

# **The life cycle of constraint rankings**

---

*Studies in early English morphophonology*

RICARDO BERMÚDEZ-OTERO

## Appendix B

---

### Neuter *a*-stem nouns in *Rushworth2*

This appendix lists the nom/acc.pl. and oblique forms of neuter *a*-stem nouns found in *Ru2*; it does not include masculine nouns, or nouns of the *scip* or *word* types. The data are based on a search of Lindelöf's (1897) glossary, checked against Skeat's (1871-87) edition of the text (see Note on Sources). For the classification and presentation of forms, refer to Appendix A.

#### AppB.1 The *wæter* type

nom/acc.pl.

*hrægl* 'garment' *LkGl(Ru)* 24.12; *JnGl(Ru)* 20.5  
*mægen*<sup>1</sup> 'power' *MkGl(Ru)* 13.25  
*sedlo*<sup>2</sup> 'seat' *LkGl(Ru)* 20.46

*wæter* 'water' *JnGl(Ru)* 3.23  
*yfel*<sup>3</sup> 'evil' *MkGl(Ru)* 7.23

obl.

*hrægle* 'garment' *LkGl(Ru)* 10.13; *LkGl(Ru)* 11.51  
(*wæg-*), *JnGl(Ru)* 19.5<sup>4</sup>  
*hræglum* 'garment' *JnGl(Ru)* 20.7, 20.12  
*mægnes*<sup>1</sup> 'power' *LkGl(Ru)* 22.69  
*mægne*<sup>1</sup> 'power' *MkGl(Ru)* 12.30, 13.26; *LkGl(Ru)*  
24.49  
*sedle* 'seat' *LkGl(Ru)* 1.52; (*heh-*) *LkGl(Ru)* 22.30,<sup>5</sup>  
*JnGl(Ru)* 19.13  
*gisedla* 'seat' *MkGl(Ru)* 12.39  
*seotlum* 'seat' *MkGl(Ru)* 12.39  
*swefnes*<sup>6</sup> 'dream' *JnGl(Ru)* 11.13

*wætres* 'water' *MkGl(Ru)* 9.41; *JnGl(Ru)*  
5.3, 5.4, etc. (6×)  
*wætre* 'water' *JnGl(Ru)* 1.26, 1.31, etc.  
(7×)  
*wættre* 'water' *MkGl(Ru)* 9.22  
*wætere* 'water' *LkGl(Ru)* 3.16  
*yfles*<sup>3</sup> 'evil' *LkGl(Ru)* 23.41  
*yfle*<sup>3</sup> 'evil' *MkGl(Ru)* 15.14; *LkGl(Ru)* 11.4,  
etc. (4×)  
*yflum*<sup>3</sup> 'evil' *LkGl(Ru)* 3.19

model paradigm

nom/acc.sg. *wæter*  
nom/acc.pl. *wæter*  
obl(gen.pl.) *wætra*; *wætera*

<sup>1</sup> Disyllabic oblique forms such as *mægnes* (1×) and *mægne* (3×) clearly show that, synchronically, *mægen* is a member of the *wæter* class in Owun's idiolect, as it is in several other OE dialects; see §AppA.1 (note 2) and references therein.

<sup>2</sup> Neut.acc.pl. *sedlo* 'seat' *LkGl(Ru)* 20.46 (Lat *discubitos*), which occurs alongside masc.acc.pl. *seatlas* (Lat *cathedras*) in the same verse, should be set aside as a scribal lapse. Elsewhere *Ru2* has masc.acc.pl. *seotlas* *MkGl(Ru)* 11.15 (Lat *cathedras*) and *seatlas* *LkGl(Ru)* 11.43 (Lat *cadedras* [sic]). Lindelöf (1897: sub voce *sedl*) notes an identical collocation of *seatlas* and *sedlo* in *LkGl(Li)* 20.46, and he therefore suggests that the text of *LkGl(Ru)* 20.46 may be the product of 'mere slavish copying' ('nur sklavisches Nachschreiben').

<sup>3</sup> In *yfel*, the fact that the initial vowel has undergone *i*-mutation shows that the stem was originally disyllabic and contained the suffix *-il-*: < WGmc \*uβil- (Campbell 1959: §199, §204.8, §643.5). In Owun's idiolect, however, the stem has become underlyingly monosyllabic, i.e. /yfl-/: cf. the oblique forms *yflēs* (1×), *yfle* (4×), *yflum* (1×). The same is true of the Mercian dialect of *Ps(A)*; see §7.5 (note 26). Note that, although the root /yfl-/ has nominal, adjectival, and adverbial uses, this appendix only includes noun tokens.

<sup>4</sup> Though *hrægle JnGl(Ru)* 19.5 looks like a dat.sg. form, the syntactic context requires acc.sg.:

Exit ergo iesus portans spinieam coronam et purpuream uestimentum  
eode forðon ðe hælend berende ðyrnenne beg & purple **hrægle**  
fellereode wede

<sup>5</sup> Lindelöf (1897) classifies *LkGl(Ru)* 22.30 *hehsedle* (Lat *thronos*) as acc.pl., but the word has the morphology of a dat.sg., which is neither syntactically nor semantically inappropriate in its context:

et sedeatis super thronos iudicantes duodecim tribus israhel  
& ge sittas ofer **hehsedle** doemmende twelfe stryndum israhela

<sup>6</sup> See §AppA.1 (note 3).

## AppB.2 The *tungol* type

nom/acc.pl.

<i>becon</i> 'sign' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 7.31	<i>aiðulo</i> <sup>1,2</sup> 'disease' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 3.10
<i>becun</i> 'sign' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 13.22; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 6.2, 6.26	<i>beceno</i> <sup>1</sup> 'sign' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 21.25; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 2.23, 9.16, 20.30
<i>foretacun</i> 'sign' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 6.26	<i>becono</i> <sup>1</sup> 'sign' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 21.11; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 12.37
<i>wuldor</i> 'glory' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 4.22	<i>tacono</i> <sup>1</sup> 'sign' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 3.2
<i>wundor</i> 'wonder' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 4.48, 11.47	<i>taceno</i> <sup>1</sup> 'sign' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 20.25
	<i>wepeno</i> <sup>1</sup> 'weapon' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 11.22

obl.

<i>adle</i> 'disease' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 5.29, 5.34; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 5.4	<i>wolcnum</i> 'cloud' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 13.26, 14.62; <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 21.27
<i>becnum</i> 'sign' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 16.20; <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 2.34	<i>wuldres</i> 'glory' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 4.22; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 1.14
<i>facne</i> 'deceit' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 1.47	<i>wuldre</i> 'glory' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 10.37, 13.26; <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 12.27; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 11.4
<i>spadle</i> 'spittle' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 9.6	<i>wundra</i> 'wonder' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 2.11
<i>symbles</i> 'festival' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 15.6; <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 14.5; <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 7.8; etc. (16×)	<i>wundrum</i> 'wonder' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 7.8
<i>symble</i> 'festival' <i>JnGl(Ru)</i> 13.29	
<i>symblum</i> 'festival' <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 12.36	
<i>wolcne</i> 'cloud' <i>MkGl(Ru)</i> 9.7; <i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 9.35	

model paradigm

nom/acc.sg.	<i>tungol</i>
nom/acc.pl.	<i>tungol</i> ; <i>tungolo</i> ; [ <i>tunglo</i> ?] <sup>3</sup>
obl.(gen.pl.)	<i>tungla</i>

<sup>1</sup> These trisyllabic forms can only derive from restructured disyllabic stems. See §7.5, §7.6, §8.3, and §AppA.2.

<sup>2</sup> Etymologically, this is a heavy monosyllabic *ō*-stem noun, and in OE it is generally feminine (Campbell 1959: §589.4). In *Ru2*, however, it is presumably neuter (Lindelöf 1897: sub voce *adl*).

<sup>3</sup> The presence of trisyllabic nom/acc.pl. forms such as *aiðulo*, *bēceno*, *tācono*, and *wēpeno* indicates that items of the *tungol* type are being absorbed into the *hēafod* class (see note 1). However, since there are

occasional instances of syncope in the latter (e.g. *dīowulo* ~ *dīowlo*; see §AppB.4), one would also expect to find sporadic instances of syncopated *tunglo* from restructured /*tungol-o*/; cf. *Or(L) wāpena* ~ *wāpna* (§AppA.2). No such forms occur in *Ru2*, but the precise significance of their absence is difficult to assess. It may be that syncope still applies infrequently to underlyingly trisyllabic neut.nom/acc.pl. forms in Owun's rather conservative dialect (see §7.6); unfortunately, *Ru2* does not provide enough *hēafod*-type nom/acc.pl. forms to draw statistically reliable conclusions (see §AppB.4).

### AppB.3 The *werod* type

nom/acc.pl.

*gæfel*<sup>1</sup> 'tribute' *LkGl(Ru)* 2.24, 23.2

obl.

*æcede*<sup>2</sup> 'vinegar' *MkGl(Ru)* 15.36; *JnGl(Ru)* 19.29 (2×)

model paradigm

nom/acc.sg. *werod*  
 nom/acc.pl. *werod*  
 obl.(gen.pl.) *weroda*

<sup>1</sup> Etymologically, the stem of *gæfel* in unquestionably disyllabic (Campbell 1959: §381, §572): cf. ins.sg. *gaebuli* in *Épinal Glossary* 117 (c. AD 725; for this dating, see Hogg 1992: §1.8 note 1). In Alfred, the noun still behaves synchronically as a member of the *werod* class: e.g. dat.sg. *gafole* (5×) (§AppA.3); cf. *mægen* (§AppA.1 note 2, §AppB.1 note 1). The same is true for Ælfric: e.g. gen.sg. *gafoles* *ÆCHom* I.4.124; dat.sg. *gafole* *ÆCHom* II.33.42, II.38.32, *ÆHom* 24.5, 24.8, 24.11. One would expect the same state of affairs to obtain in *Ru2*, but unfortunately this cannot be confirmed directly, as Owun does not use *gæfel* in the oblique cases. Given the markedly conservative character of his declensional system, however, there is no reason to suspect failure of apocope in the *werod* class (§7.7, §8.6, §AppA.3).

<sup>2</sup> < Lat *acētum* (Campbell 1959: §495, §496, §511, §519).

### AppB.4 The *hēafod* type

nom/acc.pl.

*diowlo*<sup>1</sup> 'devil' *MkGl(Ru)* 3.22, 16.9

*diowla*<sup>1</sup> 'devil' *LkGl(Ru)* 9.49

*hæmdo*<sup>2</sup> 'wedding' *JnGl(Ru)* 2.1

*diowulo*<sup>1</sup> 'devil' *LkGl(Ru)* 8.38

*heofodo* 'head' *LkGl(Ru)* 21.28

*heofud*<sup>3</sup> 'head' *MkGl(Ru)* 15.29

obl.

*diowles* 'devil' *JnGl(Ru)* 8.44

*diowle* 'devil' *MkGl(Ru)* 5.18

*diofle* 'devil' *LkGl(Ru)* 4.2

*diowla* 'devil' *MkGl(Ru)* 3.15, 3.22, 5.9; *LkGl(Ru)* 11.15

*diowlum* 'devil' *MkGl(Ru)* 5.15, 9.38; *JnGl(Ru)* 8.48, 13.2

*heofdes* 'head' *LkGl(Ru)* 12.7

*heofde* 'head' *LkGl(Ru)* 21.18; *JnGl(Ru)* 20.7, 20.12

*hefde* 'head' *JnGl(Ru)* 19.30

model paradigm

nom/acc.sg. *hēofod*  
 nom/acc.pl. *hēofodo*; *hēofdo*  
 obl.(gen.pl.) *hēofda*

<sup>1</sup> Neuter forms occur alongside masculine ones: e.g. neut.acc.sg. *ðæt dīowul LkGl(Ru)* 11.14, masc.nom.sg. *ðe dīawul LkGl(Ru)* 4.3, masc.acc.sg. *ðone dīowul MkGl(Ru)* 7.26, masc.nom/acc.sg. *dīowlas* 8× e.g. *MkGl(Ru)* 6.13. See §AppA.4 (note 2).

<sup>2</sup> See §AppA.4 (note 3).

<sup>3</sup> Uncharacteristically, Lindelöf (1897) fails to report the occurrence of this acc.pl. form in *Ru2*:

Et praetereuntes blasphemabant eum mouentes **capita** sua [...] *MkGl(Ru)* 15.29  
bifærendum gieofulsadun hine cerrende **heofud** hiora [...]

It may be that, though Lat *capita* can only be plural, Lindelöf assumes Owun to have glossed it with a singular noun used distributively (i.e. *each* one of the passers-by moved *his head*). This, however, does not fit with Owun's or Aldred's glossing practice in other passages, where Lat *capita* is rendered by unambiguously plural forms:

		<i>Lat</i>	<i>OE</i>
Owun	<i>LkGl(Ru)</i> 21.28	capita uestra	heofodo iowre
Aldred	<i>MtGl(Li)</i> 27.39	capita sua	heafda hiora
	<i>MkGl(Li)</i> 15.29	capita sua	heafda hiora
	<i>LkGl(Li)</i> 21.28	capita uestra	heafda iuera

It is perhaps not a coincidence, however, that, at the point in question, Owun is glossing virtually the same Latin words as Farmon in *MtGl(Ru)* 27.29:

Praetereuntes autem blasfemabant eum mouentes **capita** sua. *MtGl(Ru)* 27.29  
hiæ þonne foreliorende hefalsadun hroerende † styredun heora **heafud**.

Be that as it may, I assume that *hēofud* in *MkGl(Ru)* 15.29 does not represent the normal treatment of *hēafod*-type nouns in the nom/acc.pl. in Northumbrian. Owun's norm is *hēofodo* ~ *hēofdo*, rather than apocope: cf. *dīowla* (1×), *dīowlo* (2×), *dīowulo* (1×), *hāmdo* (1×), *hēofodo* (1×). In Aldred's North Northumbrian, syncope applies consistently: e.g. *hāmdo JnGl(Li)* 2.1, *hēafda* (3×; see above), *dīowbla MkGl(Li)* 1.32. See further §7.2 (note 6) and §AppA.4 (note 7).

### AppB.5 The *nēten* type

nom/acc.pl.

*mæsleno*<sup>1</sup> '(piece of) brass' *LkGl(Ru)* 21.2

*neteno*<sup>2</sup> 'animal' *JnGl(Ru)* 4.12

obl.

*legedes*<sup>3</sup> 'lightning' *LkGl(Ru)* 11.16

*wibedes*<sup>4</sup> 'altar' *LkGl(Ru)* 1.11

*wibide*<sup>4</sup> 'altar' *LkGl(Ru)* 11.51

*mægdnes*<sup>5</sup> 'maiden' *MkGl(Ru)* 5.40, 5.41;

*LkGl(Ru)* 8.50, 8.51

*mægdne*<sup>5</sup> 'maiden' *MkGl(Ru)* 6.22, 6.28

model paradigm

nom/acc.sg. *nēten*

nom/acc.pl. *nēteno*

obl.(gen.pl.) *netena*

<sup>1</sup> This form contains the Gmc derivational suffix \*-i:n-, which was used to form adjectives of material (Campbell 1959: §643.5(b)): e.g. *gylden* 'golden' (see also Campbell 1959: §204.6), *lēaden* 'leaden' (see also Campbell 1959: §204.6), *seolfren* 'silvern' (< \**seluvrīna*; Campbell 1959: §213 note 1), *stānen* 'made of stone' (see also Campbell 1959: §355.4). Hogg (1992: §7.87) describes *mæslen* as 'Northumbrian'; other dialects have *mæstling*, with the suffix *-ing* and an epenthetic *-t-*.

<sup>2</sup> See §AppA.5 (note 1).

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. nom.sg. *lēgeð LkGl(Ru)* 10.18 (West Saxon *līgett*; see §AppA.5 note 4). The noun oscillates between the masculine and the neuter in OE (Campbell 1959: §579.2): its gender in *Ru2* cannot be determined, though Lindelöf labels it as neuter. As regards the suffix, I remarked in §AppA.5 (note 4) that *-ett* interchanges with *-ot*; Owun's variant appears to represent yet a third possibility.

<sup>4</sup> See §AppA.5 (note 5).

<sup>5</sup> Etymologically, *mægden* is a member of the *nīeten* class; see §AppA.5 (note 1). Unlike *wībed*, however, it fails to resist syncope in the oblique cases; cf. West Saxon dat.sg. *mādene CP(H)* 415.18, *ÆHom* 1.459, *ÆCHom* II.1.3, etc. This suggests that, in tenth-century South Northumbrian, *nīeten*-type stems were undergoing gradual restructuring, with the underlying foot head on the second syllable disappearing on an item-by-item basis; see §7.6, §8.4, and Campbell (1959: §358).