by virtue of their bases, which are exclusively non-learned verbs of French and English origin, often also related to finance. Financial collectives and action/fact together account for most of the possible ME coinages in *-age*. Most of those with native bases are financial collectives such as WHARFAGE, but action/fact is in the majority among those with Romance bases, such as REPOISAGE 'weighing', and in a slight majority among neologisms overall. There is no clear semantic pattern among the few later alternatives to words in other suffixes.

Early nouns in *-al* have mixed semantics, due probably to the mixed derivation of the suffix. In the 14th and 15th centuries a number of collectives, both analysable and unanalysable, appear with the French ending *-aille*, all with concrete meanings. From the 14th century, however, the greater part of the sample consists of learned nominalised adjectives in *-al*, both analysable and unanalysable in ME, borrowed from Latin via French. Their nominal meanings therefore derive from whatever nouns they are most usually attributed to, as in ORIENTAL 'person from the east', or BOREAL 'north wind'. In some of these the implied noun has a 'case' meaning, usually instrumental, as in GENITAL. This is true of both unanalysable borrowings and those which are analysable in respect of related nouns already existing in ME. Perhaps because of this attributive model, the suffix is also attached in the 14th century in a mainly intensive sense to a number of other ME bases, producing analysable nouns such as RENTAL, SIGNAL and CORONAL from *rent*, *signe* and *corone* + *-al*, which retain the originally instrumental meaning of the base. Among deverbal formations also the instrumental sense is the most prominent in both 14th and 15th century analysable nouns. From the



14th century a handful of analysable deverbal action nouns appear, mainly in contexts of specific instance and with a tendency to select bases from verbs such as *reversen* which express completed processes. This accords with Marchand's original characterisation of deverbal *-al* (1960: 181: 4.5.3.), although the numbers of deverbal nouns in the ME sample are too low to be informative. Among the few possible ME coinages and even fewer later alternatives to words in other suffixes, there are slight majorities respectively of specific instance and instrumental senses.

### 8.3.2. *Summary*

**Table 11: Semantics of 5 suffixes in first attributions across 957 unanalysable and analysable nouns, 1150-1500**

	-ment	-ance/-ence	-ation	age	-al
Instrument	<b>76</b>	44	32	14	30
Agent	1	12	0	0	6
Object	17	12	3	13	7
Res/state	30	44	41	19	2
Act/quality	15	<b>58</b>	14	8	3
Act/fact	10	21	<b>76</b>	23	5
Act/instance	59	20	46	15	12
Intensive	0	0	0	1	0
Collective	2	0	0	<b>73</b>	19
Locative	0	0	0	7	3
Attributive	0	0	0	0	<b>64</b>
Total	210	211	212	173	151

If the semantics of analysable and unanalysable nouns are taken together for the whole of the ME period, the results are as in Table 11. The figures relate to occurrences rather than individual words, so that the same word may be counted twice if it appears with different meanings in different contexts at the same date; however, I have omitted five ambiguous occurrences in single contexts. The only purely intensive formation has also been omitted. Majority figures are given in bold.

We can see that two of the suffixes, *-ment* and *-ance*, are not limited to one clearly preferred area, and that instrumental meaning is prominent for both; however, the figures for instrumental meaning are much higher in *-ment*, and in *-ance* instrument is clearly outnumbered by quality and equalled by state. In *-ment* instrument is the most frequent meaning, though a high total is also shown for specific action. In *-ation*, *-age* and *-al*, single preferences appear for general action/fact, collective and attributive meanings respectively.

The distribution of the table, vertical columns and important horizontal rows have been found significant according to the chi square test. The total distribution in Table 11 is significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  939.814 (df 36). The vertical distributions of semantic categories for each suffix are also all significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 9): for *-ment*  $\chi^2$  is 303.143, for *-ance* 185.445, for *-ation* 297.528, for *-age* 230.442 and for *-al* 222.046. In rows containing majority figures for one suffix, the horizontal distributions of those categories across suffixes are significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 4): for *-ment* (instrument)  $\chi^2$  is 54.816, for *-ance* (quality) 98.837, for *-ation* (action/fact) 119.481, for *-age* (collective) 208.872 and for *-al* (attributive) 256.

The majority figure for *-al* is the only one in its row, since no other suffix occurs with attributive meaning. These distributions may of course be skewed by the presence of such denominal categories, which apply mainly to *-age* and *-al* (see 1.4.3.2.). If these categories are omitted, however, the revised total distribution is still significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  247.605 (df 24). The revised vertical distributions are also significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 6); for *-ment*  $\chi^2$  is 154.519, for *-ance* 66.512, for *-ation* 144.67, for *-age* 25.478 and for *-al* 60.677.

In terms of numbers alone the biases are clear. However, this table takes no account of development over time or differences between patterns of unanalysable and

analysable nouns. The unanalysable borrowings in each suffix show a clear majority of first citations where the word in context bears a particular case meaning in relation to its base, or represents a particular aspect of action and/or of real world semantics. In all suffixes this preference reappears in analysable nouns, but by the end of the 15th century it is rivalled or superseded by other tendencies, the direction of which may or may not be clear. The main biases are repeated up to a point in possible ME coinages and later alternatives to existing suffixed words. The numbers of possible coinages and of later alternatives are of course relatively low for all suffixes.

Table 12 below gives a simplified list of the main variations for each suffix.

**Table 12 : Semantic tendencies of 5 suffixes, 1150-1500**

	<b>Unanalysable</b>	<b>Analysable</b>		<b>Bases</b>
	1150-1500	1150-1500	15c.other	<i>Real-world</i>
-ment	Instrument	Act/instance	Instrument	Concrete, practical
-ance	Quality	Result/state	Instrum, Act'n	Mental, moral
-ation	Act (fact)	Act/fact	Act/instance	Technical
-age	Collective (general)	Collective (financial)	Act/fact	Social, financial
-al	Attributive	Attributive	Instrument (Act/instance?)	Learned (deA) Mixed (deV)

In addition to their special tendencies, it will be seen from the two analysable columns that by the end of the ME period groups of suffixes are active in similar areas, notably *-ment*, *-ance* and *-al* in instrumental senses and *-ment*, *-ation* and *-age* in action (general fact or specific instance). In *-ment* instrumental meaning has been strong throughout, while in *-ance* it has a resurgence in the 15th century. In *-ation* the use of scientific terms to name facts or processes is extended to more familiar subjects in which specific example is appropriate. However, it seems that special biases can clearly be

seen, not only in the kind of contexts in which a given suffix is most typically chosen to make its first appearances, but also in those where it does not typically appear (for example, in the low number of quality nouns in *-ment*, *-ation* or *-age*, or of specific instance contexts in *-age* and *-ance*), as well as in the real-world semantics of the bases to which the suffixes most typically attach. In some cases (*-ation*, *-age* and, with reservations, *-al*) these tendencies are laid down by the nature of the original unanalysable borrowings. In *-ment* and *-ance* there appears to be a divergence between unanalysable and analysable uses, though not in the kinds of bases, which remain generally distinguishable in semantic type from each other and from those of other suffixes. Furthermore, these differences in real-world semantics ensure that the suffixes remain fairly distinct in the kinds of instrumentality and action which they can all, but not interchangeably, express.

There follow for comparison tables of the unanalysable and analysable semantic profiles for ME nouns discussed in Chapters 3 to 7, showing the semantic categories of their earliest appearances. It will be noticed that under ‘action’ certain nouns have been listed midway between ‘quality’ and ‘fact’. These are those which first appear as denoting acts in a moral context. In these tables, ambiguous uses in single contexts have been included in brackets.

### Note

1. In addition there are two early reanalyses of OE words into suffixed forms with *-al*, one 14th-century reanalysis of a Latin phrase, and three back-formations on Romance verb stems in *-ail(le)*, one in each of the three periods.

**TEXT BOUND INTO  
THE SPINE**

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

Variable print quality

Table 13: UNANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ment*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUMENT	AGENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
1150-1300 iment urnement estement coupement irmament ommandement onument ynement nchantment orment estament arnement	parlement		torment			tornement contenment amonestement commencement enterement
4th Century nstrument rgument erifiment xperiment dubbement pparement rbitrement mercement ocument npediment		element tenement	(emprisonment)	sentement		abettement (emprisonment) aspiement
5th Century podiment triment edicament ndiment irtencement plement istement plicament		predicament apatissement document	machinament meliorament lineament ferrement emolument delirament excommengement		perjurement jugulment	eslargissement entassement

Table 14: ANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ment*: SEMANTICS OF FIRST ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUMENT	COLLECTIVE	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
50-1300 ndement ombrement* rishment			(amendement) avauncement acordement consentement	jugement afetement	chastiment*	sacrament (amendement) enticement corounement
h Century chement irement	vesselment	approvement conjectement*	savement figurement	concelement compassement		confermement presentement <i>cont'd</i>

Analysable *-ment*: cont'd

INSTRUMENT	COLLECTIVE	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance/occasion
veiment engement visement sement novement pparailment bushement evisement ccusement dornement efreshement ncreasement bataylment xcusement ablement omplement traiment urement rement		paiement additament	amountment martirement entendement finishment marrement onement allegement	gouvernement misgouvernement cursement hardiment	feffement attainement punishment attachement	procurement enditement adjurement abatement congelement assignement examenement eggement conspirement delaiement reffement commendement temperament murtherment agrement
<i>5th Century</i> storment ilment ointement ilement deinement vament ointment vertisement errement chement ievement oundement ment urement tenement itrollement iversement powailment sonment ilegement ntement atement	utensilment	wonderment enrollement emblaiment endouement denombrement assemblement heritement achievement	annulment abaishment auctorisement abreggement legement anientissment emblemishment preferrement famishment anoiment	misavisement acuement apprisement attendement imagenement	purgement pechement improvement reconcillement	chaungement purifiment alterment repaiement aloinement reteinement accomplishment excitement attournement appesement stallement aquitement ravishment remevement emploiement* amortisement empoverishment arreinement ajornement accrochement recettement trespasement vitaillement amentissment exploiement resignement usurpement* failment* brevement

doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating



Table 15: UNANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ance/-ence*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUM'T	AGENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance/Occ
<i>1150-1300</i> conscience pitaunce sentence observaunce penaunce reverence allegeaunce sustenaunce	preeminence circumstance substaunce appurten'nce	ordinaunce	silence ignoraunce penitence desperaunce alliaunce	pacience contenaunce bobaunce remembraunce		demurraunce
<i>14th Century</i> suraunce pestilence reconisaunce vidence advertence outraunce	audience relisaunce eminence frequence	retenaunce science	accustomaunce prescience contemplaunce	violence creaunce arrogance olipraunce abstinence* magnificence prudence perseveraunce displesaunce eloquence sapience providence incontinence accidence inconstaunce convenience alligeaunce	survei'ce	experience resistence
<i>5th Century</i> esaunce ardonaunce emonstraunce sistence ofesaunce emorance		jactaunce	inspiraunce covenance trepidance adolescence* tribulaunce obliaunce deficiencie congaudence combustaunce	benevolence puissaunce insipience toleraunce voillaunce humiliaunce lachaunce unperseveraunce intoleraunce	adjuvaunce artilaunce navigaunce	

doubtful analysability due to uncertain dating

Table 16: ANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ance/-ence*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUMENT	AGENT	OBJECT	RESULT/ STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
1150-1300						
defiance* defence		aqueintaunce signifiaunce*	greaunce destourbaunce (sufferaunce) encombraunce	obediencia* inobediencia* (sufferaunce)		
14th Century						
vengeance* aquitaunce quite-clam'ce offence concordaunce anoiaunce affermaunce signaunce	suffisaunce variaunce aboundance	usaunce daliaunce significaunce	honoraunce repentaunce deliveraunce acordaunce affiaunce coveraunce presence innocencia* absence amontaunce assuraunce* anoiaunce	purveiaunce* maintenaunce temperaunce innocencia* diligencia* plesaunce excellence	continuaunce governaunce misgovernaunce allouaunce aparaunce obeissaunce inobeisshaunce magnificencia heritaunce	restoraunce deceivaunce renovelaunce attendaunce discontinuaunce entendaunce
15th Century						
allegaunce contrariaunce verifiaunce severaunce achevisaunce hindraunce exorbitaunce sojournaunce adherencia* commandaunce entraunce socoraunce stoppaunce prefiguraunce	dependence	afferencia consideraunce principaunce*	perturbaunce esperaunce sonderaunce furtheraunce disacordaunce abaissahaunce alleviaunce preferraunce prosperaunce paraunce foreyevaunce recreaunce	unrepentaunce inconveniencia* vauntaunce untemperaunce prouissaunce moderaunce militaunce misusaunce	repugnaunce avauntaunce avoidaunce fecundaunce duraunce ministraunce frequentiaunce favouraunce resonaunce mainouraunce jouissaunce enduraunce	tariaunce concurrence utteraunce aspiaunce laudaunce sportaunce queraunce assemblaunce revertencia repliaunce festaunce parfourmaunce

\* Doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating

Table 17: UNANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ation*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUMENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
			Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
1150-1300 tribulacioun		contemplacioun indignacioun			meditation cogitacioun commendacioun transmigracioun
14th Century interpretacioun perturbacioun replicacioun prefiguracioun observacioun arbitracioun stipticacioun pronosticacioun exacerbacioun invocacioun	generacioun exalacioun	incarnacioun abhominacioun delectacioun reputacioun prolongacioun recreacioun denominacioun inflacioun opilacioun melioracioun	inspiracioun obstinacioun simulacioun mitigacioun  conspiracioun adulacioun illustracioun	revelacioun    conversacioun consideracioun preparacioun speculacioun altercacioun relaxacioun calcinacioun albificacioun fermentacioun citrinacioun approbacioun anticipacioun aspiracioun* augmentacioun imitacioun suffocacioun separacioun coagulacioun	annunciacioun administracioun determinacioun mutacioun estimacioun demonstracioun lamentacioun interrogacioun resignacioun exaltacioun elevacioun hesitacioun
15th Century indicacioun invitacioun amigracioun confutacioun		obfuscacioun fatigacioun debilitacioun admiracioun pregnacioun ablactacioun dubitacioun deploracioun radicacioun	moderacioun	sophisticacioun  vituperacioun computacioun veneracioun infiltracioun prefocacioun medicacioun claudicacioun reduplicacioun palpitacioun appodiacioun approximacioun lapidificacioun narracioun ablacioun perforacioun perambulacioun radiacioun evocacioun perpetracioun militacioun evitacioun	nominacioun peregrinacioun frequentacioun precipitacioun

Table 18: ANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-ation*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

INSTRUMENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
			Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
<i>1150-1300</i> temptacioun*		salvacioun		temptacioun*	
<i>14th Century</i> imaginacioun* excusacioun* declaracioun salutacioun* supportacioun* preambulacioun recordacioun renunciacioun		edificacioun reconciliacioun desperacioun condempnacioun lineacioun inclinacioun alienacioun* sanctificacioun (communicacioun) gloriacioun		significacioun multiplicacioun accusacioun transmutacioun* supplicacioun* continuacioun duracioun* presentacioun* acceptacioun* adjuracioun mortificacioun* supplantacioun*  calculacioun* distillacioun* sublimacioun* fixacioun congelacioun declinacioun mollificacioun illuminacioun alteracioun applicacioun alteracioun representaion	visitacioun occupacioun* taxacioun ranslacioun* conjuracioun dissimulacioun deliberacioun reparacioun usurpacioun examinacioun restoracioun reservacioun (communicacioun)
<i>15th Century</i> sequestracioun recomendacioun affirmacioun denunciacioun allegacioun reportacioun allocacioun annotacioun annotacioun	addicacioun	transformacioun relegacioun* alleviacioun abbreviacioun* magnificacioun infrigidacioun spasmacioun quassacioun glorificacioun defraudacioun	perseveracioun	vexacioun molestacioun governacioun derivacioun cancellacioun denudacioun maturacioun reversacioun transpiracioun aggregacioun suppuracioun carminacioun pronunciacioun inoculacioun* ablaqueacioun	molestacioun coronacioun transfiguracioun martirizacioun assignacioun alternacioun argumentacioun solemnisacioun deformacioun adnullacioun contentacioun annotacioun daliacioun anterioracioun

\*Doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating

Table 19: UNANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-age*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

COLLECTIVE		LOCATIVE	INSTRUMENT	OBJECT	STATE	ACTION		
General	Financial					Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
150-300								
omage hgage lvage	truage tallage*		avauntage outrage	heritage image message visage	damage tapinage	corage		viage
ith C ompanage annage uscilage lumage	cariage senage pedage	vesinage village	vassalage presage suffrage	beverage	mortgage savage	sacrilage	socage artemage	pelrinage rigolage peregrinage
ith C murage) oscage rbage artilage ntage ârage ramage	aunage pontage relage arrage scutage			overage	nounage sorage	tarage umbrage	(murage) tarage frolage ulnage summage ullage	portage

Doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating

Table 20: ANALYSABLE NOUNS IN -age: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

COLLECTIVE	INTENSIVE	LOCATIVE	INSTRUM'T	OBJECT	STATE	ACTION		
						Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
neral Financial i0- 10 age* faldage onage age			passage*	usage hostage	parage			rivage servage
h Century nage stallage inage arrerage nage tronage nage costage tage auterage suage hidage bage quarterage rage windage		hermitage parsonage herbergage cotage	disavantage patronage	pavage gainage	mariage bondage vileinage disparage spousage dotage barnage hountage concubinage savage		brokage lodemanage pillage	arrivage
th Century plusage pickage zage ankerage lage poundage iage tonnage rdage cranage ssage cartage navage plankage Keyage fraughtage seigneurage groundage guidage barrage mesurage coverage wharfage batellage chevage furnage butlerage tollage gavelage	personage	vicarage	bailliage sterage garbilage portorage feriage apparage	peisage partage (presserage) ambassage	discorage (presserage) borwage disusage	falsage ramage	coilage rouelage correctage repassage parkage hostilage scourage average mockage despoilage sondage procurage couperage parentage taxage	paiage garnerage repoisage labourage stoppage brokerage arbitrage leakage

doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating

Table 21: UNANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-al*: SEMANTICS OF FIRST ATTRIBUTIONS

ATTRIBUTIVE	COLLECTIVE	LOCATIVE	INSTRUM'T	AGENT	OBJECT	ACTION		
						Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
<i>150-1300</i> ardinal pecial apital nervaile	entraille	hospital	counsel	minstral	entaile			bataille
<i>4th Century</i> omonical ncipal kregal nimal nimal enial mperial riennal feneral orporal uienal quinoxial iennal nincral hnuel oial zal urreal	dismal vitaille frapaille chenaille trental polaille limaille		nasal temporal dial cordial original* genital braccal		remissaile	moral	regal	ordal
<i>5th Century</i> eptentrional pascal asal ommensal arietal ocal ubital lcal tual igital moroidal nbunal urnal urial radual uinquenal octrinal ennoral oreal oval onthoral	brushail almaille coraille antiquaille		brachial susprial pectoral manuel	responsail	judicial resaille			funerelle(s)

Table 22: ANALYSABLE NOUNS IN *-al*: SEMANTICS OF 1st ATTRIBUTIONS

TRIB	COLLECT	LOC	INSTRUM'T	AGENT	OBJECT	STATE	ACTION		
							Quality	Fact	Instance/Occasion
0-1300		biriel	penitencial apparail		travail*			bridale assaile*	
h C cial vincial ental terial inial onial emonial idental* stancial ural	poverail bushaille portal brigantaille	rivaille	ordinal coronal aventaille rental signal divinaille spiritual suppowail	springal governail causal	decret	repentaille		memorial espiaille	spousaille supposal arivaile rehersaille deposal
h C odal rcurial urismal* zal ial ccessional l ramental itral ital amidal nstrual	botaille bestial cordaille		sustenail reprisail* testimonial reparail fantastical nerval firmal organal	stoppal	apposail	disavaile		trial reversal aquitaile misgovernail	refusal reversal

doubtful analysability owing to uncertain dating



## Chapter 9

**A COMPARISON OF 5 SUFFIXES ACROSS 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE****9.1. Data for comparison**

I should now like to consider these suffixes as they appear around 1600, that is about a century after the end of the ME period. As noted in 1.4.2., constraints of time and space forbid a comparison of the ME sample with a similarly wide and varied sample from a later date. I have therefore chosen a cross-section of work by a notably versatile and varied writer of the period following the Middle Ages, which of course requires a different sampling technique from that of first attributions used hitherto: I have simply looked at words in all five suffixes as they are used in five plays by Shakespeare. This has, I hope, the additional advantage of providing a comparison between the previous cross-textual overview of usage and the highly conscious use of the same and similar lexis by a literary artist.

Even in the wide field of Shakespearean language studies there appears to be little detailed comparison of latinate suffixes as used in the plays. Brook lists some of the suffixes without analysis, omitting *-ation* and *-age* (1976: 132-7). Hussey (1982) and Blake (1983), though they do not compare suffixes, are enlightening on the use of latinate words to fill rhetorical patterns, and Salmon (1987) and Nevalainen (2001) have both discussed isolated uses of forms in *-ment* (see 9.2.2.1. and 9.7.2. below). Garner (1987a) has provided an updated list of Shakespeare's neologisms, which I have used here. Garner's list is based on that of Schäfer (1973), the first work to list them, which he finds 'perhaps too inclusive' (1987a: 208). His own contains 600 neologisms altogether, 58 being nouns formed in the suffixes under consideration, of which 36 appear in the five plays examined here.

I have chosen the plays with the highest number of neologisms coined by Shakespeare in these suffixes, a choice which also gives a representative cross-section of dramatic genres. They are *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*, *Twelfth Night* and *Henry V*. For each suffix I will first present the semantic profile found in these plays for words of ME origin, many of which also appear in my previous sample. This will then be compared first with the semantic profile previously observed for that suffix in ME, and secondly with the profile found in the plays for nouns of later origin formed in the same suffix, including the neologisms coined by Shakespeare.

## 9.2. Semantics of *-ment* across five plays by Shakespeare

### 9.2.1. Nouns of ME origin

All the nouns in *-ment* of ME origin which appear in these plays appeared also in my ME sample.

**Table 23: Semantics of ME nouns in *-ment* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12thNt	Henry V	Total
Instrum't	14	8	5	8	7	<b>42</b>
Agent	0	0	0	0	1	1
Object	1	2	0	0	2	5
Res/State	3	1	1	3	2	10
Act/qual	1	2	2	0	1	6
Act/fact	0	1	1	0	2	4
Act/inst	1	1	3	2	2	9
Total	22	15	12	13	17	77

The figures here reflect the number of meanings, which are based on a total of 40 words. I have omitted occurrences in ambiguous single contexts, but the number of occurrences is still higher than the number of words; however, the figures are too low to be tested alone for statistical significance. The majority figure is printed in bold.

It will be seen from the table that in all five plays the majority of words in *-ment* occurs in instrumental senses. In Chapter 3 this appeared to be true of my sample of

first attributions of unanalysable words in this suffix. It did not seem true of analysables, in which instrumental senses, though still a major semantic category for words in *-ment*, were clearly outnumbered by contexts for specific action.

#### 9.2.1.1. *Recurring ME nouns*

In most of these suffixes there are institutionalised words of ME origin which appear throughout the plays with similar meanings, although these meanings may sometimes be played on and varied by Shakespeare as a poet. Such words are usually but not always unanalysable, and often opaque. An exception is analysable JUDGEMENT, which appears in all five plays with various meanings (see 9.2.3. below). The opaque noun INSTRUMENT appears frequently in four, always with instrumental meanings, though with different real-world senses.<sup>1</sup> Unanalysable ARGUMENT appears four times in *Hamlet* alone, also instrumentally, with differences of sense in context<sup>2</sup>.

#### 9.2.2. *Nouns of post-ME origin*

**Table 24: Semantics of post-ME nouns in *-ment* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12thNt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	4	2	1	1	0	<b>8</b>
Agent	1	1	0	0	0	2
Object	4	0	1	0	1	6
Res/state	3	2	1	2	0	<b>8</b>
Act/qual	0	0	0	0	1	1
Act/fact	0	1	0	0	0	1
Act/inst	3	1	1	1	0	6
Total	15	7	4	4	2	32

Instrumental meanings are equalled by result/state in this table. The numbers are low, however, and the results cannot be tested for statistical significance. The table is based on a total of 29 words, 18 of which are neologisms coined by Shakespeare. I

have omitted two further Shakespearean neologisms, BODEMENT and ENTREATMENT, each of which is ambiguous in a single context (see 9.2.3. below).

#### 9.2.2.1. *Instrument*

Of the later nouns not coined by Shakespeare, MERRIMENT (1576) and COMPLIMENT (1578) seem to be used instrumentally in context:

- (1) Hamlet: ... your flashes of *merriment*, that were wont to set the table on a roar  
*Hamlet* V i 187-8;
- (2) Olivia:                               'Twas never merry world  
Since lowly feigning was called *compliment*  
*Twelfth Night* III i 95-6.

Here the senses are respectively 'means of making merry' and 'means of paying a compliment'.

*Hamlet* not only has a larger number of nouns in *-ment* than any other play, but also the largest number of neologisms in this suffix, the total being 12 out of 36 across the five plays (Garner 1987: 217-25).<sup>3</sup> Just over a third of the previously attributed *-ment* forms in this play (ME or post-ME) have instrumental meaning, as do just under a third of neologisms.

Blake argues that prefixes and suffixes could be added and omitted in Shakespeare's verse for metrical reasons, and that the meaning of latinate vocabulary was of less importance than its sound and rhythm (1983: 42-4). BLASTMENT(s) is a case where the suffix might be thought to have been added to the noun *blast* simply to fit the metre; but if so, 'blastings' would have done as well, as *blast* is a verb in ME (c1400[a1300]) as well as a noun (c1275[?a1200]). Salmon in fact points out that such words cannot have been coined for metrical purposes, as the metre would be unaffected by the addition of *-ing*, and it is her view that verbal nouns in *-ing* cannot usefully be substituted for them (Salmon, 1987: 196). This will be discussed further in

9.7.2. below. If the suffix here is taken as attaching to the verb rather than the simplex noun, it transforms the nominalisation to ‘means of blasting’ :

Laertes: And in the morn and liquid dew of youth  
Contagious *blastments* are most imminent  
I iii 41-2.

Alternatively, it could perhaps be read as ‘state of being blasted’, but the adjective ‘contagious’ seems rather to suggest the noxious means.

Nouns denoting speech which are ambiguous between instrument and action, such as the neologisms BODEMENT and ENTREATMENT, will be discussed in 9.2.3. below. However, DEFINEMENT, playfully coined by Hamlet to mock Osric, clearly refers to the words or means of defining:

Hamlet: Sir, his *definement* suffers no perdition in you  
V ii 112.

ALLAYMENT in *Troilus* refers to the means of allaying described in the previous line:

Cressida: If I could temporize with my affection  
The like *allayment* could I give my grief  
IV iv 6-8.

#### 9.2.2.2. *Object*

HATCHMENT (1548), *Hamlet* IV v 215, a corruption of ACHIEVEMENT, has the institutionalised objective sense ‘escutcheon’ (an achieved or completed account of armorial bearings).

Four neologisms refer to objects of action. In *Hamlet*, these include STREWMENT, DISTILMENT and ANNEXMENT. STREWMENT(s) in the plural refers to flowers strewn on Ophelia’s grave (V i 229). The ‘leperous *distilment*’ is the distilled poison which the dead King’s brother poured into his ear (I v 64), while ‘each small *annexment*’ is each thing joined to a king’s life, which in Rosencrantz’s

complicated metaphor will fall when the king does (III iii 21-2). CEREMENT is a version of *cerecloth* ‘waxed cloth’ (I iv 48).

#### 9.2.2.3. *Agent*

Shakespeare’s neologism APPERTAINMENTS in *Troilus* has the agentive meaning ‘things belonging’ (*Troilus* II iii 79).

#### 9.2.2.4. *Result/state*

All five nouns in this category are neologisms. In *Hamlet* CONDOLEMENT and RETIREMENT are experiential states:

- (1) Claudius: ... To persevere  
In obstinate *condolement* is a course  
Of impious stubbornness  
I ii 92-4,
- (2) Guildenstern: The King, sir ... is in his *retirement* marvellous distempered  
III ii 307-10.

REINFORCEMENT in *Troilus* (V.v.16) and Orsino’s CLOYMENT in *Twelfth Night* (II.iv.98) are also passive states.

AMAZEMENT is listed by Garner and the *OED* as first appearing in *King John* V i 35. It appears twice each in *Hamlet* and *Troilus*, always as a passive state:

Rosencrantz: ... your behaviour hath struck her into *amazement* and admiration  
*Hamlet* III ii 333 (see also III iv 113);

Hector: I have a roisting challenge ...  
Will strike *amazement* to their drowsy spirits  
*Troilus* I ii 209-11 (see also V iii 85).

These usages bear out Marchand’s characterisation of the modern suffix (1969: 332, 4.65.5).

#### 9.2.2.5. *Action: quality*

RETIREMENT also appears in *Henry V* with the meaning ‘habitual [praiseworthy] practice’:

Canterbury: And never noted in him any study,  
 Any *retirement*, any sequestration  
 I.i 57-8.

#### 9.2.2.6. *Action: specific instance*

DEBATEMENT (1536) is the only post-ME noun not coined by Shakespeare to occur in a context of specific action ('debating' rather than instrumental 'words of debate'):

Hamlet: That on the view and knowing of these contents,  
 Without *debatement* further, more or less,  
 He should those bearers put to sudden death  
*Hamlet* V ii 46.

There are, however, four neologisms in this category. IMPARTMENT, also in *Hamlet*, refers to a specific act of imparting: the Ghost beckons to Hamlet 'as if it some *impartment* did desire/ To you alone' (I iv 58- 59). EXTOLMENT in the same play refers to a specific action of extolling:

Hamlet: ... but, in the verity of *extolment*, I take him to be a soul of great  
 article ...  
 V ii 115.

In *Troilus*, plural SUBDUEMENT(s) refers to instances of surrendering in battle (IV v 185-7) and DENOTEMENT in *Othello* also appears in a specific context:

Iago: He hath devoted and given up himself to the contemplation, mark  
 and *denotement* of her parts and graces  
 II iii 307-8,

There are no coinages in *-ment* by Shakespeare in *Twelfth Night* or *Henry V*.

#### 9.2.3. *Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity*

Consideration of ambiguities raises the stylistic question: how do these semantic tendencies affect the use of these words by a literary artist? In poetic writing especially, of course, we find ambiguities and multiple meanings, since poetic writing has to create meanings beyond the conventions of the language. However, it cannot do this without

reference to those conventions, and in the suffixed words under consideration most of the multiple meanings and ambiguities across these plays occur between the semantic areas we have found to be prominent for them in Middle English.

In these plays metaphorical use of words in *-ment* occurs rarely, and even multiple meaning is comparatively rare. The main example is the analysable ME noun JUDGEMENT, the ambiguity of which has been discussed in Chapter 3 on ME *-ment* (3.4.2.1.). In *Hamlet* alone this noun appears with three separate meanings: twice as an instance of action:

Horatio: Of accidental *judgements*, casual slaughters  
V ii 335,

Polonius: Take each man's censure, but reserve thy *judgement*  
I iii 69;

and (more usually) with the instrumental meaning 'faculty of judging':

Hamlet: The heyday in the blood is tame, it's humble  
And waits upon the *judgement*  
III iv 70-71

(see also II ii 437, III ii 96, IV iii 5 ). The faculty, however, may also partly be seen as a personal quality, whether by qualification:

Polonius: I am sorry that with better speed and *judgement*  
I had not quoted him  
II i 111-12

(see also *Henry V* III vii 54, IV vii 45), or by suggestion that the faculty is not universal, as in *Troilus* :

Pandarus: You have no *judgement*, niece  
I ii 93.

In the same scene, Troilus is later identified with this quality in himself:

Pandarus: ...he's one o'th' soundest *judgements* in Troy whosoever [etc.]  
I ii 192.

The word also occurs in this play as an instance of judging:



Nestor: But that Achilles...  
 ... will, with great speed of *judgement*,  
 Ay, with celerity, find Hector's purpose [etc.]  
 I iii 327-30.

Otherwise it is the instrumental faculty (*Othello* I iii 9, II I 293, II iii 200, II iii 234, IV iii 211; *Twelfth Night* III ii 13; *Henry V* II ii 136).

The analysable ME noun ENTERTAINMENT appears once in *Hamlet* as an instance of action:

Polonius; But do not dull thy palm with *entertainment*  
 Of each new-hatch'd, unfledged courage  
 I iii 64-5.

Elsewhere it has the instrumental sense 'means of entertaining':

Rosencrantz: To think, my lord ... what lenten *entertainment* the players shall  
 receive from you  
 II ii 315-17;

which also appears in *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*:

Viola: The rudeness that hath appeared in me have I learned from my  
*entertainment*  
 I v 206;

Iago: Note if your lady strain his *entertainment*  
 With any strong or vehement importunity  
 III iii 248.

Elsewhere in *Othello* it appears as a general action/fact:

Cassio: I could well wish courtesy could invent some other custom of  
*entertainment*  
 II iii 31-2.

In many contexts, complex nouns signifying utterances could refer either to the words - the means of utterance - or to the act of speaking them. An example is the neologism ENTREATMENT in *Hamlet*:

Polonius: Set your *entreatments* at a higher rate  
 Than a command to parle  
 I iii 122-3.

The neologism BODEMENT in *Troilus* has a similar ambiguity. It refers to Cassandra's verbal prophecies, and could mean either the act of prophesying or the words by which she prophecies:

Troilus: This foolish, dreaming, superstitious girl  
 Makes all these *bodements*  
 V iii 78-9.

#### 9.2.4. Summary

**Table 25: Semantics of total occurrences in *-ment* across 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Night	Henry V	TOTAL
Instrum	18	10	6	9	7	50
Agent	1	1	0	0	1	3
Object	5	2	1	0	3	11
Res/state	6	3	2	5	2	18
Act/qual	1	2	2	0	2	7
Act/fact	0	2	1	0	2	5
Act/inst	4	2	4	3	2	15
Total	35	22	16	17	19	109

The 109 occurrences in *-ment* are based on 71 words, of which 40 existed in ME. Instrumental senses are clearly in a majority, but the figures are too low to be tested alone for significance.

**Table 26: Comparison of semantics of *-ment* in ME and 5 Shakespeare plays**

	ME 1150-1500	5 Shakesp. plays	ME %	Shakesp.%
Instrument	76	50	36.2	45.9
Agent	1	3	0.5	2.8
Object	17	11	8.1	10.1
Result/state	30	18	14.3	16.5
Act/quality	15	7	7.1	6.4
Act/fact	10	5	4.8	4.6
Act/inst'nce	59	15	28.1	13.8
Collective	2	0	1	0
Total	210	109		

If we compare the figures for Shakespeare with those for the previous ME sample, the distribution of the first two columns of Table 26 is significant at  $p < 0.1$ ,  $\chi^2$  12.682 (df 7). However, differences and similarities are more apparent if we transform the figures into percentages, since the raw figures are based on different totals. It will be seen from the last two columns that in all categories other than instrument and specific instance, the proportions are fairly similar in both periods. The proportion of instrumental meanings in Shakespeare has increased by 9.6%, over a quarter of the proportion in ME, and that of specific instance meanings has decreased by 14.3%, over half the proportion in ME. The two-cell distribution of figures for instrument is significant to  $p < 0.05$   $\chi^2$  5.365 (df 1), and that for specific instance to  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  26.162 (df 1).

The high score of instrumental uses in these plays is perhaps due to the wide currency of opaque or unanalysable words, which in the ME period were also predominantly instrumental. Specific instance, which was dominant among ME analysable nouns in *-ment*, is relatively infrequent here, even among ME nouns taken alone (see Table 23). If we look at post-ME nouns alone there are almost twice as many instrumental senses as specific instance contexts, which latter are also outnumbered by object and result/state (see Table 24). However, it may be noted that most of the multiple meanings and ambiguities are between instrument and specific instance.

### **9.3. Semantics of *-ance/-ence* across five plays of Shakespeare**

The suffix *-ance/-ence* has the highest number of appearances in all five plays.

#### **9.3.1. Nouns of ME origin**

58 (almost two thirds) of the 84 nouns of ME origin appeared in my previous sample.

**Table 27: Semantics of ME nouns in *-ance/-ence* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	9	6	7	9	12	<b>43</b>
Agent	8	4	4	0	3	19
Object	3	1	4	1	3	12
Res/state	9	11	7	8	7	42
Act/qual	10	8	8	5	12	<b>43</b>
Act/fact	8	4	2	3	6	23
Act/inst	6	2	3	2	2	15
Total	53	36	35	28	45	197

The table is based on 80 words, omitting occurrences in ambiguous single contexts. Overall the majority of meanings here are equally divided between instrument and quality, the latter being taken together with fact/quality (qualitative action).

#### 9.3.1.1. *Recurring ME nouns*

The most frequently recurring ME nouns are divided among the most frequently recurring meanings for ME *-ance*. Those which can bear instrumental meanings include CONSCIENCE, REMEMBRANCE, OFFENCE, DEFENCE, PESTILENCE and SENTENCE.<sup>4</sup> Frequently recurring nouns with the sense ‘being X’ include unanalysable IGNORANCE. Nouns of being which are analysable in respect of adjectives are PRESENCE and ABSENCE.<sup>5</sup> Recurring nouns expressing qualities are unanalysable PATIENCE and OBEDIENCE.<sup>6</sup>

#### 9.3.2. *Nouns of post-ME origin*

**Table 28: Semantics of post-ME nouns in *-ance/-ence* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	1	0	1	0	0	2
Agent	0	1	2	0	1	4
Object	2	0	1	0	0	3
Res/state	1	2	2	1	3	<b>9</b>
Act/qual	0	1	1	0	1	3
Act/inst	0	0	2	1	2	5
Total	4	4	9	2	7	26

Here result/state is the dominant meaning, a tendency already noted in my previous results for later analysable *ance/-ence* (see 4.4.8. and 8.3.1). However, the total numbers here are even lower than for post-ME *-ment*. Omitting CONFERENCE and the neologism TRANSPORTANCE, which occur in ambiguous contexts, the 27 meanings reflect a total of 22 words, seven of which are neologisms.

#### 9.3.2.1. *Agent*

INGREDIENCE (1526), *Othello* II iii 299 has the agentive meaning 'thing entering a recipe'. Two of Shakespeare's neologisms are also in this category.

ARRIVANCE in *Othello* is a collective noun which also has an agentive meaning, 'people arriving':

3rd Gent.: For every minute is expectancy  
Of more *arrivance*  
II i 41-2.

IMMINENCE, a noun of being from the adjective *imminent* (a1400-a1500[1436]), was coined by Shakespeare in *Troilus* and is probably also agentive (see 9.3.3. below).

#### 9.3.2.2. *Result/state*

Of words not coined by Shakespeare, four denote passive states. In ACCEPTANCE (1574) and REFERENCE (1589) we might find some ambiguity between action and state, depending on whether the focus is on the subject or object of the underlying verb. In the first use of ACCEPTANCE in *Henry V* the emphasis seems to be on the acceptor, making the noun denote an instance of action:

Ely: How did this after seem receiv'd, my lord?  
Canterbury: With good *acceptance* of his majesty  
I i 83;

(see also *Othello* iii III 467). In the second, the emphasis is on the thing accepted rather than the act of accepting, so that the noun expresses a state of being accepted:

Chorus: In your fair minds let this [the play] *acceptance* take  
Epilogue 14),

REFERENCE, found also in *Henry V* and *Othello*, is part of an institutionalised phrase where the speaker is not usually conscious of the underlying sense, so that the emphasis is harder to determine:

Canterbury: ... Many things, having full *reference*  
To one concern  
I ii 205-6.

The underlying sense could be 'referring fully' or 'being fully referred'. As the things are inanimate I favour the latter sense. In *Othello* I v 235 it means 'being considered', a condition requested for Desdemona on her arrival under escort. The other passive states are ADMITTANCE (1589) 'being admitted' (*Hamlet* II ii 51, *Henry V* II iv 67) and RIDDANCE (1535) 'being rid of' (*Troilus* II i 119). EXPECTANCE (1602), *Troilus* IV v 146, is an active experiential state.

For Shakespeare's neologism TRANSPORTANCE in *Troilus*, see 9.3.3.

below. Of the three neologisms in *Othello*, only REPROBANCE bears one of the usually dominant senses for *-ance*. This expresses a passive state, possibly that of damnation:

Gratiano: This sight would make him do a desperate turn ...  
And fall to *reprobance*  
V i 206-8.

In *Twelfth Night* the only neologism in *-ance* also expresses a passive (negative) state, that of 'not being regarded':

Orsino: Since you to *non-regardance* cast my faith, etc.  
V i 119).

#### 9.3.2.3. *Action: quality*

Words denoting attributes are PREDOMINANCE (1602), *Troilus* II iii 128. and PORTANCE 'noble bearing' (1590), *Othello* I iii 138. Shakespeare's neologism

SONANCE in *Henry V* falls into the category of qualitative action, referring both to the sounding and the quality of the trumpets:

Constable:                    Then let the trumpets sound  
                                      The tucket *sonance*, and the note to mount  
                                      IV ii 33-4.

#### 9.3.2.4. *Action: specific instance*

ACCEPTANCE is a specific action in *Henry V* (see 9.3.2.2. above) and *Othello* III iii 467. CURRANCE<sup>7</sup> ‘moving at speed’ is also specific in *Henry V* I i 33.

IMPORTANCE (1505) in *Twelfth Night* (V i 351) has the sense ‘importuning’. The neologism ITERANCE in *Othello* (mode *iteration*) expresses an instance of action:

Othello: What needs this *iterance*, woman?  
                                      V ii 149.

#### 9.3.3. *Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity*

VIOLENCE appears in *Hamlet* I. iii. with an instrumental sense, as a means to a specified end:

Hamlet: Nor shall you do my ear that *violence*  
                                      To make it truster of your own report  
                                      I ii 171-2.

However, at the beginning of the play the action implies a quality:

Marcellus: We do it wrong, being so majestic,  
                                      To offer it the show of *violence*  
                                      I i 143-4,

while at the end it is a pure quality attributed to Laertes’ swordplay:

Hamlet: I pray you pass with your best *violence*  
                                      V ii 292.

ASSURANCE occurs in *Twelfth Night* both as state:

Malvolio: ... You should put your lord in desperate *assurance* she will none  
                                      of him  
                                      II ii 58

and instrument, the latter twice:

Viola: Good gentle one, give me modest *assurance* if you be the lady of the house  
I v 173;

see also IV iii 26.

REMEMBRANCE in *Twelfth Night* can suggest either an instrumental faculty:

Valentine: A brother's dead love, which she would keep fresh  
And lasting in her sad *remembrance*  
I i 32-3

or a passive state:

Sebastian: She is drowned already, sir, with salt water, though I seem to drown her *remembrance* again with more  
II i 26-8.

In V i Olivia plays on both meanings:

Olivia: A most extracting frenzy of mine own  
From my *remembrance* clearly banished his  
V i 278-9.

OFFENCE, also ME, is an example not only of multiple but of ambiguous meaning. In

*Hamlet* this word usually appears with the instrumental sense 'means of offending':

King: Have you heard the argument? Is there no *offence* in't?  
Hamlet: No, no, they do but jest, poison in jest. No offence i'th' world.  
III ii 242-5.

(See also III I 126, IV v 219). Elsewhere it is an action, an instance of

offending:

King: And where tis so, th'offender's scourge is weighed  
But never the *offence*  
IV iii 6-7.

In I v, however, Shakespeare plays explicitly on active and passive implications of the verb 'offend':

Hamlet: I am sorry they [Hamlet's words] offend you, heartily ...  
Horatio: There's no *offence*, my lord.  
Hamlet: Yes, by St. Patrick, and there is, Horatio,  
And much *offence* too.  
I v 134-8.





Here Orsino seems to be drawing our attention to the condition or state of lovers in earlier times. Later, however, Viola swears by the integrity of her love as by a quality, an attribute as intrinsic as youth:

Viola: By *innocence* I swear, and by my youth,  
I have one heart, one bosom and one troth  
III i 154-5.

Both SILENCE and IGNORANCE, usually nouns of being, are personified in *Hamlet*, *Troilus* and *Othello*, although this is a figure more usual with qualities:

King: His *silence* will sit drooping  
*Hamlet* V i 284;

Troilus: But I am weaker than a woman's tear,  
Tamer than sleep, fonder than *ignorance*  
*Troilus* I i 10;

Iago: ... fools as gross  
As *ignorance* made drunk  
*Othello* III iii 401-2.

Similarly VENGEANCE, usually instrumental 'means of avenging' appears in *Hamlet* as the quality 'vengefulness' in an unusual semi-personification in the Player's speech:

1st Player: A roused *vengeance* sets him new a-work  
II ii 479.

and in *Othello* as a personification of the act of avenging:

Othello: Arise, black *Vengeance*, from thy hollow cell!  
III iii 444.

Finally PLEASANCE in *Othello* could mean either the means of pleasing, the quality of pleasantness, or the state of being pleased, and in one line suggests all three:

Cassio: That we should with joy, *pleasance*, revel and applause transform  
ourselves into beasts!  
II iii 283.

9.3.4. *Summary***Table 29: Semantics of total occurrences of *-ance/-ence* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	10	6	8	9	12	45
Agent	8	5	6	0	4	23
Object	5	1	5	1	3	15
Res/state	10	13	9	9	10	<b>51</b>
Act/qual	10	9	9	5	13	46
Act/fact	8	4	2	3	6	23
Act/inst	6	2	5	3	4	20
Total	57	40	43	31	52	223

The 223 tabulated occurrences in the suffix *-ance* across these five plays are based on 103 words. Of these, 80 are of ME origin, including 26 words which do not appear in my original ME sample. Of the 23 words of 16th century origin, seven are neologisms appearing first in Shakespeare.

It will be seen from the table that by far the highest proportion of uses overall are in the semantic areas of result/state, quality (with qualitative action) and instrument, in that order. The semantic pattern appearing above appears to be largely due to the continuing presence of words of ME origin. Of 18 words not introduced by Shakespeare but first attributed in the 16th century, a clearer majority expresses states. Of Shakespeare's seven neologisms, two express states and one a quality, while two more are ambiguous between state and instrument or state and agent.

We have seen throughout Chapter 4 that result/state in this suffix often means mental state (in deverbal active or passive senses, e.g. REPENTANCE, ASSURANCE) or is closely related to quality ('being X' in de-adjectival forms, e.g. INNOCENCE). The patterns, however, do vary according to the play. We can also see from Table 29 above that in addition to these semantic areas *Hamlet* contains a relatively high proportion of agent, action/fact and specific instance uses. This may be

partly due to the fact that this long play has a larger number of nouns in this suffix:

however, all plays have more nouns in *-ance* than in any other suffix. My classification

of agent nouns here has included nouns formed in *-stance* with institutionalised

meanings, the derivation of which does not denote states but rather things which

'stand' in a certain position, such as SUBSTANCE, CIRCUMSTANCE and

INSTANCE. The relative prominence of action contexts in *Hamlet* may be due to the

political nature of the plot; it is partly shared by *Henry V*, also a play of politics and

action, which has six occurrences of *-ance* in the area of action/fact.

**Table 30: Comparison of semantics of *-ance/ence* in ME and 5 Shakespeare plays**

	ME 1150-1500	5 Shakespeare plays	ME %	Shakesp. %
Instrument	44	45	20.9	20.2
Agent	12	23	5.7	10.3
Object	12	15	5.7	6.7
Result/state	44	51	20.9	22.9
Act/quality	58	46	27.5	20.6
Act/fact	21	23	10	10.3
Act/instance	20	20	9.5	9
Total	211	223		

The total distribution of figures in the first two columns is not significant, at  $p < 0.48$ ,  $\chi^2$  5.465 (df 6). It will be seen from the last two columns that there is little difference between the percentages for most categories. Only agent senses show a large percentage increase, with a two-cell distribution significant at  $p < 0.05$   $\chi^2$  3.457 (df 1); however, the raw numbers are low. The share of quality senses in Shakespeare has decreased by 6.9%, but both numbers are still high.

## 9.4. Semantics of *-ation* across five plays by Shakespeare

### 9.4.1. Nouns of ME origin

The suffix *-ation* has the second highest number of appearances across these plays. Out of 87 nouns of ME origin found in the plays, approximately half (44), a relatively low proportion, appeared also in my previous ME sample. Two ambiguous occurrences have been excluded from the table.

**Table 31: Semantics of ME nouns in *-ation* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	6	3	4	4	1	18
Agent	1	0	0	1	0	2
Object	4	3	3	2	3	15
Res/state	8	1	7	3	6	25
Act/qual	0	0	0	0	3	3
Act/fact	3	9	2	3	4	21
Act/inst	10	7	7	4	8	<b>36</b>
Total	32	23	23	17	25	120

Across the plays a majority of *-ation* words of ME origin occurs in contexts of specific instances of action. In two plays these are equalled or marginally surpassed by result/state senses, and in another they are outnumbered by contexts of general action/fact. In my original ME sample, however, general action/fact was the dominant sense for both analysable and unanalysable nouns (see 5.4.7.).

#### 9.4.1.1. Recurring ME nouns

There are no words in *-ation* which appear in all five plays. PREPARATION appears in four, as does CONTEMPLATION (see 9.4.3. below). The unanalysable ME noun PROBATION ‘testing’ appears as a specific instance in three.

### 9.4.2. Nouns of post-ME origin

Again, the numbers are low, the occurrences being based on only 21 words including a single coinage by Shakespeare. The distribution therefore cannot be tested

for significance. There are no occurrences with agentive and objective senses. As in Table 31, a majority represents specific instance of action.

**Table 32: Semantics of post-ME nouns in *-ation* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrum	1	0	2	1	0	4
Res/state	0	1	2	0	1	4
Act/qual	1	2	0	0	0	3
Act/fact	0	2	1	0	3	6
Act/ inst	1	1	4	2	1	9
Total	3	6	9	3	5	27

9.4.2.1. *Action: specific instance*

INSINUATION (1526) in *Hamlet* refers to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's manoeuvring for the 'employment' of betraying Hamlet (V ii 59-60). NEGOTIATION (1579) in *Troilus* appears in the plural:

Calchas: That their *negotiations* all must slack  
Wanting his manage  
III iii 24-5,

and CELEBRATION (1529) in *Twelfth Night* refers to the occasion of Olivia's marriage (IV iii 30). IMPUTATION (1545) 'bringing a case' in *Henry V* occurs in the King's comment on the specific example put forward by the soldiers in the discussion of responsibility for war crimes:

King Henry: ... The *imputation* of his wickedness, by your rule, should be  
imposed on his father that sent him  
IV i 145-6.

Only *Othello* has more than one post-ME noun in *-ation* appearing in contexts of specific instance. Here there are four. CELEBRATION refers to Othello's marriage (II ii 7), SEGREGATION (1555) to the dispersing of the Turkish fleet (II i 10) and IMPUTATION to the bringing of evidence against Desdemona and Cassio (III iii 403). EXPECTATION (1536) occurs in the negative, but the context is specific:

Iago: ... and the impediment ... removed, without which there were  
no expectation of our prosperity  
II I 269-71.

The only neologism in *-ation* in these plays is ACCOMMODATION (*Othello* I  
iii 236), which has its instrumental modE meaning.

#### 9.4.3. *Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity*

Among ME nouns, CONTEMPLATION appears as a specific instance in  
*Troilus* II iii 24-5 (Thersites contemplating Patroclus), in *Othello* II iii 307-8 (Othello  
contemplating Desdemona's 'parts and graces', and *Twelfth Night* II v 30 (Malvolio  
contemplating the letter he receives), while in *Henry V* it is generalised as a quality:

Ely: And so the Prince obscured his *contemplation*  
Under the veil of wildness  
I i 63-4.

MITIGATION in *Twelfth Night* is a quality, but also suggests the action, and perhaps  
the resulting state:

Malvolio: ... Ye squeak out your coziers' catches without any *mitigation*  
or remorse of voice  
II iii 88-9.

PREPARATION in *Henry V* refers twice to specific acts of preparation for war (IV  
Prol. 12-14, II Chorus 12-14) and can also have the objective sense of 'armies  
prepared' (*Hamlet* II ii 62-3). Elsewhere in *Henry V* it means the state of being  
prepared for death:

King Henry: ... not dying, the time was blessedly lost wherein such  
*preparation* was gained.  
IV i 175-7

APPROBATION in ME was a synonym for *probation* 'testing' with a secondary  
meaning 'approval'. In *Henry V* it suggests both the experiential state of approval and  
an instance of confirming it by an action:

King Henry: For God doth know how many, now in health

Shall drop their blood in *approbation*  
 Of what your reverence shall incite us to  
 I ii 18-20.

Elsewhere it is the passive state 'being approved' (*Troilus* I iii 59, *Twelfth Night* III iv 178).

Personification is likely to be of action rather than pure quality. In *Troilus*, SPECULATION appears in an extended personification of its own activity:

Achilles: For *speculation* turns not to itself  
 Till it has travelled, and is mirrored there  
 Where it may see itself.  
 (III iii 109-11).

Of the three post-ME nouns in *Troilus*, only EMULATION (1552) is seen as a pure quality as well as qualitative action, being personified as 'pale and bloodless emulation' in I iii 134, and again in III iii 156:

Ulysses: For *emulation* hath a thousand sons.

In II ii 213 and IV v 122-3 it is partly animate, but also in the first a literal and generalised fact:

Hector: Whilst *emulation* in the army crept,

while in the second it appears in the context of a specific though hypothetical instance:

Hector: The obligation of our blood forbids  
 A gory *emulation* twixt us twain

The experiential state EXPECTATION (1536) is personified, but also in action:

Prologue: Now *expectation*, tickling skittish spirits,  
 Sets all on hazard  
 Prolog. 20-21,

while EXPOSTULATION (1586), occurs in a generalisation about a specific situation:

Troilus: Nay, we must use *expostulation* kindly  
 For it is parting from us  
 IV iv 59-60;



that is, the general power of expostulating must be used with care in this instance, for soon it will not be available.

#### 9.4.4. *Summary*

**Table 33: Semantics of total occurrences in *-ation* across 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Instrument	7	3	6	5	1	22
Agent	1	0	0	1	0	2
Object	4	3	3	2	3	15
Res/state	8	2	9	3	7	29
Act/quality	1	2	0	0	3	6
Act/fact	3	11	3	3	7	27
Act/inst'ce	11	8	13	6	9	47
Total	35	29	34	20	29	148

**Table 34: Comparison of semantics of *-ation* in ME and 5 Shakespeare plays**

	ME 1150-1500	5 Shakespeare plays	ME %	Shakesp. %
Instrument	32	22	15.1	14.9
Agent	0	2	0	1.3
Object	3	15	1.4	10.1
Result/state	41	29	19.3	19.6
Act/quality	14	6	6.6	4.1
Act/fact	76	27	35.8	18.2
Act/instance	46	47	21.7	31.8
Total	212	148		

The 148 tabulated occurrences in *-ation* across these plays are based on 106 words, 85 of which existed in ME. As with *-ance*, the overall semantic pattern here is basically similar to those shown for ME and post-ME words taken separately (see Tables 31 and 32). In Table 33 the majority appears more clearly with the addition of the figures for the 44 ME words which do not appear in my original sample. The overall pattern, however, is clearly different from that for my original ME sample, where a large majority of action meanings fell into the category of general fact (see 5.4.7. and 8.3.1.). Here the majority of action meanings is specific in all but one play.

The first two columns in Table 34 show a significant distribution at  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 30.001$  (df 6). It will be seen from the last two columns that the ME percentages of action/fact and specific instance meanings have been almost reversed in Shakespeare, with a 17.6% drop in action/fact (almost half the ME proportion) and a 10.1% rise in specific instance (again, almost 50% of the percentage in ME). It might be expected of a dramatist that the majority of actions referred to by any nouns would be specific rather than general; here the exception is *Troilus*, perhaps a more reflective work. However, what we have seen in this section may be part of an emerging linguistic pattern, in which post- ME *-ation* takes over the ‘specific instance’ area seen in 3.4.9. to be prominent for analysable ME nouns in *-ment*. The findings in 9.2.4. here suggest that *-ment* might have reverted to its original tendency to attract instrumental meanings which we saw in Chapter 3 (see again 3.4.9.) for unanalysable ME nouns. More data would be needed to confirm this, both from Shakespeare and from wider 16th-century usage.

### 9.5. Semantics of *-age* across five plays of Shakespeare

There are fewer nouns in *-age* than in the deverbal suffixes considered above, with no more than 12 occurrences for any of these five plays. In all plays they are fairly evenly spread among a selection of meanings available to nouns in *-age*. The most prominent overall are objective and instrumental; however, some of these meanings overlap with collectivity (see 9.5.3. below).

#### 9.5.1. *Nouns of ME origin*

All nouns in *-age* of ME origin which appear in these plays appeared also in my original sample.

**Table 35: Semantics of ME nouns in *-age* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Intensive	0	0	0	1	0	1
Collective	3	2	0	2	0	7
Locative	0	0	0	0	1	1
Instrum	1	2	3	2	5	<b>13</b>
Agent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Object	4	2	1	3	3	<b>13</b>
Res/state	1	1	4	1	2	9
Act/qual	1	1	1	0	1	4
Act/fact	0	3	0	0	1	4
Act/inst	2	0	0	3	0	5
Total	12	11	9	12	13	57

The figures here are all too low to be tested alone for statistical significance. The profile differs from those for the original sample in the prominence of objective and instrumental uses, both of which outnumber collective across the plays. In my original ME sample, on the other hand, collectives clearly dominated among analysable nouns, due to a large subset of financial terms which do not figure largely in Shakespeare (see 6.4.6.1., 6.4.6.10. and 8.3.1.). However, PILLAGE and COINAGE, which I have classified here as objective in relation to their bases (the ME verb *coinen* precedes the complex noun) also have collective meaning.

#### 9.5.1.1. *Recurring ME nouns*

A number of opaque ME words recur with institutionalised meanings in various semantic areas. The concrete objective noun VISAGE (derivationally ‘thing seen’) appears in all five plays, and MESSAGE (derivationally with the objective sense ‘thing sent’), besides the ‘quality’ noun COURAGE, in four. Not all, however, are opaque or invariable in meaning. De-adverbial (AD)VANTAGE (transparent, though technically unanalysable in ME) also appears in four of the plays and not always in the same way (see also below, 9.5.3.). The early analysable deverbal nouns PASSAGE and

MARRIAGE, though less frequent, also recur. PASSAGE appears in all five plays. with a range of action and case meanings (see 9.5.3.) while MARRIAGE appears as both state and occasion in four.

### 9.5.2. *Nouns of post-ME origin*

The occurrences are based on 10 words, the majority of which were coined by Shakespeare. GUARDAGE, with a single ambiguous occurrence, has been omitted.

**Table 36: Semantics of post-ME nouns in *-age* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Collective	0	2	0	0	0	2
Locative	0	0	0	0	2	2
Instrum	1	1	0	0	0	2
Agent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Object	0	0	0	0	1	1
Act/qual	1	0	0	0	0	1
Act/fact	1	1	0	0	0	2
Act/inst	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	5	4	0	0	3	11

#### 9.5.2.1. *Collective nouns*

Six of Shakespeare's neologisms in *-age* have at least partly, though not all primarily, collective meaning. SCAFFOLDAGE and PLANTAGE in *Troilus* are concrete collectives; in the former the suffix seems at first sight purely intensive and in the latter to take the place of a plural marker (phenomena noted in ME; see 6.4.7.), but in both it adds a sense of totality:

Ulysses: To hear the wooden dialogue and sound  
 Twixt the stretched footing and the *scaffoldage*  
 I iii 156,

Troilus: As true as steel, as *plantage* to the moon  
 III ii 175.

In the former passage the suggestion is of the whole scaffolding creaking and sounding along its uprights and horizontals, and in the latter, cultivation across the face of the earth.

GUARDAGE in *Othello* and LUGGAGE in *Henry V* have complex meanings and will be discussed below in 9.5.3. Although among these plays *Henry V* has the lowest number of collective uses of established nouns, it has three complex neologisms in this suffix and they all have collective resonance. The locative STERNAGE suggests the collected ships to the rear of the fleet:

Prologue: Grapple your minds to *sternage* of this navy  
III Prol. 18.

The ‘caves and womby vaultages of France’ may be a tautologism, and the suffix certainly helps the metre, but it also adds a notion of multiplicity, of caves opening out of each other to rebound the echo suggested in the next lines:

Exeter: That caves and womby *vaultages* of France  
Shall chide your trespass, and return your mock  
In second accent of his ordinance  
II iv 124.

#### 9.5.2.2. *Instrument*

*Hamlet* has one neologism, VENTAGE(s) (III ii 365), which has an instrumental sense (the apertures in a musical instrument by which air is vented). Besides Shakespeare’s coinages, the four other nouns of post-ME origin appear in only two of the plays. WAFTAGE in *Troilus* has the instrumental sense ‘transport by wind’:

Troilus: Like a strange soul upon the Stygian bank  
Staying for *waftage*  
III ii 8-9.

#### 9.5.2.3. *Action: quality*

COZENAGE (1583) ‘deceit’ in *Hamlet* is an attribute involving action:

Hamlet: He that hath ...



*Twelfth Night* II i 9-10

‘The travelling I have in mind is only wandering about’.

The neologism GUARDAGE is ambiguous in a single context. When Brabantio asks whether Desdemona

Would ever have - t’ incur a general mock -  
Run from her *guardage* to the sooty bosom  
Of such a thing as thou  
I ii 69-71,

the word suggests both a concrete collectivity ‘guards’, and a state of being guarded.

Denominal functions may themselves overlap, so that VAULTAGE ‘cave’ (*Henry V*, II iv 124) is both collective and locative.

De-adverbial (AD)VANTAGE moves easily between stative and instrumental meanings. Othello’s line:

And bring them after in the best *advantage*  
I iii 294

plays on the derivational stative sense ‘being ahead’, while for Iago, claiming that Cassio is

... a finder out of occasions, that has an eye can stamp and  
counterfeit *advantages*, though true *advantage* never present itself  
II I 235-7,

this sense is preceded by the instrumental ‘means of getting ahead’. Finally, the analysable deverbal noun PASSAGE may denote an action (*Hamlet* V ii 392), an instrumental ‘means of passing’ (*Othello* I ii 98) or even an object ‘things passed [experienced]’ (‘passages of proof’, *Hamlet* IV vii 111; ‘such impossible passages of grossness’, *Twelfth Night* III ii 68).

#### 9.5.4. *Summary*

The total number of 67 occurrences in *-age* is based on 37 words. Although purely collective meanings are outnumbered here by instrumental and objective,

collectivity may be combined with these meanings even in deverbal nouns. Only one of the neologisms, VENTAGE, is a purely deverbal instrumental; the other coinages are collective, locative or a combination of these. The general profile differs somewhat from that in the 15th century, where action/fact, rather than object or instrument, is the most frequent sense after the collective for both analysable and unanalysable nouns (see 6.4.7., and 8.3.1.).

**Table 37: Semantics of total occurrences in *-age* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Intensive	0	0	0	1	0	1
Collective	3	4	0	2	0	9
Locative	0	0	0	0	3	3
Instrument	2	3	3	2	5	15
Agent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Object	4	2	1	3	4	14
Res/state	1	1	4	1	2	9
Act/quality	2	1	1	0	1	5
Act/fact	1	4	0	0	1	5
Act/inst'ce	3	0	0	3	0	6
Total	16	15	9	12	16	67

**Table 38: Comparison of semantics of *-age* in ME and 5 Shakespeare plays**

	ME	Shakespeare	ME %	Shakesp. %
Intensive	1	1	0.6	1.5
Collective	72	9	41.6	13.4
Locative	7	3	4	4.5
Instrument	14	15	8.1	22.4
Agent	0	0	0	0
Object	13	14	7.5	20.9
Result/state	20	9	11.6	13.4
Act/quality	8	5	4.6	7.5
Act/fact	23	5	13.3	7.5
Act/instance	15	6	8.7	9
Total	173	67		

In Table 38, the distribution of the first two columns is significant at  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 30$  (df8). It will be seen that there are considerable percentage differences in



several categories, especially those of instrument, object and collectivity. However, the numbers in the Shakespeare sample are comparatively low.

### 9.6. Semantics of *-al* across five plays of Shakespeare

There are even fewer occurrences in *-al* across these five plays than there are in *-age*. Only one play has more than eight examples out of a total of 28 words. The exception is *Hamlet*, which has 12.

#### 9.6.1. Nouns of ME origin

**Table 39: Semantics of ME nouns in *-al* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Attribute	2	1	1	2	0	7
Collective	1	0	0	0	2	3
Locative	1	0	0	0	1	2
Instrum	4	2	2	2	1	<b>11</b>
Agent	1	0	0	0	0	1
Object	0	1	0	1	0	2
Res/state	0	0	0	0	1	1
Act/qual	0	0	0	0	0	0
Act/fact	1	1	1	1	0	4
Act/inst	1	0	1	1	1	4
Total	11	5	5	7	6	34

All the nouns in *-al* of ME origin appear in my original sample. As in the original sample, the majority of ME nouns in *-al* are attributive in origin. Some nouns, such as MINERAL and MEMORIAL, developed instrumental meanings, and have been counted as instrumentals here.

#### 9.6.1.1. Recurring ME nouns

Few nouns in *-al* appear repeatedly across the plays, and none in all.

GENERAL appears in three, but in *Troilus* and *Othello* it is always a military title. The attributive/collective use of it in *Hamlet* ('caviary to the general', II ii 435) is unique in these plays. Three more, MINERAL, MORAL and MEMORIAL, appear in two plays

each. All are attributives with instrumental meaning. In *Hamlet* MINERAL means ‘mine’ (IV i 25), in *Othello* it means ‘drug’ (I ii 74, II i 287); MORAL in *Troilus* and *Henry V* has its modern instrumental meaning ‘lesson’; while MEMORIAL occurs in *Twelfth Night* with the instrumental sense ‘monument’ (III iii 23).

#### 9.6.2. Nouns of post-ME origin

**Table 40: Semantics of post-ME nouns in -al in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Attribute	0	1	0	1	0	1
Instrum	0	0	0	1	0	1
Act/inst	1	0	1	1	0	<b>3</b>
Total	1	1	1	3	0	5

These figures are too low to be tested for significance, as there are only five nouns of post-ME origin in these plays, including two coined by Shakespeare. Lexis not coined by Shakespeare includes the attributive noun MORTAL (1526), *Troilus* I iii 225 and the ‘occasion’ noun NUPTIAL (c1555), *Othello* II ii 6. Not counted here are two occurrences of deverbial DENIAL (1528) in *Twelfth Night*, in which we find again the ambiguity of nouns of speaking, where either the act or the words (‘means of denying’) could be suggested. These contexts are discussed below in 9.6.3.

Of the coinages, the attributive noun PRODIGAL does not appear in Garner (1987a), but is given in the *OED* as first appearing in *The Merchant of Venice* II vi 14,16 (1596). In *Twelfth Night* it is applied to Sir Andrew (I iii 22). PERUSAL in *Hamlet* is listed by Garner (1987: 221) as appearing first in Sonnet 38. In *Hamlet* it denotes an instance of action:

Ophelia: He falls to such *perusal* of my face  
 As he would draw it  
 II I 90-1.

### 9.6.3. *Metaphor, multiple meaning and ambiguity*

As we saw in Chapter 7, for many denominal ME nouns in *-al* there is an attributive function, which may combine with others. Examples here are unanalysable MORAL and analysable MEMORIAL, which also have the instrumental senses ‘lesson’ (Troilus’ ‘the *moral* of my wit’, *Troilus* IV iv 106; Fluellen’s ‘Fortune is an excellent *moral*’, *Henry V* III vi 37) and ‘means of remembering’ (Menelaus as ‘the primitive statue and oblique *memorial* of cuckolds’, *Troilus* V i 53).

As with *-age*, there is some overlapping between the collective function and the cases or aspects of nouns in relation to their bases, even where the bases are opaque. The ‘occasion’ nouns BATTLE and FUNERAL, for example, unanalysable in ME, are by derivation collectives, meaning ‘things pertaining to’ fighting or death. BATTLE in *Henry V* retains some of its original collective meaning:

Salisbury: The French are bravely in their *battles* set  
IV iii 69

but also implies an instrumental ‘order of battle’. FUNERAL (Hamlet I ii 12), by derivation a denominal collective meaning ‘things pertaining to death’, has its usual ‘occasion’ sense in *Hamlet* (I ii 12).

In analysable deverbal DENIAL in *Twelfth Night* we find the ambiguity of nouns of speaking, where either the act or the words (‘means of denying’) could be suggested:

Malvolio: ... He’s fortified against any *denial*  
I v 140.

Later in the same scene, the reference seems to be clearly to the instrumental content:

Viola: In your *denial* I would find no sense,  
I would not understand it  
I v 255-6.

9.6.4. *Summary***Table 41: Semantics of total occurrences in *-al* in 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	Hamlet	Troilus	Othello	12th Nt	Henry V	Total
Attributive	2	1	1	3	0	7
Collective	1	0	0	0	2	3
Locative	1	0	0	0	1	2
Instrument	4	2	2	3	1	<b>12</b>
Agent	1	0	0	0	0	1
Object	0	1	0	1	0	2
Res/state	0	0	0	0	1	1
Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0
Act/fact	1	1	1	1	0	4
Act/inst'ce	2	0	2	2	1	7
Total	12	6	6	10	7	39

The 39 meanings are based on a total of 28 words, of which all but four are ME and appear in my original sample.

**Table 42: Comparison of semantics of *-al* in ME and 5 Shakespeare plays**

	ME	Shakespeare	ME %	Shakesp. %
Attributive	64	7	42.4	17.9
Collective	19	3	12.6	7.7
Locative	3	2	2	5.1
Instrument	30	12	19.9	30.8
Agent	6	1	4	3
Object	7	2	4.6	5.1
Result/state	2	1	1.3	3
Act/quality	3	0	2	0
Act/fact	5	4	3.3	10.3
Act/instance	12	7	7.9	17.9
Total	151	39		

Here instrumentals (some derivationally attributive) have overtaken purely attributive meanings, and the latter have been equalled by action nouns expressing specific instance. There is a significant difference at  $p < 0.1$  between the total distribution of this suffix in the ME and in the Shakespearean samples ( $\chi^2$  15.938, df 9). The two-cell distributions of raw figures for collective and attributive senses are significant at

$p < 0.001$  (df1),  $\chi^2$  11.636 and 45.761 respectively, and that for instrument at  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\chi^2$  7.714. That for specific instance, however, is not significant.

## 9.7. Conclusions

### 9.7.1. *Productivity*

Across the five plays selected for investigation, the total number of words in these suffixes is 354. In this database the largest number of types appears in *-ance* with 109, of which 84 were already current in ME. The next highest word score is that of *-ation* with 103, of which 87 were current in ME, while *-ment* has 73 total words, 40 of which were in use in ME. The lowest are *-age* and *-al* with 39 and 28 respectively, of which respectively 28 and 24 appear in ME.

If we look at Shakespeare's neologisms the picture is different. The suffix with the highest number of neologisms is *-ment*, which scores only third in overall frequency. There are 30 neologisms in *-ment* in the total canon and 20 in these five plays (12 of which appear in *Hamlet*). The next is *-ance*, with a total of 12, seven of which appear in these five plays. There are also seven neologisms in *-age* in these five plays, which amount to most of the total coinages in this suffix in Shakespeare (eight across the canon). Only one of each appears here in *-ation* and *-al*, out of a total of only four each across all plays. Identical scores for neologisms in *-ation* and *-al* seem surprising, in that *-ation* is the most prolific of the suffixes in the *MED* and the second most prolific in these plays, while *-al* is the least prolific in both. Indeed, on the evidence of these texts it seems that *-al* was still not highly productive by the end of the 16th century. Given the high total of ME and post-ME words in *-ation* across these plays, however, it seems clear that *-ation* was still productive; in a conference paper, Cowie (1998) has estimated its productivity as peaking in 1650. It is possible that the

incidence of coinage in a given suffix was idiosyncratic in Shakespeare; it certainly varied from play to play, *-ment* being favoured in *Hamlet* and *-age* in *Henry*

*V*. In the five plays selected, *-ment* and *-age* both have a high ratio of coinage to overall word score (respectively 20 out of 73 and seven out of 39). On the other hand, *-ance*, with the highest word score (109) has no more neologisms in these plays than *-age*, which has the second lowest word score. It seems, therefore, that of the four suffixes already productive in ME, *-ment* and *-age* retained fewer words from ME in general use, and that Shakespeare at least was ready to compensate for this with a high rate of coinage. This bears out Plag's suggestion (see 1.2.1.) that 'the proportion of neologisms among attested types increases with decreasing type frequency' (1999: 27).

#### 9.7.2. *Semantics*

**Table 43: Total semantics of 5 suffixes across 5 plays by Shakespeare**

	-ment	-ance/-ence	-ation	-age	-al
Instrument	50	45	22	15	12
Agent	3	23	2	0	1
Object	11	15	15	14	2
Result/state	18	51	29	9	1
Act/quality	7	46	6	5	0
Act/fact	5	23	27	5	4
Act/inst'ce	15	20	47	6	7
Collective	0	0	2	9	3
Locative	0	0	0	3	2
Attributive	0	0	0	0	7
Total	109	223	150	66	39

The single intensive PERSONAGE has been omitted from the table. According to the chi<sup>2</sup> test, this distribution of total occurrences across the plays is significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  316.231 (df 36). The vertical distributions of semantic categories are significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 9): for *-ment*  $\chi^2$  is 189.44, for *-ance* 154.803, for *-ation* 152.133, for *-age* 36.727 and for *-al* 32.026. The horizontal distributions of three rows

containing majority figures are significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 4); for *-ment* (instrument)  $\chi^2$  is 42.736, for *-ance* (act/quality) 70.15, for *-ance* (result/state) 109.906 and for *-ation* (act/instance) 56.319. The majority figures for *-age* and *-al* are themselves much smaller figures in the row for instrumentals.

If the partially applicable categories (attributive, collective and locative) are omitted from the table (see 1.4.3.2., 8.3.2.), the revised total distribution is still significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  142.851 (df 24). The revised vertical distributions for *-ment*, *-ance* and *-ation* are also significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 6): for *-ment*  $\chi^2 = 99.908$ , for *-ance* 41.462, for *-ation* 66.162, for *-age* 22.222 and for *-al* 28.741.

The dominant semantics for *-ance/-ence*, *-age* and *-al* across the five plays show both similarities and differences in respect of those for my ME sample. Although the numbers for post-ME lexis taken alone are mostly below significance, all suffixes but *-ance/-ence* and *-age* have significant total distributions around majorities in one semantic area. However, the vocabulary in *-ance/-ence* is still largely that of mental and moral states and qualities, although extending into instrumental senses. For *-ance*, the figures for both act/quality and result/state are the highest in their rows, although the figure for act/quality is lower than that for result/state. The figure for instrumentals almost equals that for act/quality, but is lower than that for instrumentals in *-ment*. In *-age* we also see a growing tendency towards instrumental as well as objective senses, sometimes combined with collectivity, as happens too in other 'case' senses. The surviving collective sense of *-age* is reflected overall and in Shakespeare's neologisms. In the last mentioned suffix, *-al*, instrumentals now outnumber pure attributives, though several of the instrumentals are attributive in origin. *-Al* apparently has still to develop as a deverbal suffix, but outside the attributive/instrumental nexus it continues to show a slight predominance in specific instance. Where deverbal *-al* is concerned.

Shakespeare's neologism PERUSAL would fall into the semantic class of such forms as DEPOSAL and REFUSAL (see 7.4.9. and 8.3.1.), which bear out Marchand's suggestion that this suffix later showed a preference for bases implying completed processes (1969: 181, 4.5.3.).

In *-ment*, however, the profile suggests that the suffix is predominantly instrumental in this period (though this predominance is only partly reflected in Shakespeare's neologisms), and that the tendency observed in ME analysable nouns in *-ment* to express specific instances of action (3.4.9., 8.3.1.) is instead to be found in this period in nouns in *-ation*. In 6.4.7., and 8.3.1., findings for ME analysable nouns in *-age* suggested that deverbal *-age* would develop in the area of general action/fact. This would fill the gap neatly, but is not borne out by these texts. However, it is noticeable that the semantic area of general action/fact is under-represented for all five suffixes. Perhaps as a dramatist, concerned with the immediate, Shakespeare is simply not much given to using abstract nouns with generalised meanings. Two questions follow from this for further investigation: whether any suffix came to specialise subsequently in general action/fact, as *-ation* did in the ME sample; and what differences there may be between specific instances as expressed respectively by *-ation* and *-al*.

The frequency of instrumental uses in most of these suffixes may tempt towards a view that they are after all for practical purposes interchangeable. As we saw above in 9.2.2.1., Blake's view of latinate lexis in Shakespeare would support that position. Garner agrees, pointing out that words such as DISTILMENT, ANNEXMENT and TRANSPORTANCE all had counterparts in disyllabic *-ion* or trisyllabic *-ation*, and may have been created simply for the requirements of the metrical line or rhetorical figure in which they appear (1987a: 214-15). Salmon, however, sees a need to explain



the choice of *-ment* in preference to *-ing* (see 9.2.2.1. above). Interestingly, she decides that *-ment* (with *-ure*)<sup>8</sup> ‘tended to denote “particular instances of action” rather than duration of an action’ (1987: 195) and that ‘the actual choice of suffix depended on aspectual and no doubt phonetic considerations, though what the latter were has not yet been explained’ (1987: 196). Nevalainen, discussing INSULTMENT (*Cymbeline* III.v.160-166), agrees that ‘when the suffix *-ing* is attached to a verb in order to turn it into a noun, it usually suggests continuous or incomplete action, which may have ruled out its use here’ (2001: 247). However, neither of these discussions explains why *-ment* might have been chosen in preference to *-ance*, *-age* or *-al*.

Certainly instrument may appear as a case of any action noun in relation to its base, as passive state may appear as an aspect. To differentiate between affixes, however, we should perhaps also look at the areas where in practice they operate least. The low incidence of ‘quality’ senses in *-ment* and *-age* persists from ME and may be an effect of the kind of bases to which they continued to be attached; while *-ance* can be distinguished from *-ment* by its richness in ‘quality’ as well as ‘state’ senses, certainly as an effect of its early association with adjectives and verbs with mental and moral meanings. Thus, while some instrumentals in *-ance* may survive accidentally as alternations with *-ment* on neutral bases, others, such as CONSCIENCE and PENANCE, will have quite a different character. My recent article (see Bibliography) discusses such semantic differences between the three deverbal suffixes *-ment*, *-ance*/*-ence* and *-ation*. In the same way, instrumentals in *-age* and *-al* are likely also to be collective or attributive nouns, such as LANGUAGE or MORAL, which can be seen as instruments by extension or attribution.

Each of the suffixes is charted below in Tables 44-48 according to the semantic categories of its appearances in these five plays. The same word may appear in more

than one category; however, each word is listed once only for each semantic category in which it appears. The numbers are therefore fewer than for the occurrences in the tables, which are counted for each play. Those ambiguous in single contexts are given in brackets.

## Notes

1. INSTRUMENT in *Hamlet* III ii 353 is a musical instrument, as in *Troilus* III i 91, and (partly) in a tedious joke about 'wind instruments' in *Othello* III i 3,6.10. It is also applied to Laertes' poisoned sword (*Hamlet* V ii 270), to 'instruments of war' and to a champion's limbs in *Troilus* (Prologue 3-5, I iii 354), to Othello's skills and to a letter in *Othello* (I iii 267, IV i 217) and to 'Cesario' in *Twelfth Night* as 'the instrument' that 'screws' Orsino from Olivia's favour' (V ii 116).

2. In the first three occurrences ARGUMENT has the objective meaning 'plot of [i.e. story expounded in] a play' (II ii 250, III iii 130, 219). In IV iv 53-6 it has the instrumental sense 'reason [means of justifying]':

Hamlet: ... Rightly to be great  
Is not to stir without great *argument*, etc.

In *Troilus* it is also instrumental, referring again to the justification for war (Prologue 25, I i 94.) as well as being twice used playfully with the objective senses 'object of jokes' (II iii 95-7), and 'object of kissing' (IV i 26) (Menelaus: I had good *argument* for kissing once). Here Menelaus is referring to Helen, and Patroclus follows with an instrumental sense (Patroclus: But that's no *argument* for kissing now [IV i 27]), referring to the justification that Menelaus was once married to Helen. In *Twelfth Night* the word also occurs four times in different contexts with instrumental meaning: 'arguments of [about] state' (Malvolio: Let thy tongue tang *arguments* of state, II v 134), 'argument of [means of proving] love' (III ii 9), 'arguments of [reasons for] fear' (III iii 12) and 'bloody arguments [physical means of dissuasion]' (III iii 32).

In *Henry V* it is three times applied to physical entities, objectively as 'object of discussion' (Dauphin: My horse is an *argument* for them all [i.e. 'eloquent tongues']), III vii 34), instrumentally as 'means of arguing' (Williams: 'When blood is their *argument*', IV i 143), and 'means of proving': (King Henry: There's not a piece of feather in our host/ Good *argument*, I hope, we will not fly [IV iii 112-3]).

3. Garner lists 14 neologisms in *-ment* in *Hamlet*, but two, INVESTMENT and ENCOMPASSMENT, are coinages in prefixes on existing ME nouns in *-ment*, and a third, EXCITEMENT, is listed in the *MED*.

4. Among ME unanalysable nouns CONSCIENCE, with the instrumental meaning 'function of discerning morally', has one of the highest incidences of occurrences in these plays, with six in *Hamlet* and 14 in *Henry V* (though seven of those are attributable to Fluellen's characteristic reiterated phrase 'in my/your conscience'). REMEMBRANCE also appears in *Hamlet* as the faculty of remembering (II ii 26), as well as with another instrumental meaning 'souvenir' (in III i 93-4 Ophelia wishes to 're-deliver' Hamlet's 'remembrances'). In *Othello* REMEMBRANCE appears twice

with this meaning of 'keepsake' (III iii 288, III iv 182), and in *Henry V* it means 'memorial' (I ii 230). OFFENCE, which occurs eight times in *Hamlet*, is used ambiguously (see 9.3.3.). This word also recurs in *Othello*, where it appears five times (more frequently than does CONSCIENCE which appears three times), as well as in *Twelfth Night* (five times) and *Henry V* (twice). DEFENCE, also instrumental, appears in *Othello* (Cassio: Give him *defence* against the elements, II i 45), as well as in *Twelfth Night* (III iv 216) and *Henry V* (I ii 153, II iv 18). PESTILENCE 'plague [means of infecting]' appears in *Hamlet* (V i 174), *Troilus* (IV ii 21), *Twelfth Night* (I i 21) and *Othello* where it is used metaphorically for words which are means of infecting Othello with suspicion (Iago: I'll pour this *pestilence* into his ear, II iii 346). SENTENCE 'statement of punishment' appears in *Othello* (I iii 210), *Twelfth Night* (III i 11) and *Henry V* (II ii 166).

5. In *Troilus* IGNORANCE occurs three times, once unambiguously as a state: Therisites: The common curse of mankind, folly and *ignorance* (II iii 27), once as a quality, in a full personification: 'short-arm'd ignorance' (II iii 14) and once ambiguously (see 9.3.3.). For the sense 'state of being ignorant' see also *Hamlet* (V ii 249) and *Othello* (II i 141, III iii 49). PRESENCE in *Hamlet* occurs once with the agentive sense 'people who are present' (V ii 174), but in other contexts means the state of being present (I iii 121, II ii 37).

6. PATIENCE has 13 appearances in *Othello*, three in *Hamlet*, six in *Troilus*, two in *Twelfth Night* and three in *Henry V*. OBEDIENCE appears as a qualitative action in *Hamlet*:

Polonius: Who in her duty and *obedience*, mark,

Hath given me this (II ii 107-8); see also *Othello* (I iii 176-8) and *Henry V* (I ii 187, IV i 128). In *Troilus* it is less specific, with a sense closer to the quality of 'allegiance':

Troilus: Who should withhold me?

Not fate, *obedience*, or the hand of Mars (V iii 51-2).

7. As this word does not appear in the *MED* I have assumed it to be post-ME; however, I have also been unable to date it from the *OED*.

8. I counted 13 occurrences in *Troilus* of the suffix *-ure*, which unfortunately is not considered here. Salmon points out that *-ment* was always more productive than *-ure*, having been 'regularly affixed to English stems since about 1300' (1987: 195), whereas *-ure* was first recorded on an English base in 1545. At the time of writing *Troilus* Shakespeare must have felt it to be either fashionable, or in some way especially suited to this play, perhaps in possessing legal connotations. The 1609 quarto claims that *Troilus* had never been 'stal'd with the Stage', but Hussey believes it would not have been printed if it had never been performed, and suggests that it was first put on at the Inns of Court (1982: 56).

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

Variable print quality

**TEXT BOUND INTO  
THE SPINE**

Table 44: SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN *-ment* IN 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE

STRUMENT	AGENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance
<i>unanalysable</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>			
element	element	fragment	torment	<i>ME analysable</i>	<i>ME an.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>
ertainment	<i>ME an.</i>	<i>ME an.</i>	<i>ME an.</i>	judgement	achievement	entertainment
mandment	government	achievement	advancement	hardiment	government	encompassment
ament	<i>post-ME</i>	accomplishment	employment	government	<i>post-ME</i>	commencement
ument	excrement	intendment	reconcilement	retirement	embracement	admonishment
ument	<i>Shakespeare</i>	payment	attachment			arbitrement
ument	appertainment	<i>post-ME</i>	intendment			enchantment
ment		designment	abatement			<i>ME an.</i>
ument		acknowledgment	concealment			judgement
vement		<i>Shakespeare</i>	impeachment			punishment
ment		cerement	abridgement			<i>post-ME</i>
pediment		distilment	<i>post-ME</i>			debatement
ament		annexment	divorcement			<i>Shakespeare</i>
ament		strewment	incensement			impartment
<i>analysable</i>			<i>Shakespeare</i>			(entreatment)
gement			amazement			subduement
idgement			condolement			denotement
sentment			retirement			interchangement
itement			reinforcement			(bodement)
ointment			cloyment			extolment
ployment						
lement						
ushment						
ment						
plement						
<i>t-ME</i>						
ument						
ipliment						
<i>Shakespeare</i>						
ument						
reatment)						
stment						
nement						
yment						
lement)						

Table 45: SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN *-ance/-ence* IN 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE

INSTRUMENT	AGENT	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance
<i>E unanalysable</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>
olence	countenance	observance	(ignorance)	violence	influence	abstinence
membrance	circumstance	ordnance	negligence	obedience	remembrance	observance
aintenance	substance	experience	silence	patience	residence	<i>ME an.</i>
onscience	consequence	ordnance	eminence	providence	licence	entrance
idence	appurtenance	science	prescience	allegiance	indulgence	offence*
stience	instance	<i>ME an.</i>	reverence	convenience	<i>ME an.</i>	utterance
telligence	audience	inheritance	credence	diligence	offence*	defence
ntience	quintessence	acquaintance	distance	(ignorance)	allowance	performance
nance	ignorance	allowance	audience	arrogance	vengeance	appearance
issance	convenience	<i>post-ME</i>	innocence	perseverance	defence	conveyance
fference	essence	suppliance	alliance	reverence	performance	<i>post-ME</i>
<i>E analysable</i>	inconvenience	appliance	penitence	negligence	defiance	(conference)
fence*	<i>ME an.</i>	inference	confidence	innocence	continuance	currance
nveyance	presence		<i>ME an.</i>	consequence	attendance	acceptance
quittance	<i>post-ME</i>		presence	eloquence	dalliance	importance
engeance)	ingredience		offence	<i>ME an.</i>	quittance	supportance
trance	occurrence		impotence	dalliance		reference
fence	<i>Shakespeare</i>		allowance	temperance		<i>Shakespeare</i>
casance)	imminence		noyance	excellence		iterance
nblance	arrivance		repentance	insolence		
therance			assurance	turbulence		
earance			performance	(vengeance)		
st-ME			sufferance	(pleasance)		
ognizance			dependence	affiance		
<i>Shakespeare</i>			absence	repentance		
nsportance)			esperance	defiance		
			acquaintance	consequence		
			(pleasance)	expedience		
			durance	<i>post-ME</i>		
			<i>post-ME</i>	predominance		
			admittance	portance		
			expectance	<i>Shakespeare</i>		
			reference	sonance		
			acceptance			
			(conference)			
			<i>Shakespeare</i>			
			(transportance)			
			reprobance			
			non-regardance			

subtle analysability owing to uncertain dating

Table 46: SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN *-ation* IN 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE

INSTRUMENT	COLLECTIVE	OBJECT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
				Quality	Fact	Instance
<i>ME unanalysable</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>	<i>ME unan.</i>
consummation	congregation	combination	reputation	moderation	meditation	preparation
application	constellation	creation*	estimation	consideration	observation	probation
ration		convocation	preparation	contemplation	conversation	anticipation
stentation		generation	admiration	<i>ME an.</i>	approbation	determination
muneration		preparation	reconciliation	reformation	imitation	equivocation
rotation		potation	indignation	variation	contemplation	publication
conversation		simulation	commendation	(mitigation)	iteration	execration
creation		admiration	(approbation)	<i>post-ME</i>	speculation	generation
<i>ME an.</i>		<i>ME an.</i>	combination	affectation	relation	negation
esperation		imagination	<i>ME an.</i>	propugnation	aspiration	contemplation
agination		deputation	obligation	depravation	castigation	meditation
ivation		transformation	inclination		consideration	(mitigation)
ligation		fortification	transformation		dedication	convocation
injuration		admiration	salvation		adulation	(approbation)
lucation			damnation		protestation	speculation
infirmation			purgation		<i>ME an.</i>	<i>ME an.</i>
cupation			vexation		divination	coronation
ollification			education		provocation	visitation
<i>post-ME</i>			alteration		sequestration	conjunction
novation			desolation		<i>post-ME</i>	recordation
pectation			<i>post-ME</i>		expectation	sequestration
oration			maculation		expostulation	molestation
<i>Shakespeare</i>			qualification		gradation	dilation*
comodation			innovation		violation	preservation
			expectation		adoration	disputation
						communication
						taxation
						<i>post-ME</i>
						insinuation
						negotiation
						segregation
						expectation
						celebration
						imputation
						advocation
						solicitation

subtle analysability owing to uncertain dating



Table 47: SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN *-age* IN 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE

EXTENSIVE	COLLECT	LOCATIVE	OBJECT	INSTRUMENT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION		
						Quality	Fact	Instance
<i>ME an.</i> personage	<i>ME unan.</i> homage garbage language umbrage (pilgrimage) <i>ME an.</i> parentage fraughtage <i>Shakespeare</i> scaffoldage plantage (guardage)	<i>ME an.</i> rivage <i>Shakesp</i> sternage vaultage	<i>ME unan.</i> hostage message visage <i>ME an.</i> coinage passage pillage <i>Shakesp</i> luggage	<i>ME unan.</i> carriage damage homage presage advantage language portage. <i>ME an.</i> passage <i>post-ME</i> waftage <i>Shakespeare</i> ventage	<i>ME unan.</i> advantage vassalage <i>ME unan.</i> bondage marriage dotage <i>Shakespeare</i> (guardage)	<i>ME unan.</i> courage	<i>ME unan.</i> carriage (pilgrimage) <i>ME an.</i> usage <i>post-ME</i> cozenage manage	<i>ME unan.</i> voyage <i>ME an.</i> marriage passage usage <i>post-ME</i> romage

Table 48: SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN *-al* IN 5 PLAYS BY SHAKESPEARE

ATTRIBUTIVE	COLLECTIVE	LOCATIVE	AGENT	INSTRUMENT	RESULT/STATE	ACTION	
						Fact	Instance
<i>E unan.</i> moral neutral diabolical <i>post-ME</i> mortal indignal	portal entrails victuals	chapel spital	<i>ME an.</i> espial	counsel moral battle apparel trial mineral <i>post-ME</i> memorial denial	<i>ME an.</i> spousal	travail travel <i>ME an.</i> supposal	funeral travel <i>ME an.</i> burial trial bridal <i>post-ME</i> nuptial <i>Shakespeare</i> perusal

## Chapter 10

**CONCLUSION****10.1. Purpose**

The aim of my study was to consider the possibility that each of these five latinate nominal suffixes might individually affect the general semantic profile of nouns which it forms. Even though all such nouns to a certain extent share a cluster of related meanings, I hoped to show that these meanings were not shared indiscriminately, but that each suffix showed general preferences for certain semantic areas, both real-world and grammatical, which would be reflected in the real-world semantics of the bases chosen to form words, and in the grammatical contexts in which the words were used. I have looked at two different kinds of sample. The first consists of approximately 1000 first citations across suffixes from the *MED*, of words chosen from a selection of texts and supplemented from the *MED*. I then compared the findings with the later use of words in these suffixes (that is, many of the same ME words with others, plus later formations) in selected texts by Shakespeare.

**10.2. Morphophonological restrictions**

In assessing the role played by semantics in suffix choice, it will be necessary first to consider possible morphophonological restrictions on the formation of words in these suffixes.

**10.2.1. Category**

Three of the suffixes, *-ment*, *-ance* / *-ence* and *-ation*, form nouns principally on verb bases; even opaque or unanalysable nouns such as MONUMENT, IGNORANCE and COGITATION are usually deverbal in the donor language. On the other hand, *-age* and *-al* are frequently denominal even in analysable nouns. However, all five suffixes can attach to bases of either category. Counter-examples include denominal

LINEAMENT, FESTANCE and MEDICATION (though these are rare, especially in *-ance* and *-ation*), and, more commonly, deverbal nouns in *-age* and *-al* such as MOCKAGE and REFUSAL. Adjectival bases are common in *-ance/-ence*, though usually from the present participle of a verb in the donor language, such as *present*>PRESENCE.

### 10.2.2. *Morphology*

It was seen in Chapter 8 that there are few constraints on the co-occurrence of these suffixes with prefixed bases. The deverbal suffixes *-ment*, *-ance/-ence* and *-ation* can all attach to bases with the latinate prefixes *a(d)-*, *su(b)-*, *co(n m)-*, *re-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *pre-*, *e(x)-*, *en(m)-*, *in(m)-*, *per-* and *pro-*, and the native prefix *en(m)-*. In the ME period, *-al* appears with all these except *per-*, and Shakespeare coins a later form with this prefix in the early 17th century (PERUSAL). The native prefix *mis-* also appears with *-ment*, *-ance/-ence* and *-al*. Constraints apply mainly to *-age*, which does not appear in ME with *mis-*, *en(m)-*, *pro-* or *e(x)-*. As the first is a native prefix, this cannot be due to the higher proportion of native bases for this suffix, nor to their largely denominal category, since the latter condition is also true of *-al*.

In the ME period the stem suffixes *-ize* and *-ify* may appear with *-ment* and *-ance/-ence* as well as with the more usual *-ation*, where *-ify* + *-ation* is generally followed by <c>. The stem suffix *-ate* is restricted to nouns in *-ation*, but in my sample the majority (12 out of 17) are back-formations from a holistically borrowed noun. The suffix *-ment* may also be added to words already suffixed in *-al*.

### 10.2.3. *Phonology*

The main constraints I have found on the phonology of the stem arise from the phonology of the suffix. Thus, for obvious reasons, stem-final /a/ does not appear before <a>- initial suffixes, and *-age* and *-ation* do not attach to stem-final /j/, /ʒ/ or

/dʒ/. Also (in my sample at least) *-ance* does not attach to /ks/, although this may not have been for reasons of sibilance, as it does attach to /s/ in ESSENCE. My sample also shows no stem-final diphthongs immediately preceding *-ation*, possibly owing to the length of the suffix, which in ME and EmodE, as we saw in 5.2.2., may not have been habitually shortened by palatalisation. Otherwise any stem-final vowel, diphthong or consonant may precede any suffix, with the possible exception of /f/, which I have not found before <a>-initial suffixes. However, /f/ occurs before the linking vowel with *-ment* in FEFEMENT and REFEFEMENT, and its non-appearance elsewhere may simply be due to the rarity of <f>-final stems.

Taken overall, it seems that morpho-phonological constraints on all these suffixes are low enough not to constitute a significant factor in suffix choice.

### 10.3. Productivity

Signs of productivity have been taken here to be a notable increase in analysability together with the existence of formations which cannot have been borrowed (e.g. those on native bases such as FALDAGE) or which, though formed on Romance bases, do not appear to have antecedents in any of the usual donor languages (e.g. MOCKAGE). The French suffixes *-ment*, *-ance/-ence* and *-age* show a clear increase in analysability over unanalysability in the 14th century. It seems to be generally accepted that the later 13th century was the peak period for the use of French in England, continuing into the early 14th century (see 2.1.2.); we might therefore estimate that words had been percolating into English throughout this Francophone period and that by the early 14th century the French suffixes were familiar and their use understood. With *-ment* and *-age* this appears to have been the case, as coinages on native bases, such as EGGEMENT and WINDAGE, appear in both suffixes in the

course of the 14th century. In my sample for this period the numbers for native bases are in fact rather higher in *-age* than they are for the unattested Romance forms (see 8.2.1., Table 8 ), which latter of course are always problematic. We might assume from this that these two suffixes were productive in the early to mid-14th century, although in the case of *-age* only as a denominal formative. In *-ance/-ence* native forms are rare, and do not appear in my sample until the 15th century. However, there are six Romance forms in *-ance* in the 14th century which are unattested in French, and in view of the high analysability of the suffix at this time we might conjecture that it too began to be productive at some time during the 14th century, possibly in later decades when many new analysable forms appear in Chaucer and Gower, and English began to replace French as a medium of education, literature and administration..

There are no native coinages in *-ation*, and in my sample analysable nouns do not outnumber unanalysable until the 15th century. However, there is a considerable increase in analysable nouns in the 14th century as compared with the early period. In addition, a number of forms on Romance bases appear in the 14th century without attestation in French, and even from the earliest period many more nouns are direct translations from Latin, often also without attestation in French, in which the French suffix is substituted regularly for the Latin ending. As I remarked in 8.2.1. and 8.2.3., this suggests that from the 14th century or earlier this suffix was also well understood, and possibly productive, among what may have been a minority of educated users.

In my sample the majority of nouns in *-al* are unanalysable throughout the ME period. Yet there are other signs of productivity, including a possible native formation, *springal*, at the beginning of the 14th century, though this is problematic (see 7.3.1.). There are also three Romance forms in the 14th century which are unattested elsewhere, and five in the 15th. However, these are of mixed origin and semantics,

including the denominal collectives BRIGANTAILLE and BOTAILLE, as well as two deverbal forms which also follow nouns. Other forms on native bases arise from confusing the suffix with other word elements (as in *buriel*); this is also true of the Romance form *dismal*, while other Romance forms unattested elsewhere are back-formations on Romance bases such as ASSAILE. It seems likely that *-al* was hardly productive during the ME period, due to the mixed derivation of the suffix in English, and its simultaneous existence as an adjectival suffix in words which lacked simplex forms in English at any time.

It has been said that ‘productivity goes hand in hand with semantic coherence’ (Aronoff 1976: 45). It appears from my sample that *-ment* shows semantic coherence from the early period, *-ance* and *-ation* from the 14th century, and *-age* from the 15th. With these four suffixes this semantic coherence does indeed accompany at least some of the signs of productivity, though in the case of *-ment* in the early period this consists of one Romance form, and *-ment*, like the other suffixes, does not show notable analysability until the 14th century. Marchand, however, claims that ‘by 1300 *-ment* was obviously a derivative suffix’ (1969: 331: 4.65.1.), and certainly early borrowings show some coherence in the predominance of instrumental meanings. In the 14th century a new semantic specialism, that of ‘specific instance of action’, arises for *-ment*. The case of *-age* is more problematic. In my sample semantic coherence emerges most clearly for this suffix a century later than the appearance of native formations and the surge in analysability in the 14th century. This is contrary to what we would expect if semantic coherence is a pre-requisite for productivity. However, collectives are in a slight majority from the earliest period, and the 14th century shows an increase in financial collective terms, along with terms expressing social states such

as SPOUSAGE. It may be that the semantics of this suffix changed direction in the 14th century, to return in the 15th century to the original route.

#### 10.4. Semantics

##### 10.4.1. *Middle English*

It seems clear that nominalisations in these suffixes are, as Jespersen put it, ‘nexus-substantives’ (1942: VI 244, 15.5)), covering the semantic range of action (fact/quality/instance), result/state, and the cases object, agent and instrument. The question to be considered is whether ‘it is of little importance which suffix is used’ (Bauer 1983:189) or whether, as Marchand claims, ‘each one suffix has a different totality of semantic features’ (1969: 227). I have suggested that nouns in *-ment* specialised in instrumental meanings and (during the later ME period) specific instance of action; that nouns in *-ance/-ence* predominantly signified quality or mental and moral state; that nouns in *-ation* in the ME period signified mainly general action/fact, especially in learned contexts, but came increasingly to replace *-ment* in specific contexts; that denominal *-age* formed mainly collectives, especially with financial meanings, and that *-al* was dominated in the ME period by attributive nouns related to adjectives (some of which took on instrumental meanings), but showed signs of developing as a deverbal formative of nouns of specific action on bases suggesting completed processes.

##### 10.4.2. *Alternative forms*

One problem in assigning ‘meaning’ to suffixes is the existence of alternative forms in different suffixes on the same stem. There certainly seem to be cases where words formed in the suffixes are distinguishable only phonologically. The ME pairs ARRIVAGE/ARRIVAILLE and SPOUSAGE/SPOUSAILLE, for example, each covered the same range of meanings before one of the pair was selected. For the

former pair the meanings were 'act of arriving' and 'place of arriving' and for the latter pair they were 'act, occasion of marriage' and 'state of being married'. However, it is possible that the suffix finally selected for a given base may then restrict its meaning. Had \*ARRIVAGE been the chosen nominalisation of the base *arrive*, we might predict that the locative meaning would have survived, by analogy with such forms as HERMITAGE and VILLAGE. Locatives, however, are less common in *-al*; indeed they are outside the main nexus quoted above, and in my sample appear to be a minor specialisation of denominal nouns in *-age*. It is perhaps as a consequence of this that the form in *-al* lost the locative sense and retained only that of '[completed] act of arriving'. Similarly ESPOUSAL today means a completed act, while the meaning 'state of being married' is restricted to the form in *-age*, SPOUSAGE however having been replaced by MARRIAGE.

Appendix 1 lists sets of alternative forms, where it may be seen that the surviving form (if any) is usually the earlier. According to first attributions, the surviving forms show small majorities (technically below significance) in most suffixes of senses I have suggested were dominant for them. The following table gives the figures for meanings of first attributions of these surviving forms from Appendix 1.

**Table 49: Semantics of first attributions of surviving nouns in alternative sets**

	-ment	-ance	-ation	-age	-al	Total
Instrum	4	4	5	3	2	18
Agent	0	1	0	1	0	2
Object	0	4	1	1	0	6
Res/state	3	7	5	0	0	15
Act/qual	0	4	0	0	0	4
Act/fact	0	2	9	0	0	11
Act/inst	2	1	6	0	3	12
Collective	0	0	0	1	0	1
Attribute	0	0	0	0	3	3
Locative	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	9	23	26	6	9	73



Only *-age* shows no sign whatever of the specialisms I attributed to it in ME, being dominant here in instrumental senses; however, the numbers for *-age* are lower than for any other suffix.

Where both forms survive there is usually a distinction, which may have changed over time. TEMPERAMENT, for example, had an action meaning in ME, but TEMPERANCE then as now signified a quality, which as we have seen in Chapters 4, 8 and 9 seems to be a typical meaning for nouns in *-ance*. The difference between GOVERNMENT and GOVERNANCE has also developed over time in accordance with tendencies we have seen for nouns in both *-ment* and *-ance*. In the 14th century these words covered the same range of meanings, ‘act, fact or quality of governing’. Today GOVERNMENT means either ‘act of governing’ or ‘those who govern’, while GOVERNANCE is always the general fact with a quality implied. A modern newspaper article makes the difference clear:

Not a national *government*, but a form of *governance* ... Quelling trouble, harmonising law, creating the nation-state.  
“Planet Earth Goes for the Big One”, Robert Wright, *Sunday Times* 27/2/2000.<sup>1</sup>

#### 10.4.3. *The 16th century*

Across the five plays by Shakespeare, *-ance* shows a similar semantic profile to that for first attributions of analysable nouns in ME. Nouns in *-ance* predominantly denote qualities and mental states, with a substantial group also having instrumental meaning. Nouns in *-age* have a lower ratio of collective meanings than in ME, perhaps because the financial subset does not appear. There are several coinages in *-age* by Shakespeare, mostly denominal, and most of which have at least partially collective meaning. However, the most substantial semantic groups in this suffix (which include deverbal nouns) are of nouns used in instrumental and objective senses. This is contrary

to the prediction suggested by my ME data, which was that deverbal nouns in *-age* would be used mainly in the action/fact area, with most bases in the financial field.

In *-al*, pure attributives are here outnumbered by instrumentals, although some of these, as in ME, are in origin attributives implying nouns with instrumental meaning. For deverbal *-al* overall there is still no clear semantic pattern. In Appendix 4, a small sample of first citations in the *OED* of 35 deverbal nouns in *-al* from the 16th and 17th centuries indicates a majority of specific instance meanings on bases denoting completed acts.

Nouns in *-ment* appear in Shakespeare in predominantly instrumental senses, which are also prominent throughout the ME period. However, in Shakespeare there is no sign of the preference for contexts of specific instances of action which had appeared to develop from the 14th century in ME. This seems to have been adopted by nouns in *-ation*, which in ME had largely signified general action/fact. I suggested in 9.4.4. and 9.7.2. that the low incidence of nouns in any suffix signifying action/fact might be due to the nature of dramatic texts, which are concerned with immediate action. However, this does not account for the lack of specific action contexts for nouns in *-ment*.

#### 10.4.4. *Description of semantics*

I would suggest, then, that certain semantic distinctions exist between these five suffixes, not as invariable rules for word formation, but as tendencies in the way they are used. These tendencies depend partly on the semantics of words formed in them on first entering the language, partly on the kinds of bases most typically selected for them, both in the donor language and in English, and partly on the kinds of text in which they most typically occur. (For textual genre figures in ME, see Appendix 2) Such tendencies appear to be subject to change over time.

**Table 50: Semantics of 5 suffixes, 1150-1611**

	-ment	-ance/-ence	-ation	-age	-al
Instrument	<b>126</b>	89	54	29	42
Agent	4	35	2	0	7
Object	28	27	18	27	9
Result/state	48	95	70	28	3
Act/quality	22	<b>104</b>	20	13	3
Act/fact	15	44	<b>103</b>	28	9
Act/inst'ce	74	40	93	21	19
Collective	2	0	2	<b>82</b>	22
Locative	0	0	0	10	5
Attributive	0	0	0	0	<b>71</b>
Total	319	434	362	238	190

The figures for all periods taken together bear out the profile for ME, with majority uses for *-ment* in instrumental senses, for *-ance* in act/quality, for *-ation* in act/fact, for *-age* in collectives and in *-al* for attributives. According to the chi<sup>2</sup> test, the total distribution is significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  1308.334 (df 36). The vertical distributions of semantic categories are also significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 9): for *-ment*  $\chi^2$  is 469.997, for *-ance* 332.175, for *-ation* 406.122, for *-age* 206.202, and for *-al* 226. Across suffixes, the horizontal distributions of rows containing majority figures are significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 4): for *-ment* (instrument)  $\chi^2$  is 91.147, for *-ance* (action/quality) 204.605, for *-ation* (action/fact) 143.588, for *-age* (collective) 206.202 and for *-al* (attributive) 284. The majority figure for *-al* is again the only one in its row. If partially applicable denominal categories are excluded, the total distribution is significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  345.835 (df 24). Vertical distributions of deverbal semantic categories only are also significant at  $p < 0.001$  (df 6). For *-ment*  $\chi^2$  is 238.694, for *-ance* 102.323, for *-ation* 180.594, for *-age* 33.699, and for *-al* 87.109.

The figures in this table, however, are skewed by the disparity in size between the Shakespearean and ME samples, and take no account of change over time. It will

be seen from Table 50 that there are also substantial secondary uses in specific instance for *-ment* and *-ation*, and in result/state and instrument for *-ance*. The figures for deverbal categories in *-age* and *-al* are possibly too low to predict preferences; furthermore, the figure for action/fact in *-age* is derived mainly from the ME data, and the figure for instrument in *-al* is inflated by attributive forms implying other, already instrumental nouns. For the periods covered here I would suggest the following special (though not exclusive) correspondences:

**-ment**

*-ment* > *V+ -ment* = *N*

1150-1500 > instrument of V-ing

1300-1500 > specific instance of V-ing

1500-1611 > instrument of V-ing

**-ance/-ence**

*V+ -ance/-ence* = *N*

1300-1611 > quality necessary for V-ing  
 mental state resulting from V-ing  
 state resulting from being V-ed;

*A + -ance/-ence* = *N*

1300-1611 quality or state of being A

**-ation**

*V+ -ation* = *N*

1300-1500 > general fact or action of V-ing (in connection with science and learning)

1500-1611 > specific instance of V-ing

**-age**

*N+ -age* = *N*

1300-1400 > social state of being N

1300-1500 > charge connected with N

1300-1611 > collectivity of N

*V+ -age* = *N*

1300-1500 > general fact or action of V-ing (in connection with money)

1300-1611 > collectivity of things V-ed

**-al**

*N + -al* = *N*

1300-1611 > thing or person with attribute of N

*V+ -al* = *N*

1300- ? > instrument or instance of completion of V (?)

### 10.5. Summary

My assumption in undertaking this study was that it is theoretically possible for affixes to have meanings. In respect of these five Latinate deverbal suffixes it is not quite possible to say, as Riddle does of the Germanic/Romance de-adjectival pair *-ness* and *-ity*, that they are ‘semantically distinct for a large proportion of the lexicon.’ Her qualification of this, however, may apply equally well to our suffixes: ‘That is, the suffixes themselves have different meanings when occurring on many bases, but the distinction is not realised on all bases’ (1985: 437). Riddle’s task was more clear-cut in that for *-ness* and *-ity* only two shades of meaning are involved, and the distinction is most demonstrable where the suffixes alternate on the same base. In the case of the deverbal or potentially deverbal suffixes in the present investigation, where more than half a dozen related meanings are potentially realisable by any of them, alternation on bases is less common and shows no very clear patterns. Dalton-Puffer, indeed, appears to believe that there are none; she finds *-acioun* and *-aunce* semantically identical, with shared meanings of ‘action’ and ‘state’ (1996: 125), and decides that instrument, result and locative have no strong ties to any suffix (1996: 122-3). If, however, these shared meanings are analysed across a sample of words on different bases and in different contexts, and are examined statistically for each suffix, distinctions do emerge. The distinctions can be seen not only in the contextual preferences seen throughout, but in the avoidances noted in 8.3.2. and 9.7.2. (as in the low numbers of quality senses in *-ment*, *-ation* and *-age*, or of specific instance in *-ance* and *-age*) and also in the semantics of bases to which each suffix most typically attaches (for example whether abstract or concrete, moral or practical). I think we can at least say that each suffix does in fact have a ‘hierarchy of productivity’, as Kastovsky claims (1986: 597), in relation to a ‘different totality of semantic features’ (Marchand 1960: 227-8; see my

1.3.2.). I hope that by contextual analysis I have been able to add more confirmatory detail to this notion than was hitherto available for these suffixes.

In limiting my study mainly to the Middle English period, I have reversed the usual practice of discussing semantics from the starting-point of modern English. My aim in this was to determine what tendencies might have been laid down for these suffixes from the time of their first entering the language. Constraints of time and space have prevented me from doing more than making a start on the logical next step, which would be to follow their development through later periods, from the 16th century up to the present day.

### Note

1. In contemporary English I have noted several uses of alternative suffixes which were new to me, though some have turned out to be listed as rare or secondary forms in the *SOED*. In *-ment*, the tendency as in the 14th century appears to be for alternatives to express specific instances of action. These include *DISOBEYMENT* for a specific act of disobedience (heard on TV; unlisted in the *SOED*) and *DENOUNCEMENT*, which has an undated listing in the *SOED* under the headword *denounce*, and was used last year in *Private Eye* for a specific act of denunciation: ‘... His *denouncement* of “Bromley, Kent” as [postally] non-existent’ (*Private Eye*, Letters page, 08/2002). The coinage *DISMANTLEMENT* (‘The *dismantlement* of the [Israel/Palestine] road map’) was heard on *Newsnight* (30/ 04/ 2003). In *-ance*, several unfamiliar terms express states, qualities or both, as in *JUBILANCE* for ‘jubilation’: ‘... the *JUBILANCE*, power and beauty of indigenous music’ (flyer for Ladysmith Black Mamba Choir, 08/ 2002). *JUBILANCE* is unlisted in the *SOED*. *HESITANCE* (used for *hesitancy*) by the nature of its base expresses a state as well as an act, as in a reported statement by one of Saddam’s executioners: ‘If I had ... shown *hesitance*, I would have been beheaded myself’ (*Sunday Times* 28/07/2003). Neil Young in the same newspaper interestingly substitutes an *-ance* form, not found in the *SOED*, for the more usual, institutionalised *AGREEMENT*: ‘I just really hope we’re all in *agreeance* that this war should go away as soon as possible’ (*Sunday Times* 03/10/04). *INDIGNANCE* (‘rare’, 1590, *SOED*) for the state of indignation appears in two recent novels, Sue Grafton’s *O is for Outlaw* (2000: 262) and Tim Parks’ *To Hell and Back* (2001), as well as in the *Sunday Times* (10.10.2004). *LUMINANCE* (1880, *SOED*) appears in preference to ‘luminousness’ or ‘luminosity’ in Philip Pullman’s *Northern Lights* (2000: 328). One cannot help noticing also the number of *faux*-French names for cosmetic products which end in *-ance* or *-ence*, suggesting wondrous qualities, such as *HYDRIENCE*, *ETERNANCE* and *MERVEILLANCE*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES

## A. Dictionaries

*An Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, 1977, ed. L.W. Stone and W. Rothwell, London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.

*Cassell's Latin Dictionary*, 1960, London: Cassell & Co.

*A Chronological English Dictionary*, 1970, ed. T. Finkenstaedt, E. Leisi and D. Wolff, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

*Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, 1883, 1969, ed. F. Godefroy, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint.

*The Middle English Dictionary*, 1969, ed. H. Kurath and S.M. Kuhn, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

*Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, 1967, München: C.H. Beck.

*The Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989, ed. J.A.H. Murray, H. Bradley, W.A. Craigie, C.T. Onions et al., Oxford: Clarendon Press.

*The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 1983, ed. W. Little, H.W. Fowler, J. Coulson, revised C.T. Onions, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

## B. Middle English Texts

Barratt, A. (ed.), 1992, *Women's Writing in Middle English*, London: Longman Group.

Bennett, J.A.W. and G.V. Smithers (eds.), 1966, *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Benson, L.D. (ed.), 1987, *The Riverside Chaucer*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaplais, P. (ed.), 1954, *The War of Saint-Sardos (1323-5)*, London: Camden Soc., 3rd ser., vol 87.

Hall, J. (ed.), 1920, *Early Middle English*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kristol, A.M. (ed.), 1995, *Manieres de Langage (1396, 1399, 1415)*, London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.

Rigg, A.G. (ed.), 1968, *The English Language: A Historical Reader*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Rothwell, W. (ed.), 1990, *Walter of Bibbesworth, Tretiz de Langage*, London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, Plain Texts Series 6.

Rutherford, A. (ed.), 1932, *The Anglo-Norman Chronicle of Nicholas Trevet*, PhD. dissertation, London University: unpublished

Sisam, K., 1959, *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Skeat, W.W. (ed.), 1906, *Nominale*, London: Transactions of the Philological Society.

Spisak, J.W., 1983, *Caxton's Malory*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sturzinger, J. (ed.), 1884, *Orthographia Gallica*, Altfranzösische Bibliothek, ed. W. Foerster, Vol. viii.

Tolkien, J.R.R. and E.V. Gordon (eds.), 1967, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, London: Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, C. (ed.), 1989, *John Gower, Selected Poetry*, Manchester: Carcanet Press.

### **C. Early Modern English Texts**

Duncan-Jones, K. (ed.), 1985, Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foakes, R.A. (ed.), 1987, Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, London: Penguin.

Humphreys, A.R. (ed.), 1968, Shakespeare, *Henry V*, London: Penguin.

Mahood, M.M. (ed.), 1968, Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, London: Penguin.

Muir, K. (ed.), 1983, Shakespeare, *Othello*, London: Penguin.

Spencer, T.J.B. (ed.), 1996, Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, London: Penguin.

### **D. Modern English Texts**

Grafton, S., 2000, *O is for Outlaw*, London: Macmillan.

Ladysmith Black Mamba Choir leaflet, 2002.

Parks, T., 2001, *To Hell and Back*, London: Secker and Warburg.

*Private Eye* (London), 2000, No. 1061.

Pullman, P., 2000, *Northern Lights*, London: Scholastic Press Ltd.

*The Sunday Times* (London), 27/02/2000



28/07/2003

03/10/2004

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adams, V., 1973, *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*, English Language Series, London: Longman.
- Anshen, F. and M. Aronoff, 1981, "Morphological productivity and phonological transparency", *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 26, 63-72.
- Aronoff, M., 1976, *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T.
- Baayen H., 1992, "Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity", in G.E. Booij, & J. Van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109-149.
- Baayen, H. and R. Lieber, 1991, "Productivity and English word-formation: a corpus-based study", *Linguistics* 29, 810-843.
- Baayen, H. and A. Renouf, 1996, "Chronicling the times: productive lexical innovations in an English newspaper", *Language* 72 (1), 69-96.
- Bailey, C.-J. N. and K. Maroldt, 1977, "The French lineage of English", in J. Meisel (ed.), *Pidgins - Creoles - Languages in Contact*, Tübingen: Narr, 21-53.
- Bauer, L., 1983, *English Word Formation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1990, "Beheading the word", *Journal of Linguistics* 26, 1-31.
- Baugh, A.C. and T. Cable (eds.), 1978, *A History of the English Language*, 3rd ed., London: Routledge.
- Bergner, H., 1995, "The openness of medieval texts", in A.H. Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 37-54.
- Berndt, R., 1969, "The linguistic situation in England from the Norman Conquest to the loss of Normandy (1066-1204)", in Roger Lass (ed.), *Approaches to English Historical Linguistics* (Tübinger Beiträger zur Linguistik 75), Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 369-391.
- Blake, N.F., 1983, *Shakespeare's Language. An Introduction*, London: Macmillan.
- Biber, D. and E. Finegan, 1987, "An initial typology of English text types", in J. Aarts & W. Meijs (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics II: New Studies in the Analysis and Exploitation of Computer Corpora*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Costerus new series 57, 19-46.

- Booij, G.E., 1986, "Form and meaning in morphology: The case of Dutch 'agent nouns'", *Linguistics* 24, 503-517.
- Brand, P., 2000, "The languages of the law in later medieval England", in D.A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 63-76.
- Brook, G.L., 1976, *The Language of Shakespeare*, London: André Deutsch.
- Burnley, D., 1992, "Lexis and Semantics", in N. Blake (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol. II, 1066-1476, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 409-499,.
- Button, C., 1990, *Generative and historical morphological studies: the German foreign suffix -ität* (M.A. dissertation), University of York: unpublished.
- Bybee, J., 1985, *Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form* (Typological Studies in Language 9), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N., 1957, *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1965, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1970, "Some remarks on nominalisation", in *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, ed. R.A. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum, Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdall, 184-221.
- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle, 1968, *The Sound Pattern of English*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Clark, E., 1981, "Lexical innovations: how children learn to create new words", in W. Deutsch (ed.), *The Child's Construction of Language*, London: Academic Press, 299-328.
- Clark, E. and D. Hecht, 1982, "Learning to coin agent and instrument nouns", *Cognition* 12, 1-24.
- Coleman, J., 1995, "The chronology of French and Latin loan words in English", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 93, 95-124.
- Cowie, C., 1998, "The discourse motivations of neologising" (conference paper), University of Manchester: unpublished.
- Crystal, D., 2003, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., 1992, "The status of word formation in Middle English",

in M. Rissanen (ed.) *History of Englishes* (Topics in English Linguistics 10), Amsterdam, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 465-482.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1992, "A diachronic view on morphological productivity: the case of English de-verbal adjectives", in W.U. Dressler and L. Tonelli (eds.), *Natural Morphology. Perspectives for the Nineties*, Padova: Unipress, 157-168.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1993, "Frenglish?: sur la productivité de la morphologie française dans le moyen anglais", *Travaux de linguistique et de philologie*, 31, 183-193.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1994, "Are Shakespeare's agent nouns different from Chaucer's? - on the dynamics of a derivational subsystem", in D. Kastovsky (ed.), *Studies in Early Modern English*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 45-58.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1995, "Middle English is a creole and its opposite: on the value of plausible speculation", in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 35-48.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1996, *The French Influence on Middle English Morphology. A Corpus-based Study of Derivation* (Topics in English Linguistics 20), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Davidson, M.C., 1998, "Approaches to code-switching in texts of the Middle English period" (conference paper), Tenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Manchester: unpublished.

Dekeyser, X., 1986, "Romance loans in Middle English: a reassessment", in D. Kastovsky and A. Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries: in Honour of Jacek Fisiak on the Occasion of his Fiftieth Birthday*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 253-267.

Dor, J., 1992, "Post-dating Romance loan-words in ME: are the French words in the Katherine Group English?" in M. Rissanen (ed.), *History of Englishes* (Topics in English Linguistics 10), Amsterdam, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 483-505.

Dressler, W.U., 1985, "Suppletion in word formation", in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics, Historical Word Formation*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 97-112.

Dunning, T., 1993, "Accurate methods for the statistics of surprise and coincidence", *Computational Linguistics* 19, 51-74.

Fasold, R., 1984, *The Sociolinguistics of Society, Language in Society* 5 (Introduction to Sociolinguistics 1), Oxford: Blackwell.

Garner, B.A., 1987a, "Shakespeare's Latinate neologisms" in V. Salmon and E. Burness (eds.), *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 229-234.

- Goatly, A., 1997, *The Language of Metaphor*, London: Routledge.
- Görlach, M., 1986, "Middle English - a creole?" in D. Kastovsky and A. Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries: in Honour of Jacek Fisiak on the Occasion of his Fiftieth Birthday*, vol. 1 (Trends in Linguistics/Studies and Monographs 32), Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 329-344.
- Halle, M., 1973, "Prolegomena to a theory of word formation", *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 3-16.
- Hussey, S.S., 1982, *The Literary Language of Shakespeare*, London: Longman.
- Jackendoff, R., 1972, *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Jakobson, R., 1936 (1962), "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre", in R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings* 1, The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 23-71.
- Jespersen, O., 1938, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford; Blackwell
- Jespersen, O. (ed.), 1942 *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, vols. I & VI, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kastovsky, D., 1985, "Deverbal nouns in Old and Modern English: from stem-formation to word-formation", in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics, Historical Word Formation*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 221-261.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1986, "The problem of productivity in word formation", *Linguistics* 24, 585-600.
- Kibbee, D.A., 1991, *For to Speke Frenche Trewely: the French Language in England, 1000-1600*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Legge, M., 1963, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lloyd, C., 2005, "Experience or experiment? Some distinctions between French nominal suffixes in Middle English", in N. Ritt and H. Schendl (eds.), *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and Literary Approaches*, Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 179-195.
- Lodge, R., 1992, "Language attitudes and linguistic norms in France and England in the thirteenth century", in P. R. Cross and S.D. Lloyd (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference 1991*, Woodbridge: Boydell, 73-83.

- Malkiel, Y., 1944, "Three Old French sources of the English 'arriv-al' and 'withdraw-al' type", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 43, 80-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1977, "Why ap-ish but worm-y?" in Paul J. Hopper (ed.), *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 341-364.
- Manczak, W., 1985, "Semantic developments of borrowings", in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics, Historical Word Formation*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 367-375.
- Marchand, H., 1960, 1969, *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word Formation*, 1st ed., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz; 2nd ed., Munchen: Beck
- Marle, J. van, 1986, "The domain hypothesis: the study of rival morphological processes", *Linguistics* 24, 601-627.
- Merk, G., 1970, "La vitalité des suffixes nominaux, du latin au français", *Revue de linguistique romane* 34, 194-223.
- Miller, D.G., 1997, "The morphological legacy of French: borrowed suffixes on native bases in Middle English", *Diachronica* 14, 233-264.
- Nevalainen, T., 2001, "Shakespeare's new words", in S. Adamson, L. Hunter, L. Magnusson, A. Thomson and K. Wales (eds.), *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language*, London: Nelson, 235-255.
- Nunnally, T.E., 1991, "An evaluative taxonomy of diachronic corpora", *SECOL Review*, 15. 1, 21-36.
- Orr, J., 1948, "The impact of French on English" (Taylorian lecture), Oxford: unpublished.
- Pattison, D.G., 1975, *Early Spanish Suffixes*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Peters, A.M., 1983, *The Units of Language Acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plag, I., 1999, *Morphological Productivity*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Poussa, P., 1982, "The evolution of early standard English: the creolisation hypothesis", *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 14: 69-85.
- Riddle, M.E., 1985, "A historical perspective on the suffixes -ness and -ity", in J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics, Historical Word Formation*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Romaine, S., 1989, *Bilingualism* (Language in Society 13), Oxford; Blackwell.
- Rothwell, W., 1968, "The teaching of French in medieval England", *Modern Language Review* 63, 37-46
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1975-76, "The role of French in thirteenth century England", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester* 58, 445-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1979, "Anglo-French lexical contacts, old and new", *Modern Language Review* 74, 287-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1980-81, "Lexical borrowing in a medieval context", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester* 63, 118-143.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1983, "Language and government in medieval England", *Zeitschrift für romanische philologie und literatur* 93, Pt. 3, 258-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1985, "Stratford-atte-Bowe and Paris", *Modern Language Review* 80, 39-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1991, "The missing link in English etymology: Anglo-French", *Medium Aevum* 60, 173-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1992, "Chaucer and Stratford-atte-Bowe", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester* 74:1, 3-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1994, "The trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer" in L.J. Kiser (ed.), *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, Ohio: Ohio State University Press 45-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2000a, "The trial scene in Lanval and the development of the legal register in Anglo-Norman", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 101 (1), 17-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2000b, "Aspects of lexical and morphosyntactical mixing in the languages of medieval England", in D.A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 212-232.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2001, "English and French in England after 1362", *English Studies* 82, 539-559.
- Salmon, V., 1987, "Some functions of Shakespearian word formation", in V. Salmon and E. Burness (eds.), *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearian Drama*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 193-206.
- Salter, E.H., 1983, *Fourteenth Century English Poetry*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schäfer, J., 1973, *Shakespeares stil: Germanisches und romanisches Vokabular*, Frankfurt: Athenäum Verlag.

- Selkirk, E.O., 1982, *The Syntax of Words*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Short, I., 1979-80, "On bilingualism in Anglo-Norman England", *Romance Philology* 33, 467-79.
- Spencer, A., 1992, *Morphological Theory: an Introduction to Word Formation and Generative Grammar*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stubbs, M., 1996, *Text and Corpus Analysis: Computer-assisted Studies of Language and Culture* (Language in Society 23), Oxford: Blackwell
- Sturtevant, E.H., 1942, *Linguistic Change: an Introduction to the Historical Study of Language*, New York: G.E. Stechert.
- Szymanek, B., 1988, *Categories and Categorisation in Morphology*, Lublin: Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Trotter, D.A. (ed.), 2000, *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Verma, S.K., 1976, "Code-switching: Hindi-English", *Lingua* 38(2), 153-65.
- Vising, J., 1923, *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Voights, L.E., 1996, "What's the word? Bilingualism in late medieval England", *Speculum* 71, 813-26.
- Wallmannsberger, J., 1988, "The 'creole hypothesis' in the history of English", in M. Markus (ed.), *Historical English: On the Occasion of Karl Brunner's 100th Birthday*, Innsbruck: Institut für Anglistik, Universität Innsbruck, 19-36.
- Wright, L., 1992, "Macaronic Writing in a London Archive, 1380-1480", in M. Rissanen (ed.), *History of Englishes* (Topics in English Linguistics 10), Amsterdam/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zbierska-Sawala, A., 1989, "Early Middle English word formation: on the status of French derivational suffixes in early Middle English", *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 22, 91-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1992, *Semantic Aspects of Derivational Affixation in the AB Language*, Frankfurt/Mainz: Peter Lang.
- Zwanenburg, W., 1984, "Word formation and meaning", *Quaderni di Semantica* 5, 130-142.

## APPENDIX 1

**Table 51: -MENT: alternatives to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes**

<i>Alternatives in -ment</i>	<i>Forms in other suffixes</i>
c1400(a1300) advancement	a1300 avantage
c1330(?a1300) encombrement	1330(?a1300) encombraunce
c1330(?c1300) savement	c1230(?a1200) salvacioun
?a1400(a1338) vengement	*c1325(c1300) vengeaunce
(1340) martirement	c1175 (?OE) martirdom
a1425(?c1380) apparailment	a1400(c1300) marterie
?1425(c1380) gouvernement	c1330 (?a1300) apparail
c1384 misgouvernement	*c1450(c1370) governaunce
1532rev(c1385) commendement	(c1375)misgovernaunce
(c1385)accusement	c1230(a1200) commendacioun
1475(1395) onement	*?a1425(c1380) accusacioun
(a1398) temperament	(a1300) unioun
a1425(?a1400) alleggement	c1330(?c1300) unite
a1500(1413) alterment	(1340) temperaunce
a1425 ordeinement	c1440(?a1375) attempraunce
?a1475 (?a1425) reteinement	c1300(?a1300) allegeaunce
1431 aquitement	(a1398) alteracioun
?1457 suppowailment	c1330(?a1300) ordinaunce
c1475(1459) reconcilement	?a1400(a1338) retenaunce
1464 resignement	a1475(1383) retencioun
1534(1464) assemblement	?a1400(a1338) aquitaunce*
1472/3 heritement	(1430) aquitaille*
a1500 anoiment	c1450(?a1400) suppowail
c1500 maintement	c1390(c1350) reconciliacioun
	a1387 resignacioun
	c1400(?a1300) assembly
	(1455) assemblaunce
	c1225(?c1200) heritage
	1532rev(c1385) heritaunce
	(c1390) anoiaunce
	(a1333) maintenaunce

**Table 52: MENT: possible ME coinages**

<i>Possible coinages on Romance bases</i>	<i>Coinages on native bases</i>
c1300(c1250) acouplement	c1400(?a1387) cursement
c1425(?c1380) apparailment	c1400(c1390) eggement
1532rev(c1385) conjectement	1391 marrement
c1400(c1390) finishment	c1425(c1395) onement
abataillement	a1400 murtherment
a1393 conspirement	?a1425(a1415) wonderment
(a1398) temperament	(1434) legement
1401 annulment	c1460(a1449) groundement
a1500(1413) alterment	a1450 botment
aloinement	(c1475) brevement
?a1425(a1415) soilment	
1422 auctorisement	
c1436 emblemishment	
c1450 recurement	
(1454) controllement	
a1500(1455) amentissement	
c1475(1459) suppowailment	
1464 usurpement	
imagement	
famishment	



**Table 53: -ANCE/-ENCE: alternatives to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes***Alternatives in -ance/-ence*

1330(?a1300) encombraunce  
 a400(c1303) acordaunce  
     c1330 presence  
 c1450(c1380) experiance  
     c1380 amountaunce  
 ?a1425(c1380) attendaunce  
 1532rev(c1385) heritaunce  
     (a1393) entendaunce  
     c1383) accidence  
     (c1395) contemplaunce  
     a1400 signifaunce  
         signance  
     (a1420) demonstraunce  
     (a1450) abaisshaunce  
     c1450 aparissaunce  
     (1451) alleviaunce  
     1452 commandaunce  
     (1455) assemblaunce  
     (1456) preferraunce  
     1457 revertence  
  
 1480 memorance  
 1493 stoppance  
  
 a1500 recreance  
 ?a1500 prefiguraunce

*Forms in other suffixes*

c1330(?a1300) encombrement  
 c1400(?c1300) acordement\*  
 a1400(c1303) presentement  
 a1450(?1348) experiment\*  
 ?a1400(a1338) amountment  
     1374 attention\*  
 c1225(?c1200) heritage  
 c1450(c1380) entedement\*  
 1450(c1380) accident\*  
 c1230(?a1200) contemplacioun  
 c1400(a1325) significacioun c1450(?a1400)  
 c1450(c1380) signal  
 ?a1425(c1380) demonstracioun  
     1435 abaisschement  
 ?a1475(?a1425) apparicioun  
     ?a1425 alleviacioun  
     c1275 commandement  
 c1400(a1300) assembly  
     (1443) preferrement  
     (1394) reversioun  
     ?a1425 reversacioun  
     (a1382) memorial  
     c1440 stoppal  
     1465 stoppage  
     (a1393) recreacioun  
     (a1382) prefiguracioun

**Table 54: -ANCE/-ENCE: possible ME coinages***Possible coinages on Romance bases*

c1384 magnifience  
 (c1395) contemplaunce  
 (1398) distroublaunce  
 a1400 signifaunce  
 c1450(?a1400) obeiaunce  
 c1450(?a1405) perturbaunce  
 a1450(c1410) tribulaunce  
     (1433) afferaunce  
     c1440 prouissaunce  
     (?1440) fecundaunce  
 c1474(c1445) aspiaunce  
 c1460(a1449) laudaunce  
     a1450 sportaunce  
     c1450 sojournaunce  
     1451 alleviaunce  
 (a1460) frequentaunce  
     prosperaunce  
     principaunce  
     favouraunce  
     militaunce  
     navigaunce  
 a1475 repliaunce  
     festaunce  
 1494 enduraunce  
     parfourmaunce  
 a1500 combustaunce  
     prefiguraunce

*Coinages on native bases*

(1435) sonderaunce  
 a1500(c1435) furtheraunce  
     1436 utteraunce  
 a1450 - a1500(1436) hindraunce  
     c1475 foreyevenaunce  
     1493 stoppaunce

*Possible coinage on unknown base*

a1450(c1410) tariaunce

**Table 55: -ACIOUN: alternatives to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes**

<i>Alternatives in -acioun</i>	<i>Forms in other suffixes</i>
a1400(a1325) significacioun (a1382) observacioun	c1275 signifiante a1250 observaunce
a1430(1383) presentacioun c1384 acceptacioun (c1386) foundacioun c1390 arbitracioun* 1390 adjuracioun c1390 examinacioun a1393 congelacioun	c1400(c1303) presentement c1384 accepcioun c1290 foundement 1532rev(c1385) arbitrement (a1382) arbitrement (1389) examinement c1385 congelement a1382 communioun (1340) perseveraunce ?a1400 medicament 1394 reversioun (1340) magnificence c1384 magnifiante
a1425(a1400) comunicacioun a1500(c1415) perseveracioun ?a1425 medicacioun ?a1425 reversacioun magnificacioun	c1175(?OE) martirdom a1400(c1300) marterie (1340) martirement c1475(?c1400) allegaunce 1389 assignement a1333 argument c1400(1378) allouaunce 1437 contentement a1400 additament 1425(a1349) daliaunce
a1475(?a1425) martirizacioun  allegacioun* (1432) assignacioun (c1443) argumentacioun 1447/8 allocacioun (1450) contentacioun c1450 addicacioun c1475 daliacioun	

**Table 56: -ACIOUN: possible ME coinages***Possible coinages on Romance bases*

(c1390) deliberacioun  
(c1385) preambulacioun  
(c1416) governacioun  
(1449) amigracioun  
(c1450) addicacioun  
(c1475) daliacioun

**TABLE 57: -AGE: alternatives to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes**

<i>Alternatives in -age</i>	<i>Forms in other suffixes</i>
c1400(?a1300) hostage c1330(?a1300) avauntage a1400(a1338) spousage c1450 groundage alliage apparage  1465 stoppage 1474 chevage c1475 taxage 1480 arbitrage	a1325(c1250) hostel c1330(?a1300) avauncement c1330(?c1300) spousaille c1460(a1449) groundement 1297 alliaunce c1330(?a1300) apparail c1480(c1380) apparement a1475(?a1430) stoppal c1430 achevisaunce c1330 taxacioun 1532rev.(c1385) arbitrement c1390 arbitracioun

**Table 58: AGE: possible ME coinages***Possible coinages on Romance bases*

(1340) peregrinage  
 a1605(?a1430) froilage  
 1437 portorage  
 (1438) rouelage  
 (c1447) foilage  
 c1450 apparage  
 ?1457 scourage  
 (1466) brokerage  
 1470-85 mockage  
 (?a1473) sondage  
 (?a1475) falsage  
 c1475 taxage  
 (c1475) couperage  
 1490 cordage  
 1491 butlerage

*Possible coinages on native bases*

c1400(?a1300) outrage  
 a1400(c1303) bondage  
 c1400(?c1380) barnage  
     dotage  
     c1386 lodemanage  
 c1410(a1387) hidage  
     1387 lastage  
     1395-6 windage  
     1422 tonnage  
     (1422) poundage  
     (1427-8) cranage  
     (1428) cartage  
 c1450(c1430) sterage  
     c1450 feriage  
     groundage  
     (?c1450) borwage  
     1465 stoppage  
     (1466) average  
     1494 tollage

*Possible coinages of unknown origin*

(1342) dennage  
 c1450(?a1408) tarage  
     (1442) fraughtage  
     1490 lecage

**Table 59: -AL: alternatives to later or simultaneous forms in other suffixes***Alternatives in -al*

a1450(a1338) repentaille  
     (a1393) arivaille  
     (a1398) substancial  
 c1450(a1400) suppowail  
 a1500(1426) lineal  
  
 (1433) finial  
 (1440) coraille  
 1543(1464) defial

*Forms in other suffixes*

c1300 repentaunce  
 c1450(c1380) arivage  
 a1325(?a1300) substaunce  
 c1440(?a1400) suppowailment  
 ?a1475(?a1325) lineament  
     (a1398) lineacioun  
 c1400(c1390) finishment  
     ?c1425 corance  
 c1400(?a1300) defiaunce

**Table 60: -AL: possible ME coinages***Possible coinages on Romance bases*

(a1393) brigantaille  
 c1395 rehearsail  
 (1397) deposal  
 a1500(a1415) apposaile  
 a1475(a1430) botaille  
     (1435) finial  
     c1440 iral  
 c1460(a1449) fantastical  
     (1454) firmal  
     1474 refusal  
     1488 reversal

*Coinages on native bases*

c1330(?c1300) springal  
 c1450(?a1400) suppowail  
 c1475(a1430) stoupaille

## APPENDIX 2

RELATION OF SUFFIX USE TO TEXTUAL GENRE IN ME<sup>1</sup>

Table 61: Distribution of suffixes across genres\*

Genre	Text total	-ment	-ance	-ation	-age	-al	Uses per genre
Fiction	118	35	<b>52</b>	<b>31</b>	34	<b>30</b>	182
Admin.	96	<b>55</b>	23	18	<b>57</b>	9	162
Religious	92	27	35	30	11	29	132
General.	65	23	22	22	18	20	105
Scholarly	22	7	3	12	8	9	38
Total	393	147	135	113	128	97	619

\*Suffix uses have been counted once each per text, not per occurrence

The distribution shown in Table 61 is significant at  $p < 0.001$   $\chi^2$  76.366 (df 16). It will be seen that the majority figures for the mainly French suffixes *-ment*, *-ance* and *-age* are in accordance with the percentages of genre share shown in Table 62 below. However, while the majority of usages for mainly Latin-based *-ation* and *-al* appear in fictional texts, we can see from Table 62 that the highest percentage of genre share for both suffixes is in fact in scholarly texts.

Table 62: % of usages per suffix per genre

	-ment	-ance	-ation	-age	-al
Fiction	19.2	<b>28.6</b>	17	18.7	16.5
Admin.	<b>34</b>	14.2	11.1	<b>35.1</b>	5.6
Religious	20.5	26.5	22.7	8.3	22
General	21.9	21	21	17.1	19
Scholarly	18.4	7.9	<b>31.5</b>	21.1	<b>23.7</b>

1. The categorisation of textual genres is unfortunately not quite complete, as some details are not yet available on the *MED* database. A list of MSS quoted in this thesis, with the suffixes found in them, is available for separate consultation.

## APPENDIX 3

NOUNS IN *-acioun* TRANSLATED FROM LATIN, WITH TEXT TYPES/CONTEXTS OF FIRST APPEARANCES

Noun	Text type/context
<i>1150-1300</i>	
a1230(?a1200) cogitacioun	religion
1297 transmigracioun	religion
<i>14th Century</i>	
c1400(a1376) mitigacioun	religion
(a1382) prefiguracioun	religion
(c1384) condemnacioun	religion
1389 exaltacioun	religion
c1390 supportacioun	general
c1475(1392) stipticacioun	medicine
(a1393) exalacioun	science
	alchemy
(c1395) mollificacioun	alchemy
	alchemy
	alchemy
a1475(1396) illuminacioun	religion
a1450(a1397) anticipacioun	rhetoric
(a1398) abnegacioun	religion
	grammar
	religion
	religion
a1400 coagulacioun	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
a1425(a1400) exacerbacioun	religion
	religion
<i>15th Century</i>	
c1400 coronacioun	general
c1450(?a1408) computacioun	mathematics
c1410 affirmacioun	general
a1450(1412) nominacioun	general
c1425(a1420) relegacioun	general
?a1425 alleviacioun	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
	medicine
approximacioun	medicine

	lapidificacioun	medicine
	aggregacioun	medicine
	claudicacioun	medicine
	debilitacioun	medicine
	infiltracioun	medicine
	reduplicacioun	medicine
	obfuscacioun	medicine
	spasmacioun	medicine
	suppuracioun	medicine
	transpiracioun	medicine
c1425	admiracioun	general
a1500(?c1425)	ablactacioun	medicine
	evitacioun	religion
a1475(?a1430)	frequentacioun	religion
(?1440)	ablaqueacioun	horticulture
(?1440)	inoculacioun	horticulture
c1475(a1445)	invitacioun	general
1447-8	allocacioun	law
(a1449)	deformacioun	general
a1500(a1450)	radiacioun	science
(1450)	adnullation	law
c1450	evocacioun	grammar
	perpetracioun	religion
c1475(1459)	confutacioun	law
a1460	militacioun	general
(a1464)	annotacioun	mathematics (calender)
a1475	precipitacioun	religion
a1500	radicacioun	general
	anterioracioun	mathematics

## APPENDIX 4

NEOLOGISMS IN *-al* IN THE 16th & 17th CENTURIES (FIRST ATTRIBUTIONS)

Malkiel has said that the growth and progress of the suffix *-al* ‘conspicuously accelerated in the period 1580-1650’ (1944: 84). This he demonstrated by the dates of first occurrences of all nouns in the suffix beginning with *re-*, a group which he believes to provide a good cross-section. I have taken his sample of 25 first occurrences for the 16th and 17th centuries, adding 10 others in different prefixes from the same period, and looked at the semantics of their first attributions in the *OED*. Of this sample of 35 words, only 10 first appeared in the 16th century.

Five have instrumental meanings, three of which are nouns of utterance: DENIAL (1528), REPLIAL (1548) and REFUTAL (1605), which first occur as references to the words used in denying, replying and refuting. REQUITAL (1579) is first used with the sense ‘means of requiting’: ‘To minister superabundant matter of sufficient *requital*’ (G. Harvey, Letter bk. 62, *OED*); but in 1582 appears in an action context ‘make ... *requital*’ (Stanyhurst Aeneis 1, 35, *OED*). RETIRAL (1611) first appears with a similar instrumental sense: ‘... A place of solitarie retirall’ (Cotgr.*OED*), but was superseded by Shakespeare’s RETIREMENT, in a suffix more usually found attached to nouns with instrumental meaning.

RECRUITAL in the 17th century has an objective sense ‘that which is supplied’: ‘Imploring them for a *recruitment* both of men and money’ (Aikman Hist. Scot. [1927] IV. X. 319, note (*OED*)). All others come into the category either of action or of state resulting from action. Marchand states that ‘derivation [in *-al*] is made almost exclusively from resultative-transitive verbs’ (1969: 237, 4.5.3.). These nouns are usually formed on verbs suggesting permanent results, as Marchand says; however, the difference between result and action depends on whether the emphasis is on the subject or object of the underlying verb. 10 are passive states with the emphasis on the object: RECITAL ‘[a legislative Act] being recited’ (1512), REPRIEVAL ‘[Gynecia] being reprieved’ (a1586), REMITTAL ‘[sins] being remitted’ (1596), REMOVAL ‘[threats] being removed’ (1597), DEPRIVAL ‘[Mankind] being deprived [of grace]’ (1611), RESTORAL ‘[Mankind] being restored [to God’s favour]’ (1611), REVISAL ‘[sin] being reviewed’ (1612), COMPOSAL ‘[affections] being composed’ (1630), REVIVAL

‘[arts] being revived’ (1651) and RENEWAL ‘[a contract] being renewed’ (1681-6).  
The only active experiential state is SURVIVAL (1598).

DISPOSAL (1630) first occurs in the phrase ‘at my own disposal’ (Wadsworth Pilgr. viii. 82, *OED*), a context of generalised fact. The 20 other nouns all appear in contexts of specific action, where the emphasis is on the subject rather than the object. Most are formed on verbs suggesting permanence. Exceptions are SURPRISAL, RESISTAL (first used in the plural, ‘acts of resistance’), REVIEWAL, DISGUIisal, APPROVAL ‘act of approving [an execution]’ and PROPOSAL.

**Table 63: Some nouns in *-al*, 1512-1695: semantic categories of first attributions**

<b>INSTRUM</b>	<b>OBJECT</b>	<b>RESULT/STATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>Instance</b>
denial	recruital	recital	<b>Fact</b>	surprisal
replial		reprieval	disposal	repressal
requital		remittal		reposal
refutal		removal		committal
retiral		survival		resistal
		deprival		resignal
		restoral		escapal
		revisal		receival
		composal		retrieval
		revival		renounsal
	renewal		reviewal	
				suppressal
				disguisal
				proposal
				returnal
				approval
				transposal