

## VERBS, VERBAL FORMS AND DEVERBAL FORMATIONS IN THE *ÉPINAL-ERFURT GLOSSARY*

HANS SAUER

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

*Abstract:* The *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary (EpErf)*, which goes back to ca. AD 700, is the earliest document of the English language of any length. It shows many of the word-formation patterns that occurred in Old English (OE); some were common, whereas others were rare. Here I concentrate on the derivation of verbs (in particular weak verbs) and on deverbal formations. I look at compounds with a deverbal second element (synthetic compounds), at combinations with particles, at prefix- and suffix-formations, and at derivations without a suffix. Whereas prefixes are listed alphabetically, suffixes are subdivided according to the word-classes which they derive (nouns, adjectives, adverbs). Because the OE words in *EpErf* always gloss Latin words, I conclude by briefly discussing the question of loan-influence on the OE glosses.

*Keywords:* *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary, glosses, Old English, word-formation*

### 1. Introduction: the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary (EpErf)*

The present paper is part of a larger project, namely, to describe the word-formation patterns in the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary (EpErf)*. There have been studies of the phonology and morphology of *EpErf* (see, e.g., Pfeifer 1974), and these aspects are also integrated in the standard historical grammars of Old English (OE), especially Campbell (1959) and Sievers/Brunner (1965). However, to my knowledge there has never been a comprehensive study devoted to the word-formation patterns of *EpErf*. Here I shall deal with the formation of verbs and with deverbal formations.

*EpErf* is transmitted in two manuscripts, namely:

- (1) *Épinal*, Bibliothèque municipale 72 (2), fols. 94–197; ca 700; written in England.
- (2) *Erfurt*, Universitätsbibliothek, Codex Amplonianus F. 42, fols. 1a1–14va33; written in Cologne by a German scribe around 800.

*EpErf* is an alphabetical glossary; it contains ca. 3000 entries (each entry consisting of lemma and gloss), mostly in a-order, but, at the end of a number of letters, there are entries in ab-order. Roughly 2000 entries are Latin – Latin, that is, a Latin lemma (headword) is followed by a Latin gloss (explanation). Roughly 1100 entries are Latin – Old English, that is, a Latin lemma is followed by an Old English Gloss.

The archetype of *EpErf* was probably compiled from a variety of sources shortly before 700 in the school at Canterbury, which had been established by

archbishop Theodore and abbot Hadrian. The Épinal manuscript was probably copied not long after the archetype.

EpErf is the earliest attestation of the English language of any length, and it is therefore important for the study of early English spelling, phonology, morphology and word-formation. It is also striking that EpErf contains hardly any Christian terms, but many terms that are related to Classical Antiquity, especially to Roman customs and institutions, which did not exist in Anglo-Saxon England.

There is no comprehensive edition of EpErf; a new edition of all witnesses together with a reconstruction of the archetype is now in progress and available on the internet (on the website of the *Dictionary of Old English*); the chief editors are Michael Herren, David Porter and Hans Sauer. The entries with OE glosses were edited by Pheifer (1974). Because I am going to deal with OE word-formation (and only marginally with Latin word-formation), I have used Pheifer's edition for the following analysis. When I refer to Pheifer's introduction or commentary, I quote this as Pheifer (1974); when I refer to the edition, I quote this as Ph plus the number assigned to the entry by Pheifer.

There is actually a third witness to the material provided by EpErf, namely the Corpus Glossary, preserved in the manuscript CCC 144, that is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 144 (see, e.g., Ker 1957: no. 36). The Corpus Glossary contains almost all the entries that are in EpErf, but also much additional material, and it is arranged in ab-order throughout; therefore, it is not always easy to find the corresponding entries in EpErf and in the Corpus Glossary. But the Corpus Glossary is important for the reconstruction the archetype of EpErf. In the present paper, however, I concentrate on EpErf and do not take the Corpus Glossary into account.

## 2. Some problems of analysis

The analysis of EpErf poses some problems; I single out three of them. Some of them are connected to the fact that EpErf provides the earliest attestation of English of any length, and also to the fact that the dialect of EpErf is Anglian and not West-Saxon.

(1) **Spelling:** EpErf uses some spelling conventions that are different from those of later OE, especially from Late West-Saxon. For example, for /w/ EpErf uses mostly <uu> or <u>, and not (or only rarely), <p>, as in later Old English, which in modern editions of OE texts is usually rendered as <w>. EpErf also often uses <d> for the dental fricative /θ, ð/ and not <þ> or <ð> as in later Old English; examples can be found throughout the present article. Anglo-Saxonists who are accustomed to Late West-Saxon spelling therefore have to do some re-adjusting when looking at EpErf.

Different (and earlier) spellings can also be seen in the use of some prefixes and particles: EpErf often or even usually has *gi-*, *fer-*, *ober-* and *te-*, where later OE usually has *ge-*, *for-*, *ofer*, *to-*; for details see below. Some of the early spellings used in EpErf are also used in the poem inscribed in the form of runes on the slightly later Ruthwell Cross (ca. 750; sometimes called *The Ruthwell Crucifixion Poem*, which is related to the poem *The Dream of the Rood*).

(2) **Meaning:** The basic assumption is that the gloss renders its lemma, providing a synonym or an explanation in the case of Latin-Latin entries, or a translation equivalent in the case of Latin-Old English entries. This is actually

often the case, as in Ph 140, where L *battutum* ‘beaten’ is glossed as OE *gibeataen* ‘beaten’.

But there are also many instances where there is (or at least seems to be) a mismatch between lemma and gloss, for example Ph 934 L *suffragator* ‘supporter’ is glossed as OE *mundbora* ‘protector’ and in the following entry, Ph 935, L *suffragium* ‘vote, suffrage’ is glossed by OE *mundbyrd* ‘protection, patronage’. But ‘supporter’ and ‘protector’ are antonyms rather than synonyms; thus, probably there was a misunderstanding on the part of the OE glossator.

There seems to be a tendency among scholars (and Pfeifer 1974 is not free from this tendency) to ascribe the meaning of the lemma also to the gloss. But in many cases this would give the gloss a meaning which is not otherwise recorded, possibly this would be a loan-meaning. But of course we have to keep in mind that all other attestations of the words attested in EpErf are later attestations.

(3) **Assignment of the EpErf forms to later forms:** In spite of the spelling, which is often different, the forms, in our case the verbs and verbal forms of EpErf can usually be assigned to the forms that are attested later and to the forms which are given in the dictionaries (see the following sections). In a few cases, however, the forms in EpErf are difficult to assign to a specific form. One of those cases is *tedridtit* (Ph 344; Erf only); BT s.v. *to-tredan* takes it as a form of *to-tredan* ‘to tread to pieces’, which would also very roughly match its L lemma (*defecit*). Pfeifer (1974: 82), however, suggests a form (*\*to)ðri(u)tið* ‘it wearsies’), but his reconstruction would lead to an otherwise unattested verb – it seems simpler to take the attested form, as BT does, as a peculiar spelling of an attested verb.

### 3. Patterns of word-formation in EpErf

All common OE patterns of word-formation are attested in EpErf, in particular: compounds; combinations with particles; prefix-formations; derivations without an explicit suffix; suffix-formations. I make a distinction between particles and prefixes. Prefixes are bound morphemes which occur only as part of a word (more precisely at the beginning of a word), while particles occur also as independent words, which are used as prepositions or as adverbs. Not all handbooks on word-formation make this distinction, and, semantically, particles are perhaps closer to prefixes than to lexical words; but I regard the formal criterion as more decisive.

It is also noteworthy that participles (especially past participles) can be the basis of further word-formation. For example, *unofaercumenrae* ‘unsubdued, not overcome’ (Ph 536) is derived from *ofercumen*, the past participle of *ofercuman* ‘to overcome, subdue’, but not directly from the verb; there was no verb *\*unofercuman* and there is no need to postulate one.

Some words show two kinds of word-formation, e.g., they have a prefix and a suffix, as, e.g., *beswicend* – these are here listed twice.

#### 3.1. The derivation of verbs

Most classes of verbs commonly distinguished for OE are attested in EpErf, namely strong verbs I–VII, weak verbs 1–2, and irregular (*-mi*) verbs; the only group that is not represented are the preterite-presents, which developed into the group of modal auxiliaries. But, for one thing, this is a small group, and for

another, as far as these OE verbs foreshadow the development into modal auxiliaries, they are only used in combination with a lexical verb; therefore, their absence in EpErf is not surprising.

Strong verbs are usually primary, that is they are not derived, at least as far as OE is concerned. Weak verbs are usually derived (from nouns, or from adjectives, or from other verbs). But whereas weak verbs 2 usually have a suffix (see below for details), weak verbs 1 (i.e. weak verbs of the first class) usually do not have a derivational suffix in their OE form. It is therefore doubtful whether they should be included in a survey of OE word-formation, but, on the other hand, it would seem strange to deal with weak verbs 2, but not with weak verbs 1; therefore I have included weak verbs 1 in my survey.

### 3.1.1. The derivation of weak verbs 1

As just indicated, it is doubtful whether weak verbs 1 should be included in a survey of Old English word-formation. The suffix which derived them originally (Germanic *\*-ija-*) caused *i*-umlaut of the stem-vowel where this was possible, but then it disappeared (except after *r*: Gmc. *\*nazjan* > OE *nerian*). Altogether there are 44 weak verbs 1 in EpErf. I have subdivided them into two groups, according to whether there is a basis in OE from which they were (or could have been) derived, and whether there was no basis even in OE. I shall give just a few examples of each group.

(1) Weak verbs 1 with a basis attested in OE: *besmirwan* ‘to besmear’ (*bismiridae* Ph 534): the basis is probably *smirels* ‘ointment, salve’; Ph 228 *gebyrddid* ‘embroidered’ from *gebyrdan*; the basis is OE *borda* ‘embroidery’ or rather WGmc *\*burdon*.

(2) Weak verbs 1 with no attested basis in OE, e.g., Ph 752 *naetendnae* from *nætan* ‘annoy, afflict’ (glossing L *proterentem*), but there is no word in OE from which *naetan* could have been derived.

### 3.1.2. The derivation of weak verbs 2 (*-ian* verbs)

Weak verbs of the 2nd class (weak verbs 2) were derived with a suffix that goes back to Gmc. *\*-oja-*, and it does not cause *i*-umlaut. In OE, the form of the suffix changes. The class of weak verbs 2 is normally called the *-ian* class, after the infinitive, e.g., *lufian*. But the *-an* is the common ending of most verbs in the infinitive, thus the derivational suffix which remains is *-i-*. In the second person sing. it is, however, *þu lufast*, and in the past it is *ic lufode* (*lufade* in Anglian). Thus, it can be said that the derivative suffix is vocalic, but it changes its shape employing different vowels (*i, a, o*). 34 weak verbs 2 are attested in EpErf. Just as with the weak verbs 1, I have grouped them into verbs where their basis exists in OE, and verbs where there is no basis in OE; I shall give just a few examples:

(1) basis attested in OE, e.g., *fultumian* (*fultemendum; fultemendi*; Ph 95 & 74) ‘to help, support’, from *fultum* ‘help, support’ (glossing L *adstipulatus*); *sorgian* ‘to care, grieve’ (Ph 79). derived from *sorg* ‘sorrow’.

(2) no attested basis in OE: e.g., Ph 364 *ahlocian* (*achloadum*) ‘to dig out’; Ph 886 *siwian* (*gisiuuid*) ‘to sew, mend, patch’, glossing L *sarcinatum*; *swornian* ‘coagulate’, but no *\*sworn-* (*suornodun* Ph 198); *browian* ‘to suffer’ but no *\*brow-* (*throuadae* Ph 365; *browung* is derived from *browian*).

### 3.1.3. Minor suffixes for forming weak verbs

The following two suffixes (*-ettan*, *-sian*) are minor in the sense that they were used much more rarely for the derivation of weak verbs. They do not survive, apart from a few obscured forms (*grunt* from OE *grunettan*; *cleanse* from OE *clænsian*).

(1) *-ettan* can be traced back to a Gmc. verbal suffix *\*-atja-*, *\*-itja-*; it derives weak verbs 1, more specifically frequentative and iterative verbs (at least in their original sense). Four verbs with the suffix *-ettan* are attested in EpErf, namely *agnettan* ‘to own, appropriate, usurp’ (*agnaettae* Ph 1096; from *agnian*); *borettan* ‘to brandish’ (*borættit* Ph 1092; from *beran*); *brogdettan* ‘to shake, brandish, glitter’ (*brocdaettendi* Ph 735; from *bregdan*); *onettan* (e.g., *onettae* Ph 712), but *onettan* has a different origin and the ending was adapted to the suffix later.

(2) *-sian* derives weak verbs 2. It is assumed that *-sian* arose from re-analysis: *egesa* → *eges-ian*, which was then re-analysed as *ege-sian*. There is just one attestation in EpErf, namely *swinsung* ‘sound, melody’ (Ph 643), the deverbial noun derived from *swinsian* ‘to make melody’ (from *swinn* ‘melody’).

### 3.1.4. A doubtful verbal suffix (*-rcian*)

The suffix *-rcian* is attested just once in EpErf, in: *lithircadae* (Ph 722; from *liðercian* ‘to smooth down, flatter’). The basis is probably *liðe* ‘soft, calm’: but the <rc> is unexplained. Pfeifer (1974: 108) postulates a suffix *-rcia-?* after *gearcian* ‘prepare’ – *gearcian* is derived from *gearo*, *gearu* ‘ready, prepared’ – but *-rcian* would be a very rare suffix with just two formations; it is not mentioned in the literature on OE word-formation. Nevertheless, I mention it here, to show the gradient from very frequent verbal suffixes (especially *-ian* for the derivation of weak verbs 2) via relatively rare, but undoubted suffixes (*-ettan*, *-sian*), to rare and doubtful suffixes (? *-rcian*).

## 3.2. Compounds with a deverbial second element (synthetic compounds)

Here I deal only with compounds the second element of which is deverbial; such compounds are also called synthetic compounds. There are 14 synthetic compounds in EpErf. Their large majority are nouns with 12 formations; only two are adjectives. Most of the nouns are agent nouns. At least four things have to be kept in mind:

- (1) Not only persons, but also animals and plants can be regarded as agents;
- (2) Derivation from strong verbs was not only made from the present tense stem, but also from one of the past stems (or the past participle).
- (3) The second, deverbial element often occurs only rarely or not at all as an independent word. Nevertheless, these elements should not be regarded as suffixes, but rather as potential words.
- (4) Participles can be the basis of word-formation: there is a compound such as *halb-clungni* ‘half-congealed’, but there is no corresponding compound verb (see also above).

### 3.2.1. Agent nouns

(1) Persons:

- *Bora* is derived from *beran* (p.p. *boren*); it appears as a second element in *mund-bora* and *ræd-bora*; *byrd* (as in *mundbyrd*) is also derived from *beran*.

- *Hröf-wyrhta* (Ph 996 *hrofiuyrcta*) ‘roofmaker’. It glosses L *tignarius*- but Pheifer (1974: 127) points out that it rather reflects L *sarcitector* – a *sarcitector* apparently made the wooden frame for the roof (see also 4.1. below).
- *Mund-bora* (Ph 934) ‘protector’, lit. ‘protection-bearer; see also *mund-byrd* below.
- *Ræd-bora* (*redboran* Ph 552) ‘counsellor, advisor’, lit. ‘advice-bearer’.

(2) Animals:

- *nihte-gale* (*necte-galae*; Ph 857) ‘nightingale’, lit. ‘night-singer’.
- *wande-wiorpe* (*uuandaewuioorpae* Ph 1045) ‘mole’, lit. [sc. animal that] throws [sc. earth]; *wande* is also attested independently as the name of the mole.

(3) Plants (on the OE plant names, see Sauer and Kubaschewski 2018):

- *gundeswelgie* ‘groundsel’ (*gundaesuelgiae*, Ph 976) lit. ‘pus-swallow’, glossing L *senecen*. In later OE this was changed through popular etymology to *grundeswelgie*, lit. ‘groundswallow’.
- *hunig-suge* (*hunaegsugae* Ph 615) ‘honeysuckle’; lit. [sc. plant that] sucks honey’; but the meaning here is really passive, namely [‘sc. plant from which] honey can be sucked’].
- *widu-winde* (*uuiidowuindae* Ph 348, 1059, 1082) ‘woodbine’, lit. [‘sc plant which] winds around wood’. *Widuwinde* and *widubinde* were apparently easily confused or could be easily exchanged.

### 3.2.2. Action nouns

- *hand-gang* (*hondgong* Ph 337) ‘submission’, lit. ‘handgoing’, apparently a legal term, glossing L *deditio*; see also 4.1. below;
- *mund-byrd* (Ph 935) ‘protection, patronage’; cf. *mund-bora* above;
- *stæf-plega* (*staebplegan* Ph 577) apparently a literal translation of L *ludi litterali*, which it glosses; see further 4.1. below.

### 3.2.3. Adjectives formed as synthetic compounds

- *fela-spræci* (*felo-spraeci* Ph 1006) ‘talkative’, lit. ‘much-talking’, glossing L *trifulus*, *trufulus* (cf. the character Truffaldino in the Italian *Commedia dell Arte*);
- *healf-clungen* (*halbclungni* (Ph 931) ‘half-congealed’, glossing L *semigelato*.

### 3.3. Combinations with particles

As indicated above, I regard particles as elements that may also occur as independent words, usually as prepositions and (or) adverbs, whereas I regard as prefixes elements that do not occur independently. Four different particles are attested in EpErf that also occur as first elements of combinations, namely *ober-* (later *ofer-*), *ut-*, *uuidir-* (later *wiðer-*), and *ymb(e)-*. Of these, *over* (< *ofer*) and *out* (< *ut*) are still current in ModE, whereas *wiðer* ‘against’ and *ymb(e)* ‘around, etc.’ died out, as well as most of the combinations with them. *Fram* as a first element of

combinations is a problematic case (see below); I regard it as an independent adverb.

(1) **ober-** (*ofer-*) occurs in two formations: *ofer-wenian* ‘to be proud’ (*oberuuaenidae* Ph 538) and *ofer-stælan* ‘to convince’ (*obaerstaelendi* Ph 192; glossing L *conuincens*);

(2) **ut-** occurs in one formation, namely *ut-aþrunge* (Ph 176 *utathrunge*) ‘pressed out’, glossing L *celatum*; i.e. referring to the technique of creating a kind of relief from metal;

(3) **wider-** ‘against’ also occurs in one formation, namely *widerhlinian* ‘to lean against’ (Ph 537 *uudirhliniendae* ‘those leaning against’), glossing L *innitentes*;

(4) **ymb(e)-** ‘around, etc.’ is attested in two formations, namely *ymbþreoding* (Ph 331 *ymbdritung*) ‘deliberation’, and *ymbhringend* (*ymbhringendum* Ph 929) from *ymbhringan* ‘to surround’, glossing L *stipatoribus*;

(5) **fram-**: This is a problematic case: *fram* occurs once, in *fram adrifan* ‘to drive away’, which I regard as a phrase consisting of *fram* + *adrifan*. CIH is not consistent: CIH does not list a prefix *frama-* (in my view, correctly), but writes several combinations with *fram* as one word, e.g., *framadrifan*, *framāstyrian* ‘to remove’ (in my view, incorrectly). The addition of *fram* shows the semantic weakness (semantic bleaching) of the prefix *a-*.

### 3.4. Prefix formations

Nine different prefixes attached to verbs are attested in EpErf, namely *a-*, *an-*, *bi-* (later *be-*), *ed-*, *fer-* (later *for-*), *gi-* (later *ge-*), *or-*, *te-* (later *to-*) and *un-*. Their frequency varies considerably: *gi-* is the most frequently attested prefix, with 30 occurrences; the second-most frequent prefix is *a-*, which is attested in 17 formations, while the others are attested more rarely; see below. There seems to be a correlation between frequency and meaning: the most frequent prefixes also often have a vague meaning (or no real meaning). *gi-* is also the most striking case of a prefix that was lost in the course of ME and vanished almost without a trace: apparently it had lost its function and the loss of function led to the loss of the form in ME (*ge-* > *i-* >  $\emptyset$ ).

(1) **ā-**: Its original meaning was apparently ‘out, out of’, which is preserved in a few formations such as *awegan* ‘carry away’ (*auægdæ* Ph 356 ‘carried away’), but more often it has a vague meaning or no meaning. It is attested in 23 different formations, e.g., *afulian* ‘to become foul, to rot’ (*afulodan* Ph 1044).

(2) **an-** (*on-*): Its original meaning was perhaps ‘away from’ (cf. Dietz 2005: 604), but in OE it had no unified meaning. There are seven attestations in EpErf; in many of them, the meaning of *an-* (*on-*) seems to be intensifying. An example is *ansuebidum* Ph 942 (from *answebban*) ‘those put to sleep’, glossing L *sopitis*.

(3) **bi-** (*be-*): The handbooks say that it had a stressed and an unstressed form; the latter was prefixed to verbs. EpErf always has the form *bi-*. There are eight formations with *bi-* in EpErf, and *bi-* does not have a unified meaning. In some formations *bi-* has a negative or privative meaning, as in *berædan* (*birednae* Ph 800) ‘to betray’ (i.e. the opposite of *rædan* ‘to advise’) and perhaps also in Ph 104 *binumini* ‘taken away’ (glossing L *adempta*), but because *niman* means ‘to take’, *bi-* has here perhaps intensifying function. In other formations, *bi-* has apparently a locative function, as in *besmirwan* (*bismiridae* Ph 534) ‘to besmear’.

(4) *ed-* ‘again’: There is just one attestation in EpErf, namely Ph 783 *edscaept* ‘new creation’, lit. ‘again-creation’ (glossing Gk *palingenesean*, which is apparently a rare Greek word, and not attested in Latin); *edscaept* is probably a loan-translation modelled on the Greek word; see also 4.1.

(5) *fer-* (*for-*): EpErf has the earlier form *fer-*, which was later replaced by *for-*. Its basic meaning is negative, but in some formations, the meaning seems to be intensifying. There are five formations attested in EpErf. The negative meaning is, for example, apparently attested in Ph 52 *faerscribaen* ‘condemned, proscribed’ (glossing L *addictus* ‘condemned, proscribed’; the later OE form is *forscrīfan*); the intensifying function appears to be present in, e.g., *ferhergend* ‘ravager’ (Ph 467); from *forhergian* ‘to ravage, plunder’: the underlying verb *hergian* has also the meaning ‘to ravage, plunder’.

(6) *gi-*, *ge-*: EpErf mostly has the earlier form *gi-*. This was a very frequent prefix in OE; in EpErf it is attested thirty times, but it disappeared in the course of ME (see above). Originally, *ge-* had apparently two functions: with nouns, it expressed collectivity and associativity; with past participles, it originally expressed perfectivity; and from the past participle it was then apparently extended to the present form. EpErf has examples of all three usages: there are 21 instances where *gi-* (*ge-*) is prefixed to the past participle, nine instances where it is prefixed to other verb forms, and six instances where it expresses collectivity or associativity. The formations belonging to the latter group are partly deverbal (e.g., *gifoegnissae*), and partly denominal (*gimodae*). The large group of past participles with *gi-* (*ge-*) and the group of formations with *gi-* (*ge-*) expressing collectivity probably reflect the original function and distribution; the group of other verb forms with *gi-* (*ge-*) probably shows the later extension. I shall give just one or two examples for each group:

- *gi-* expressing collectivity: *gifoegnissae* (Ph 889), glossing L *sartatecta*. The meaning is difficult to ascertain. *Gifoegnisse* literally means something like ‘things joined together’ (CIH s.v. *+fēgness* gives ‘association, companionship, conjunction’); the meaning ‘repairs’ is apparently adapted to one assumed meaning of L *sartatecta* lit. ‘mended roofs’, but Lewis and Short give ‘buildings in good repair’ as the meaning (s.v. *sarcio*); see further 4.1.
- *gi-* (*ge-*) as first element of past participles, e.g., *gibeataen* ‘beaten’ (Ph 140 from *beatan* ‘to beat’); see also 2 (2) above.
- *gi-* prefixed to other verb forms, e.g., *gifræmith* (Ph 725; glossing L *prouehit*). The meaning ‘advances’ for *gifræmith* is apparently adapted to the L lemma.

(7) *or-* had apparently two different meanings in OE, namely ‘very’ (as in *oreald*, very old (cf. G. *uralt*)), and ‘without’. There is one example in EpErf, where the meaning is apparently ‘without’, i.e. a negative meaning: *georuierdid* (Ph 990 ‘shamed, disgraced’; CIHall s.v. *+orwyrðan*, derived from *wierðan*, *wyrðan* ‘to value, appreciate’).

(8) *te-* (later *to-*) indicates separation. There are two examples in EpErf: *tecinid* and *tedridtid*: *tecinid* ‘splits, cuts into pieces’ (Ph 343, Erf only; CIH s.v. *tōcīnan*); glossing L *dehiscat*; *tedridtid* (Ph 344; Erf only). This form is difficult to assign to a normalized form; see section 2.(3) above. Like BT, I take it as a form of *totredan* ‘to tread to pieces’.



(9) **un-** is a negative prefix, which is still common in ModE. There are seven attestations in EpErf, namely *unamaelti*, *unasedd*, *ungesewen*, *unhyri*, *unlidouuac*, *unofercumen*, *unþyhtig*. Some of these are actually denominal, not deverbal (*unlidouuac*): I just discuss *unofercumen*: *unofercumen* ‘unsubdued, not overcome’ (Ph 536), glossing L *indigestae*: The prefix has been added to the past participle of the verb *ofercuman*; there was no verb *\*unofercuman* (cf. section 3 above and the following section).

### 3.4.1. Double prefixes

In four cases, a prefix has been added to another prefix or particle, namely *unamaelti* (Ph 769); *ungiseem* (Ph 333); *unofercumen* (Ph 536); *utathrungaen* (Ph 76). In three instances, it is the prefix *un-* that has been added to a past participle, and in one instance, the prefix *ut-* has been added to a past participle; this confirms the observation that past participles can be the basis of word-formation, cf. section 3 above. The examples also show that *a-*, and *ge-* were semantically weakened.

### 3.5. Derivation without an explicit suffix

Deverbal derivations without an explicit suffix appear as second elements of synthetic compounds; they are discussed in section 3.2. above.

### 3.6. Suffix formations

In the material discussed here, EpErf has nine suffixes. The three verbal suffixes *-ettan*, *-ian*, *-sian* are discussed above (3.1.1 & 3.1.3.); the remaining six suffixes are discussed in the following sections. The suffixes *-end* and *-ere* were used for the formation of agent nouns; the suffixes *-ness* and *-ung* were used for the formation of action nouns and collective nouns; the suffix *-i* (later *-e*) was used for the formation of adjectives, and *-lice* for the formation of adverbs.

#### 3.6.1. Suffixes forming agent nouns

Two suffixes are attested for the formation of agent nouns: *-end* and *-ere*. The suffix *-t* is marginal, at least in EpErf: it is rare and occurs once in an agent noun (*hrofwyrrhta*), but once also in an action noun (*edsceaft*).

(1) **-end**: This suffix derives masculine agent nouns from verbs. It is not always easy to distinguish nouns from present participles in *-ende*; I have classified formations in *-end* as agent nouns if they gloss a Latin lemma which is an agent noun. Applying this criterion, there are seven agent nouns in *-end* in EpErf:

- *bæðend* ‘inciter’ (*baedendrae* Ph 539), glossing L *impulsore* ‘inciter, instigator’;
- *beswicend* ‘deceiver’ (*biswicend* Ph 645), glossing L *impostorem* ‘deceiver, impostor’;
- *forhergend* ‘ravager’ (*ferhergænd* Ph 467), for L *grassator* ‘vagabond, street robber’;
- *fultemend* ‘helper’ (*fultemendum* Ph 95), glossing L *adsestores*; see also Ph 74;

- *scyhend* ‘seducer, pimp’ (Ph 654) glossing L (from Gk) *maulistic* ‘pander’;
- *wēdend* ‘madman’ (*uuoendendi*, prob. for *uuoedendi*, Ph 575), glossing L *lymphatico*;

(2) *-ere*: This is probably an early loan-suffix, borrowed from L-*arius*; in Latin it formed mainly denominal nouns; cf. from EpErf, e.g., *dromidarius* ‘camel-driver’ (Ph 320; cf. 319); *egderi* ‘harrower’ (Ph 396, glossing L *erpiciarius*; the preceding entry, Ph 395, has L *erpica*, glossed by OE *egdae* (on *erpica*, see Pfeifer 1974, 86). It was borrowed in Germanic as *\*-arjaz*, *\*-aerjaz*, which explains the *i*-umlaut in OE *-ere*. The usual form in OE was *-ere*, Ep once has the older form *-eri* (*egderi* Ph 396), where the *i* causing the *i*-umlaut is still visible. The earliest formations in the Germanic languages were probably also denominal; but later *-ere* formed also deverbal derivations. The bridge for the transition from denominal to deverbal derivation were apparently formations that were doubly connected, which could have been derived from a noun or from a corresponding verb; see the examples given below. EpErf has five formations. One can only be explained as a denominal derivation (*scinnere*), the others allow of a double explanation, that is they can be explained as denominal nouns or as deverbal nouns.

- *byrgeras* ‘buriers’ (Ph 760), a hapax legomenon, is doubly connected: it could have been derived from *byrgan* vb wk 1 ‘to bury’ or from the noun *byrgen* ‘burial, grave’;
- *egderi* ‘harrower’ (Ph 396; Erf only; CIH s.v. *egðere*) glossing L *erpiciarius* ‘harrower’. *Egderi* is probably derived from the noun *egdae* ‘harrow’ (Ph 395), which actually precedes it in Erf. Both are rare words, only recorded in a few glosses. But because they are connected to the work of the farmers, they may have been common words;
- *flitere* (*flitere in ebhatis* Ph 854) ‘disputer (in lawsuits)’, glossing L *rabulus* ‘cheap lawyer’ and apparently an attempt to render the Latin into OE. *Flitere* is also doubly connected: it could have been derived from the verb *flitan* ‘to quarrel, dispute’ or from the noun *flit* ‘dispute, strife’;
- *scinnere* ‘magician, illusionist’ (*scinneras* Ph 952) was probably derived from the noun *scinn* ‘spectre, illusion’; apparently there was no corresponding verb.
- *teblere* ‘gambler’ (*teblere* Ph 7) glosses L *aleator*. It is also doubly connected: it could have been derived from the noun *tæfl* (< L *tabula*), which immediately precedes it in EpErf (*teblae* Ep, *tefil* Erf; Ph 5). The word has also an interesting semantic development. *Tæfl* is a loan-word from L *tabula* ‘table’; because gambling was apparently done at a table, it changed its meaning to ‘game with dice, die’.

### 3.6.2. Suffixes forming action nouns and abstract nouns

The most frequent suffix for the formation of action nouns in EpErf is *-ing*, *-ung* with nine attestations. A rarer suffix is *-ness* with one attestation, where it refers to the result of the action. Rare suffixes were also *-d* (*mundbyrd* ‘protection, patronage’; Ph 935) and *-t* (*edsceaft* ‘new creation’, lit. ‘again-creation’; Ph 783).

(1) *-ung*, *-ing* forms deverbal action nouns which are feminines. In a few cases EpErf has *-in* instead of *-ing* (*scildinnae*, *tyctinnae*). The suffix is well attested in EpErf:

- *creopung* (*criopungae* Ph 696) ‘creeping’, from *crēopan* ‘to creep’;
- *grennung* (Ph 852; a hapax legomenon) ‘grinning’, from *grennian* vb wk 2;
- *leasung* (Ph 426) ‘lying’, from vb wk2 *lēasian* ‘to lie’, glossing L *famfaluca* (the entire entry is Ph 426 *famfaluca - leasung uel faam*);
- *monung* (in the phrase *gebles monung* ‘tax collecting’; Erf only; Ph 394) ‘admonition, claim, etc.’ from *manian*, *monian* vb wk 2; glossing L *exactio*;
- *scilding* (*scildinnae* Ph 1038) ‘protection’, lit. ‘shielding’, from vb wk 1 *scildan*, *scioldan* ‘to shield, protect’, glossing L *tutellam*;
- *swinsung* (Ep; Ph 643); ‘sound, melody’, from vb wk 2 *swinsian* ‘to make melody’, glossing L *melodium*;
- *tyhtung* (*tyctinnae* Ph 516) ‘incitement, etc.’ from *tyhtan* vb wk 1 ‘incite, instigate’, glossing L *incitamenta*;
- *pingung* (*pingungae*; Ph 532) ‘intercession’, glossing L *interuentu*;
- *wlatung* (*uulatung* Ep; *uulating* Erf; Ph 667) ‘nausea’, from *wlætān* vb wk 1 ‘to defile’, glossing L *nausea*;
- *ymbdritung* (Erf only; Ph 331) ‘deliberation’, from vb wk 2 *ymbdredian* ‘to deliberate’, glossing L *deliberation*.

(2) **-ness**: *gefēgness* (*gifoegnissae* Ph 889) ‘association, conjunction’, glossing L *sartatecta*; ‘repairs’, according to Pheifer (1974:119); L *sartatecta* ‘mended roofs’; see also 4.1. below (on *hrof-wyrhta*).

### 3.6.3. Suffixes deriving adjectives

The suffix *-i* (later *-e*) occurs three times in EpErf, and it derives adjectives from verbs: one is a compound (*felospræci*), and two are prefix-formations with the prefix *un-*:

- *felospræci* (Ph 1009; CIH *felaspræce*) ‘talkative, loquacious’ lit. ‘much speaking’; glossing L *trifulus*, *truffulus*; (cf. *truffaldino* ‘buffoon’, a character in the Italian *Commedia dell Arte*). *Spræci* is doubly connected: the basis could be the noun *spræc* or a stem of the strong verb (class V) *sprecan*.
- *unamaelti* (*unamaelti sperwi* Ep; Ph 769) ‘unmelted’, a hapax legomenon; glossing L *pice seuo*. The gloss does not match the lemma.
- *unhyri* (Ph 983) lit. ‘unheard of’, ‘wild, ferocious’ – glossing L *trux* ‘wild, ferocious’ – the meaning ‘wild, ferocious’ of *unhyri* is probably taken from the L lemma.

### 3.6.4. Suffixes deriving adverbs

A frequent suffix for the derivation of adverbs from adjectives even in the earliest attestation of OE was *-lice* (> ModE *-ly*), which arose from re-analysis, e.g., *heofon-lic-e* > *heofon-lice*. There are two attestations in EpErf:

- *hierwendlice* (*heruendlicae* Ep; Ph 186) ‘with contempt’, glossing L *contemptum*; the OE adverb is derived from the present participle of *hierwan*, *herwan* ‘to abuse, despise’;
- *gemengidlice* (*gimengidlicae*, Ep Ph 750) ‘mixed, confusedly; glossing L *permixtum*. *Gimengidlicae* is derived from the past participle of the vb wk *mengan*.

### 3.6.5. Suffixes for the derivation of verbs

Normally I would deal with the derivation of verbs here; but because verbs are the main topic of this paper, the derivation of verbs is discussed in section 3.1. above.

## 4. Loan-influence

Many of the Latin lemmata in EpErf reflect the world of Roman customs and law, which did not exist in Anglo-Saxon England or, in any case, had no relevance for the Anglo-Saxons. Nevertheless, the glossators were apparently expected (or saw it as their duty) to come up with a translation equivalent. They used various strategies. In a few cases there was apparently a translation equivalent in Old English, in other cases, they translated the Latin term literally (see 4.1.). In a number of cases they used a vague translation, which does not really render the meaning of the Latin word or phrase. But whereas it is often easy in the sphere of the religious vocabulary to identify loan-formation (see Gneuss 1955), this is much more difficult in other areas of the vocabulary. In the following sections I shall discuss a few of the more striking entries, but without any claim to completeness.

### 4.1. Literal translations and more or less exact correspondences

- *edscaept* ‘again-creation’ (Ph 784; glossing L or rather Greek *palingenesean*), is probably a loan-translation; see 3.4. (4) above.
- *hondgong* (Erf only; Ph 337) ‘surrender’, glossing L *deditio*: Apparently *hondgong*; ‘surrender’, lit. ‘going to the hand (sc. of the superior man)’ is equivalent to L *deditio*. *Hondgong* refers to the action that expressed the surrender.
- *hrof-wyrhta* (Ph 996) ‘roofmaker’, glossing L *tignarius*. Pfeifer 1974, 127 points out that the correspondence is rather to L *sarcitector*. This was apparently the man who made the wooden frame of a roof. It is difficult to say whether *hrof-wyrhta* is a loan-rendering of *sarcitector* or whether it was a native compound that existed independently.
- *gimodae* lit. ‘those of one mind’ (Ph 201) glossing L *coniurati* ‘conspirators’, lit. ‘those sworn together’. I do not know whether there were conspiracies in early Anglo-Saxon England, but obviously conspirators have to be unanimous and have to act unanimously. As with *hrof-wyrhta* it is difficult to say whether *gimodae* is a loan-creation triggered off by L *coniurati*.
- *staeb-plegan* ‘literary games, letter-games’ (Ph 577; glossing L *ludi litterari* Ep). *Staeb-plegan* is apparently a literal translation (a loan-translation) of the L lemma, which disregards that *ludi litterari*, literally ‘literary games, or letter games’, is lexicalized, and referred to a ‘primary school’. But schools in Anglo-Saxon England were probably called *scōl* (a loan-word from L *schola*), and not *staeb-plega*.

### 4.2. More general or more vague rendering

- *bisiuuidi uuerci* ‘work sewn together’ (Ph 699), glossing L *opere plumari[o]* ‘work embroidered with feathers’
- *gigeruuid* ‘prepared’ (Ph 730) glossing L *praetextatus*, i.e. clothed with the *toga praetextata*; in classical Rome, boys belonging to the nobility were clothed with the *toga praetextata*. Perhaps the glossator had no clear idea of what a *toga praetextata* was and therefore he used a fairly general term to render it.

- *red-boran* ‘those bringing advice’ (Ph 551) – L *iurisperiti* ‘those learned in the law’. Probably there were no law-schools in early Anglo-Saxon England – laws were often transmitted orally; but the kings probably had their advisors, thus the use of *red-boran* instead of *iurisperiti* looks like a kind of cultural substitution. For the OE laws that were written down, see Liebermann 1903–1916.

## 5. Conclusion

I have dealt with the derivation of verbs, analysing the verbs attested in the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*. Strong verbs are primary, whereas weak verbs are derived. Weak verbs of the first class usually do not show the original suffix in Old English, whereas weak verbs of the second class usually show the suffix, which is *-i-* in some forms and shows, e.g., in the infinitive present ending *-ian*. But the vowel changes in some inflected forms (*ic lufige*, but *þu lufast*, *ic lufode*); therefore we can just say that weak verbs of the second class are synchronically derived with a vowel. A rarer suffix for the formation of weak verb of the first class was *-ettan* (as in *boretan* ‘to brandish’); a rarer suffix for the formation of weak verbs of the second class was *-sian* (as in *swinsian* ‘to make melody’); a doubtful suffix is *-rcian*, which is attested just in *gearcian* ‘to prepare’ and in *lithircian* ‘to smooth down, to flatter’. There are also some derivations from verbs, more precisely derivations with a deverbial noun as a second element; some survive in Modern English, as *nightingale* (< *nihtegale* ‘nightsinger’), whereas others were rare or even hapax legomena, e.g. *edscaept* ‘again-creation’ or *staebplegan* ‘letter-plays’. Both are apparently loan-translation of their lemmata, *edscaept* translating the rare word *palingenesean*; *staebplegan* translating *ludi litterali* – but whereas *ludi litterali* had the lexicalized meaning ‘primary school’, *staebplegan* is just a translation of the literal meaning – schools in Anglo-Saxon England were probably just called *scōl* (> *school*). Some deverbial nouns occur as second elements of compounds, but rarely or not at all as independent words, e.g. *-bora* occurs in *mund-bora* ‘protector’ (lit. ‘protection-bearer’) and *redbora* ‘advisor’ (lit. ‘advice-bearer’), but very rarely independently.

## References

- Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press [many reprints].
- Dietz, Klaus. 2005. “Die altenglischen Präfixbildungen und ihre Charakteristik” in *Anglia* 122, pp. 561-613.
- Gneuss, Helmut. 1955. *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen*. Berlin: Schmidt.
- Ker, Neil Ripley. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liebermann, Felix. 1903–1916. *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. 3 vols. Halle: Niemeyer [reprint: Aalen: Scientia, 1960].
- Sauer, Hans, Elisabeth Kubaschewski. 2018. *Planting the Seeds of Knowledge: An Inventory of Old English Plant Names*. English and Beyond 8. Munich: Herbert Utz.
- Brunner, Karl. 1965. *Altenglische Grammatik*. Nach der Angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer. (referred to as Sievers/Brunner).

**Edition**

Ph = Pheifer, J. Donovan (ed.). 1974. *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Dictionaries**

BT = Bosworth & Toller: *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Joseph Bosworth, T. Northcote Toller (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1898 [many reprints]; *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Supplement*. Toller, T. Northcote (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1921 [many reprints].

CIH = Clark Hall, John R. (ed). *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1960 [many reprints].

Lewis, Charlton T., Charles Short (eds.). *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1897 [many reprints].