

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2025.29.07>

UDC: 811.111'373.611

Myroslava M. Sattarova

PhD Student,

Department of Applied Language Studies,

Comparative Linguistics, and Translation,

Faculty of Foreign Philology,

Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine,

Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1031-4444>

e-mail: m.m.sattarova@udu.edu.ua

Alla A. Zernetska

Doctor of Sciences (Linguistics), Professor,

Department of Applied Language Studies,

Comparative Linguistics, and Translation,

Faculty of Foreign Philology,

Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine,

Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8500-5884>

e-mail: a.a.zernetska@udu.edu.ua

THE EVOLUTION OF THE SUFFIX -HOOD IN ENGLISH

Bibliographic Description:

Sattarova, M., & Zernetska, A. (2025). The Evolution of the Suffix -HOOD in English. *Scientific Journal of Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 29, 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2025.29.07>

Abstract

The paper analyses the historical development and semantic transformations of the suffix -HOOD in English. This morphological study traces the suffix from its roots in Old English to its modern usage, illustrating how it has influenced the language and has itself been influenced by social and cultural changes over the centuries.

Initially, the suffix -HOOD, derived from Old English -HĀD, denoted a state, condition, or quality and was commonly used in conjunction with words indicating social orders or stages of life, such as maidenhood or priesthood. The paper examines the etymology and original contexts of -HOOD, highlighting its role in expressing individual identity and collective experience.

As the English language evolved, the -HOOD usage expanded beyond these traditional frameworks, encompassing a broader range of meanings unrelated to social roles. Significant linguistic changes during the Middle English period demonstrate how -HOOD began to be used more generically to denote various

conditions or qualities. This is exemplified by words like *likelihood* and *falsehood*, which abstractly refer to the nature of being probable or untrue, respectively.

The paper also considers the contemporary implications of the suffix in modern English, showing how *-HOOD* continues to adapt to express new social realities and conceptual categories. This is evident in newly coined terms such as *neighbourhood*, which reflects the concept of a local community, and *sisterhood*, which embodies the collective identity of women. These examples demonstrate how *-HOOD* functions as a linguistic tool and a reflection of our evolving social structures and values.

By providing a comprehensive analysis of historical texts, including Old English manuscripts and Middle English literature, as well as linguistic trends observed in these texts and the impact of sociocultural transformations, this paper not only tracks the evolution of *-HOOD* but also contributes to our understanding of the dynamic nature of morphological processes in English. Through this study, the author invites readers to appreciate the complex ways in which language evolves in response to changing human needs and perspectives, making a significant contribution to the fields of historical linguistics and etymology.

Keywords: etymology, social roles, linguistic changes, sociocultural transformations, morphological processes.

1. Introduction.

The issue addressed in the study of the presented paper concerns understanding the dynamics and evolution of the suffix *-HOOD* within the context of its etymological development and changes in its usage throughout the history of the English language. This becomes particularly relevant in the context of the suffix's expanding functional possibilities and its adaptation to express contemporary sociocultural realities and conceptual categories. The practical significance of such a study lies in the more profound understanding of the mechanisms of morphological change in the English language and their impact on linguistic expressions of identity and social roles.

The paper contributes significantly to addressing this issue by comprehensively analysing of the suffix etymology and its historical usage, from Old English to Modern English. The author employs historical texts and linguistic analyses to trace the transformations of *-HOOD*, highlighting its role in shaping abstract and concrete states of identity. This study opens new perspectives on understanding morphological adaptation in language and the importance of morphological changes in reflecting the evolution of social structures and cultural interactions. Thus, the paper contributes to a deeper understanding of general trends in the development of the English language and is valuable to specialists in linguistics, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics, as well as a broader audience interested in language change.

2. Literature Review.

The evolution of the suffix *-HOOD* in English has often been traced back to Old English *hād*, as attested in dictionaries by Bosworth and Toller (1898) and Clark Hall (1996). These works provide foundational lexical and semantic insights, highlighting *-HĀD* as an element denoting "state" or "condition." Subsequent historical transitions toward Middle English have been examined through grammars and surveys (e.g., Dobson, 1968; Freeborn, 2006; Hogg, 1992; Mossé, 1969), which document how *-HOOD* emerged amid broader morphological and phonological developments.

A major aspect of research on *-HOOD* concerns the variability and productivity of affixes over time. Influential in this regard are quantitative studies on morphological productivity by Baayen (1992, 1993), who demonstrates that frequency and transparency significantly affect an affix's ability to form new words. Such an approach has guided corpus-based analyses (e.g., Cowie, 1999; Dalton-Puffer, 1996; Hay & Baayen, 2002), which draw on resources like the British National Corpus (2001) to reveal how *-HOOD* competes with other suffixes and exhibits varying degrees of usage across regions, genres, and time periods. Dalton-Puffer (1996) underscores the role of French influence on Middle English

morphology in particular, noting how contact-driven processes could either inhibit or enhance the productivity of native affixes such as -HOOD.

From a diachronic perspective, morphological corpora and textual editions – like Gradon's (1979) study of Aenbite of Inwyt and the investigations of later Middle English materials in line with Markus (1990) – provide evidence that -HOOD coexisted with other nominalizing suffixes, sometimes displaying semantic overlaps and at other times expressing distinct shades of “rank,” “state,” or “condition.” Early observations in Marchand (1969) placed -HOOD within broader categories of word-formation, whereas more specialized treatments like Martin (1906) and Sauer (1992) highlight the complexity of abstract suffix competition in Middle English. Traces of these patterns are also found in cross-linguistic comparisons of Germanic nominal suffixes (e.g., Wiesner, 1968), suggesting potential parallels for the English case.

Although some works present general outlines of the historical development of -HOOD, detailed mappings of its phonological and semantic nuances remain incomplete. In part, this is due to the scarcity of consistent manuscript data before the standardization phase (see Mitchell & Robinson, 2003; Pintzuk et al., 2001). Efforts to address these gaps have turned toward parsing large text collections – such as corpora described by Kroch (1989), Kroch & Taylor (2000), and Kroch, Santorini, & Delfs (2004) – and employing principles of grammaticalization (Hopper, 1991; Hopper & Traugott, 2003) to explain the evolution of derivational processes. Moreover, dictionary resources like the Oxford English Dictionary (2008) and the Dictionary of Old English (DOE) (2003) offer diachronic attestations that help situate -HOOD in relation to shifting lexical and cultural contexts.

Overall, investigations into the suffix -HOOD underscore the need for a multifaceted approach, combining Baayen's (1992, 1993) model of morphological productivity with corpus evidence (Cowie, 1999; Dalton-Puffer, 1996) and historical lexicographic data (Bosworth & Toller, 1898; Clark Hall, 1996). Such an integration holds promise for uncovering how -HOOD emerged, competed with other affixes, and attained the meanings recognized in Present-Day English.

3. Aim and Objectives.

The main aim of the paper is to provide a thorough analysis of the historical development and morphological transformations of the suffix -HOOD in English, its semantic evolution, and its role in shaping lexical meanings and social identities. The research work aims to identify the critical linguistic and sociocultural factors that have contributed to its adaptation and changes in usage, as well as to assess its contemporary use and productivity within the linguistic system.

These tasks will help provide a deep understanding of the linguistic changes occurring in using of the suffix -HOOD and its impact on the evolution of the English language from the perspectives of historical linguistics, morphology, and sociolinguistics.

Diachronic analysis is used to conduct a historical review of the origin of the suffix -HOOD and its initial uses in Old English, as well as to explore the stages of the suffix's evolution from Middle to Modern English, including changes in meaning and usage.

Semantic expansion is aimed at analysing the semantic changes and expansions with the suffix -HOOD and how they have affected its lexical combinations; assessing how societal changes have influenced the adaptation and reinterpretation of the suffix in forming new lexical items.

Morphological analysis presupposes the examining of the structural characteristics of the suffix -HOOD and its compatibility with different classes of words and studying the productivity of the suffix -HOOD in contemporary word formation.

Sociolinguistic context is used to evaluate how the use of -HOOD affects the formation of social identities and communities and to review examples of contemporary usage of -HOOD in media, literature, and popular culture to illustrate its semantic flexibility and cultural significance.

4. Methodology.

These approaches offer a comprehensive understanding of the suffix -HOOD development in English. Historical linguistics provides a diachronic analysis, tracing the origin and evolution of -HOOD from Old English to Modern English, while the etymological approach explores its semantic shifts over time. Morphological analysis examines the structure, productivity, and interaction of -HOOD with other morphemes, evaluating its frequency in modern word formation.

Semantic changes are explored through conceptual metaphors and metonymies, showing how societal shifts influence the meanings of -HOOD. Methodologically, corpus research quantifies usage and semantic changes, while comparative analysis examines -HOOD alongside similar morphemes in other languages. Interdisciplinary studies incorporate insights from history and sociology to understand the cultural factors shaping language.

Research methods include historical analysis of texts and etymologies and corpus studies using resources like COCA and BNC to track frequency and usage patterns. Data collection employs qualitative reviews of literature and historical documents, and quantitative methods use statistical tools to measure suffix frequency over time. Data interpretation draws on frameworks from historical linguistics and sociolinguistics, applying language evolution models to explain changes.

5. Results and Discussion.

This study offers an original, comprehensive approach to analysing the suffix -HOOD, considering linguistic factors and sociocultural contexts. It focuses on the semantic flexibility of -HOOD and its role in shaping social identities and groups. The research highlights how morphological units like -HOOD adapt to societal changes, with practical implications for language policies, education, and understanding language trends. By examining the historical development of -HOOD from Old English to Modern English, this research aims to expand global knowledge of linguistic change and its social impact.

The study uses diachronic corpora, including the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE), the Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2), and the British National Corpus (BNC), among others. These annotated corpora allow for an in-depth analysis of -HOOD at both the word and phrase levels across different historical periods, supported by dictionaries such as the Oxford English Dictionary and the Middle English Dictionary. By utilizing comparable corpora, the research provides a detailed view of the evolution and productivity of -HOOD as a suffix, especially in its early stages.

5.1. Development of the suffix -HOOD, -HĀD in Old English.

Before analysing data from the YCOE, it is helpful to understand the definition of the suffix -HĀD given in the Oxford English Dictionary. Originally, -HĀD was a standalone noun meaning person, condition, rank, or quality and was used in Old English words like *cild-hād* (childhood) and *mæð-hād* (virginity). Over time, it evolved into the suffix -HOOD and stopped being a standalone word. By the 15th century, the form shifted to the modern -HOOD, which can now attach to various words to express a state or condition, making its usage highly flexible and productive. Many derivatives, such as childhood and priesthood,

trace back to Old English, and the suffix has replaced older forms like -HEAD in words like falsehood and lustihood.

In exploring the historical development of the suffix -HOOD, it is noted that in Old English (OE), the term -HĀD functioned as a free morpheme encompassing meanings such as person, individual, condition, state, nature, form, manner, sex, and order, among others (Oxford English Dictionary, 2002). According to Clark Hall, hād appeared both as an independent word and as a suffix -HĀD, which typically denoted a state or condition, exemplified in words like cildhād (childhood) and mægðhād (maidenhood) (Clark Hall, 1996, p. 164).

Joseph B. Voyles identifies a suffixal element -HAID used with adjectival and nominal bases to form nouns indicating the state or quality of being associated with the base word. He suggests this formation likely originated from compounds in Early Germanic languages (Voyles, 1992, p. 274). In contrast, Klaus Faiß argues that the transition of -HĀD from a free morpheme to a suffix occurred during the Middle English (ME) period. These differing views highlight the need for further investigation into the morphological status of -HĀD in OE (Faiß, 1989, p. 190).

Several factors may have contributed to -HĀD evolving from a free morpheme to a bound suffix. One possibility is its frequent use as the second element in compounds, which could have facilitated its reanalysis as a suffix. Another consideration is Messing's hypothesis that the prevalence of syntactic constructions using the verb form hādian (the OE verb derived from -HĀD) provides insights into its morphological development. According to Faiß, the earliest recorded use of the ME suffix -HŌD, meaning condition or state, dates to around 1440, with the last recorded instance of the free morpheme variant occurring around 1599.

Hans Marchand observes that in OE, -HĀD was a free morpheme conveying meanings like state, rank, order, condition, and character. Formations involving -HĀD were generally compounds where -HĀD functioned as the second element. Most of these were derived from nouns, such as bishophood or childhood. During the ME period, derivations from adjectives began to emerge, expressing meanings like state of being or instance of, as seen in words like falsehood and likelihood. However, Marchand notes that this type of adjectival derivation was never highly productive and is seldom encountered in contemporary English (Marchand, 1969, p. 293).

In Modern English, the suffix -HOOD typically signifies a state or condition, often related to fundamental aspects of human life. Examples include wifehood and widowhood, referring to civil statuses with legal implications, and boyhood and girlhood, which denote life stages. It also represents collectives, as seen in brotherhood and ladyhood. Beyond human concepts, the suffix has expanded semantically to include animals, as in nonce-formations like cathood and duckhood, indicating the nature or state of these animals.

Regarding the phonological changes of this element, there appear to have been two forms that developed differently: one is -HĒDE, and the other is (-)hād. It is assumed that the former is due to West Germanic influence (Martin, 1906; Skeat, 1892) and corresponds to the Modern German -HEIT. The latter is Old English (OE) -HĀD [ha:d], which develops into Middle English (ME) -HŌD [hɔ:d]; in Late ME, it evolves into [ho:d], and during the significant sound change known as the Great Vowel Shift, it becomes [hu:d]. The long vowel was shortened, resulting in Modern English (ModE) [hʊd] (Faiß, 1989, p. 55; Hogg, 1992; Markus, 1990). It is evident that two different forms existed, as ME -HĒDE could not have developed from OE -HĀD (and it does not occur in OE) for phonological reasons. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume a phonological variant -HĒDE that developed into -HEAD, as in maidenhead, which eventually became obsolete over time.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, the Old English free morpheme -HĀD held various meanings such as person, personality, sex, condition, quality, and rank, highlighting its polysemous character. It is theorized that these diverse meanings originated from a single core concept. To understand the evolution of suffixes like -HOOD, it is crucial to analyse linguistic changes across all levels, especially semantics.

Traugott Elizabeth Closs and Richard Dasher emphasize that studying semantic change inherently involves considering polysemy due to how meanings evolve. They propose that older meanings, some of which were primary, often coexist with newer ones, and while old meanings seldom vanish entirely, they are typically retained alongside new interpretations (Traugott & Dasher, 2005, p. 11). Additionally, Paul Hopper describes the gradual accumulation of meanings as layering, a standard process in language development (Hopper, 1991).

The evidence suggests that the suffixes -HOOD, -DOM, and -SHIP have been polysemous for centuries, with their relationships and levels of prominence shifting over time.

In his 1968 study, Joachim Wiesner highlights that the Old English term -HĀD was employed to translate the Latin word *ordo* in religious texts. Importantly, *ordo* did not imply order in a general sense but referred explicitly to ecclesiastical ranks, such as the priesthood. Supporting evidence is found in related Germanic languages; for instance, in Old Norse, the word *heir* denotes a person of high status, more precisely indicating the rank of a priest or even a magician (Wiesner, 1968, p. 8).

In the works of Bede, the weak denominal verb *hādian*, meaning “to ordain, to consecrate”, is attested. Interestingly, this verb is used in constructions where a noun indicating the person being ordained precedes it.

To understand the semantics of -HĀD, we analyse its use in various contexts. The noun -HĀD often means office, while the verb *hādian* refers to ordaining or consecrating, and *hadung* denotes ordination in Old English. Given the religious context of many texts from this period, -HĀD is frequently used in this sense, though it did not lead to widespread language changes. Besides office, *hād* also means person, sex, or status, as seen in compounds like *witness of the groom or bride*.

Syntactically, phrases like [Noun + -HĀD] are semantically compositional with a clear referential meaning, while compounds with -HĀD are non-referential. The study of -HĀD grammatical status shows it can be modified by numerals, adjectives, or genitive nouns, indicating its use as a free morpheme. When -HĀD follows a noun, it takes the genitive case, confirming the syntactic connection between components.

In Hans Sauer's study, the creation of genitive compounds is examined in detail, which serves as a source for our syntactic criteria (Sauer, 1992). Therefore, if elements of the type [Noun/Adjective + -HĀD] show agreement between the main Noun and its modifiers, they function as phrases. This observation is supported by the fact that -HĀD is used with adjectives as modifiers, which is atypical in analyses of previous years (Martin, 1906; Dalton-Puffer, 1996). This suggests that -HĀD could be a source of derivative forms such as -HOOD with an adjective base in modern English.

Many instances of Adjective + -HĀD in Old English show syntactic agreement between the Adjective and -HĀD, making them syntactic phrases. Adjectives appear more frequently before -HĀD than nouns in the genitive case, which is rare. These phrases often have meanings similar to Noun + -HĀD structures, such as *cyninges hāda* and *cynelica hād*, meaning king's rank. Even in cases like *clānan hāde*, where *clānan* seems like a qualitative adjective, it functions as a relational adjective.

These findings highlight the semantic connections and metonymic changes that have

occurred, leading to multiple meanings of -HĀD in modern English. The evolution of -HĀD in Old English reflects the complexity of linguistic change. It transitions from syntactic phrases to compound-like formations, gradually transforming into a suffix without a strict, linear progression. It is essential to understand that linguistic development is rarely discrete or isolated. Research by Kroch (1989), Hopper & Traugott (2003) highlights that old and new forms or structures often coexist for a significant period. This phenomenon, known as synchronic variation, can be observed at the level of individual speakers and entire linguistic communities, demonstrating dynamic and adaptive nature of the language to various communicative needs and contexts.

The coexistence of old and new structures in Old English, where syntactic phrases with -HĀD as nouns exist alongside compounds where -HĀD functions as a morphological head, reflects ongoing linguistic change. This suggests linguistic elements can adapt based on the community's and individual speakers' experiences. Nouns like *biscop*, *fulwiht*, *mægð*, and *arcebisceop* show clear genitive case endings such as -es and -an, indicating that these phrases follow traditional grammatical rules for the genitive case in Old English, rather than being simple morphological forms.

According to Sauer, the word *cyne* in *cynehād* is an allomorph of *cyning*, which is not used as a free morpheme. This fact further emphasizes the complex nature of *cynehād* and allows it to be classified as a compound with a distinct morphological structure (Sauer, 1992, p. 84).

Formations with Noun + -HĀD in Old English illustrate a range of combinations used to describe states, ranks, or offices. Words like *pāpanhād*, *nunanhād*, and *wuduwanhād* are compounds that describe social or functional roles rather than simply referring to a person or object. While some phrases appear to have inflectional endings, these ones act as linking morphemes rather than authentic inflections, as they lack referential content. This reflects how compounds in Old English formed new words with distinct meanings, showcasing the flexibility and evolution of language to meet changing communicative needs.

According to Messing's analysis, one can observe an evolution from an eventive reading to a resultative reading and then to an objectual reading. This means that morphemes or phrases may initially be used to describe a specific event and then shift to expressing the result of that event or even a more general concept related to the event (Messing, 1917a).

In Old English, the formation *hādung* typically reflects an event, such as ordination, but it evolved to express the resulting state of that event. While *hād* refers more broadly to a condition or quality, *hādung* focuses on the result of an action. For example, *hād* can describe a state without referencing the event that caused it. Old English phrases with -HĀD, like *pāpanhād* and *wuduwanhād*, act as compound words describing social roles, where endings are more linking morphemes than authentic inflections. This distinction between specific Old English uses and the abstract qualities conveyed by the modern suffix -HOOD highlights the evolution of linguistic structures.

Old English adjectives with -HĀD often had relational meanings, referring to specific characteristics rather than abstract qualities. For instance, *efen-hād* indicates someone possessing the quality of being even, not just the abstract property. Over time, adjectives transitioned from predicative (describing status) to attributive (expressing general attributes). This shift reflects the broader linguistic evolution from specific meanings in Old English to more abstract uses in modern English.

The stress patterns in Old English poetry, especially in alliterative verse, help to distinguish between phrases and compounds. Stress on -HĀD in phrases suggests it functioned as a syntactic head, while shifted stress in compounds indicates its role as a morphological head. This stress analysis, drawn from Old English poetry, reinforces the idea

that -HĀD retained autonomy within phrases while gradually integrating into complex word formations as a suffix. Understanding these stress patterns offers insight into how Old English morphemes functioned independently and within compounds.

This criterion is based on empirical data and, therefore, is more satisfactory than Marshand's conclusion: "[...] -HOOD today is a suffix, but in Old English, it was, like -DOM, an independent word [...]. Combinations with -HĀD as the second word were considered compound words in Old English" (Marshand, 1969, p. 293).

The study of Old English data has revealed critical features in using the morpheme -HĀD. In syntactic phrases, -HĀD shows grammatical agreement with modifiers, indicating high syntactic integration, while in compound words where -HĀD is the second element, it displays morphological independence with no agreement, reflecting its function as an abstract suffix denoting a state or quality.

The semantic distinction lies in referential interpretation of -HĀD when modified by a noun, pointing to a specific object or situation. However, -HĀD functions abstractly in compounds, indicating a general state or quality. The higher frequency of noun-based -HĀD formations over adjective-based ones highlights its flexibility and evolution from a free morpheme to a suffix, capable of forming complex words with specific and abstract meanings.

The analysis of the frequency of -HĀD formations shows nouns are more frequent and productive bases, as they often function as autonomous units. At the same time, adjectives are more specific and act as modifiers. This reflects a broader range of contexts for nouns compared to adjectives. Applying of Hay's measure suggests that base words have more lexical independence than derivative formations, which are less frequent and semantically transparent, indicating a trend toward decomposition during language processing.

The occurrence of multiple hapax legomena (words used only once) in -HĀD formations underscores its productivity in Old English, showing its role in creating new lexical units. This reflects its transition from a free morpheme to a bound suffix integrated into the language. Further study of Middle English is expected to reveal the continuation of -HĀD development and its variations in forming new lexical structures.

5.2. -HĀD, -HŌD, and -HĒDE In Middle English (ME).

According to the Middle English Dictionary (MED), the suffix -HĀD, -HŌD, and -HĒDE formed nouns denoting rank, position, condition, or qualities typical of the Noun referent. Despite earlier literature suggesting -hōd(e) is the primary form derived from Old English -HĀD, the MED lists -HĒDE as the main form. However, its origins remain unclear, and little evidence supports this. The MED also claims -that -HĒDE appears earlier in specific contexts, which contradicts Old English data. The role of -HĀD, -HŌD(E), and -HĒDE as both suffixes and free-standing elements is poorly understood. Texts are categorized into four time periods based on manuscript dates: M1 (1150–1250), M2 (1250–1350), M3 (1350–1420), and M4 (1420–1500).

Variations in stress patterns between the free element and its use in formations within poetic texts can provide insights into its status. The *Ormulum*, an Early Middle English poem, is written in highly regular 15-syllable unrhymed iambic lines with a pause after the 8th syllable. This consistency helps to determine whether elements are stressed or not. Orm's uniform spelling system and iambic metre can thus be used to assess the status of the Noun -HĀD both when it appears alone and as part of a compound (stressed syllables are marked with an acute accent). Sauer (1992, p. 230) notes that the spelling of -DŌM reflects its phonological status: the vowel in -DŌM must have been long at that time; otherwise, -DĠM would have been used, which is not found in the texts. Thus, the reduction to [dām] likely

happened later in the ME period. This approach can also be applied to *-HĀD*: since it is spelled with one final consonant, the vowel in closed syllables should be interpreted as long.

Orm consistently marks inflectional suffixes as short and unstressed, but whether this applies to derivational suffixes like *-HĀD* remains. In the *Ormulum*, the meter shows that *-HĀD* is stressed when used alone as a free morpheme, but in compounds like *maggdennhād*, stress depends on the position in the line. According to Donka Minkova, in certain metrical positions, such as the fourth foot of the first half-line, *-HĀD* is stressed 90% of the time. In other positions, *-HĀD* tends to be unstressed, indicating that it could still be treated as a free word. Thus, in standalone use, *-HĀD* receives stress, but in compounds, it typically does not. With its strict meter, analysing texts like the *Ormulum* provides valuable insights into the morphological and prosodic behaviour of *-HĀD* (Minkova, 1996).

It is assumed that the forms used in OE were familiar to ME speakers and acted like a reference lexicon (Cowie, 1999; Scherer, 2003). This approach will be extended to other stages: forms from OE and ME were known to Early New English (ENE) speakers, and Modern English (ModE) speakers recognized forms from OE, ME, and ENE. This method can sometimes show that what seems to be a new formation is an older form that existed earlier with higher frequency.

A closer examination of these formations reveals exciting patterns. For example, *spushād*, with its non-native root from Old French (*spouse*), suggests that *-HĀD* was seen as a functional suffix for word formation. Some forms are rare, like *clerichād* (occurring twice) and *wedlachād* (appearing once), referring to the clerical order and the state of marriage. *HĀD* generally signifies conditions or qualities. Most of these formations are noun-based, except for *wreccehēde*, derived from an adjective, meaning miserable. While some noun-based forms are frequent, others, like *wedlachād*, are rare. These formations denote rank/office or state/condition, with adjective-based forms exceptionally uncommon.

In the M2 period (1250–1350), the *-HĀD* suffix disappears, replaced by *-HĒD(E)* and *-HŌD*. The phonological evolution is as follows: Old English *HĀD* [ha:d] becomes Middle English *HŌD* [hɔ:d], which later develops into [ho:d] during the Great Vowel Shift and eventually into the Modern English *HOOD* [hu:d]. Additionally, *-HĒD(E)* [he:d], derived from Old Saxon, coexists with *-HŌD*.

A notable change during this period is the increase in formations with adjectival bases, including many productively formed words (some participles like *blessed*, functioning as adjectives). For instance, in the example, words like *uayrhēde* (*beauty*), *richesse* (*richness*), and *bliss* (*bliss*) illustrate this development.

Walter Skeat and Martin Friedrich suggest that this form may have been borrowed from a continental Germanic dialect, likely Frisian, and that in ME there were two different *-HĒD(E)* suffixes – one native and one borrowed. This claim is based on the idea that the suffix suddenly began attaching to adjectives in ME, whereas, in OE it was only used with nouns. However, this assumption is problematic because, as shown earlier, two coexisting patterns are found in OE: Noun + *HĀD* and Adjective + *HĀD*. Both of these patterns contributed to later formations with the suffix *-HOOD*, contradicting Skeat and Martin's theory (Skeat, 1892; Martin, 1906).

The appearance of the suffix *-HĒD(E)* in ME cannot be ascribed to a sudden increase in adjectival forms. Instead, it is plausible that *-HĒD(E)* was borrowed as a simple form from a continental Germanic dialect.

An alternative hypothesis from the MED suggests that the suffix *-HĒD(E)* is a northern variant of *-HŌD(E)*, influenced by Old Norse (e.g., Old Icelandic *heiðr*, meaning honour or worth). If true, this form would appear more frequently in northern Middle English texts, especially in the Danelaw region.

In contrast, the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, written in the Kentish dialect, shows typical linguistic features of the region, such as the voicing of fricatives and vowel changes. Two instances of *bysihēde* are found in this text, directly translating Old French terms, suggesting that the translator, Dan Michel, used native Kentish resources rather than borrowing foreign suffixes. The text also contains several formations with *-HÖD(E)*, including *spoushōd*, *manhōd*, and *knyzhōd*.

To summarize the examination of Middle English texts, evidence suggests Old Norse's influence. Firstly, many texts from the East Midlands and Northern dialects exhibit the *-HĒD(E)* suffix. Secondly, as noted by Pamela Gradon, irregular plural forms ending in *-e*, such as *þinge* and *ziþe*, do not follow regular derivational patterns (Gradon, 1979, p. 62). These forms are also found in the *Ormulum*, a text known for its significant Old Norse influence.

However, several points argue against Old Norse influence. For one, some texts not belonging to the Danelaw dialects also display the *-HED(E)* form. Additionally, the linguistic changes mentioned could be attributed to the phonological shift from OE [æ] to Kentish [E/e], as suggested by the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). The suffix *-HED(E)* may thus represent a modified form of the OE suffix *-HAD*, or it could be influenced by other morphological factors like *-REDE* (Gradon, 1979, p. 58).

This analysis demonstrates that the *-HĒD(E)* form, which cannot be systematically derived from the Middle English *-HÖD(E)*, is not satisfactorily explained by the existing analyses. In agreement with Dalton-Puffer (Dalton-Puffer, 1996, p. 77), Trips (2009) proposes that *-hēde*, which had developed into a suffix, represents an 'irregular' variant of the standard *-hōd(e)*.

In the M2 period, noun + *-HĒDE/-HÖD* formations became less common for personal offices than Old English and M1, with titles like knight and prince linked more to noble birthright. *Godhōd* had the highest frequency, showing high decomposability, while newer formations like *broþerhēde*, *barnhēde*, and *princehēde* were absent in OE, marking them as recent developments. *Knighthēde*, although a hapax legomenon, was known from OE.

The use of *barnhēde*, with a Scandinavian root, reflects the northern influence, while *childhēde* evolved to signify both the period from birth to puberty and childish behavior. In formations like *worþssiphēde* and *uncunninghēde*, the bases (*worþship* and *uncunning*) were perceived as single lexical units, suggesting that by the M2 period, *-HĀD/-HĒDE/-HÖD* had fully transitioned from free to bound morphemes. This is supported by the rise in new formations, especially those with adjectival bases, indicating productive morphological patterns.

As the form *-HOOD* begins to co-occur with *-HÖD* (and *-HĒDE*), it suggests that *-hōd* underwent a further phonological change during this period, likely associated with the Great Vowel Shift, which could be described as follows: Phonological developments: Middle English *-HÖD* [hɔ:d] evolved into Late Middle English [ho:d], with the spelling *-HOOD* beginning to appear. Meanwhile, the variant *-HĒDE* [he:d] continued to be used.

The most common formations, *manhood*, and *godhood*, are well-established with increasing frequency from the M2 to M3 periods, indicating they are becoming perceived as single lexical units rather than base words with suffixes. These terms describe enduring qualities, representing the state of being a man or a god. Similarly, *youthhood* refers not just to the state of youth but to a person embodying youthfulness.

Formations like *broþerhēde* can also convey collectivity, as in the example of brotherhood referring to both the fraternal bonds and the organization itself. Over time, this term may have shifted also to represent the activities and duties of such groups, as noted in historical examples from the Middle English Dictionary.

A comparison between the M2 and M3 periods reveals that in M3, adjectival formations with -HĒDE / -HŌD are less common than their nominal counterparts. This shift suggests a return to older patterns after a period of change. As Dalton-Puffer observes: “In ME3, the situation starts to resemble M1 again, indicating a gradual return to previous norms after a phase of disruption” (Dalton-Puffer, 1996, p. 79).

At this stage, the suffixes -HĒDE, -HŌD, and -HOOD are well-established for forming terms that describe a state of being [Adjective]. For example, the adjectival base comes from Old French (*povre*), highlighting that many ME formations with Old French bases support the idea that -HĒDE, -HŌD, and -HOOD function as suffixes.

Compared to M2, there is a decrease in the frequency of both noun-based and adjective-based formations in M3. However, the pattern is similar to that in M1, aligning with Dalton-Puffer’s findings.

In the M4 period, new formations with -HĒDE, -HŌD, and -HOOD became more standardized, with *manhood* and *godhood* particularly frequent. *Godhood* expanded to represent not only the nature of God but also depictions of God in art. The development of these suffixes is further evidenced by their use with non-native bases, influenced by Old French, as seen in formations like *caitilhēde* (captured), *gentilhēde* (noble), and *povrehēde* (poor). This confirms that by this period, the suffixal role of Old English *hād* was firmly established.

5.3. -HĒDE / -HŌD / -HOOD in Early Modern English (ENE).

In Early Modern English (ENE), the use of the suffix -HOOD is examined across three periods: E1 (1500–1570), E2 (1570–1640), and E3 (1640–1710). In Middle English (ME), formations like *maidenhēde* (maiden-state), *godhēde* (god-state), and *knighthēde* were common, but by E1, the productivity of -hād, -hēde, -hōd, and -hood significantly declined.

In E1, suffix variations are still present, though with lower frequency. For example, the ME form *childhēde* had 15 tokens, while its ENE counterpart *childhood* had 14, but with a much lower occurrence rate. The only new formation in E1 is the *neighbourhood*. While noun-based forms like *childhood*, *godhood*, *priesthood*, and *brotherhood* continue to appear, their frequency decreases, and adjectival base forms are limited.

In Early Modern English (E1), the formation *likelihood* has the highest frequency, with *unlikelihood* also appearing, showing the productive use of the prefix *un-*. These formations and *falsehood* demonstrate that -HĒDE, -HŌD, and -HOOD clearly function as suffixes, indicating various states. However, the overall number of types remains low, and the *unlikelihood*, as a hapax, does not contribute significantly to the suffix productivity. By the E2 period, -HĒDE disappears, leaving only -HŌD and -HOOD, which continue to decline in frequency.

In *English Dictionary*, the term *livelyhood* initially denoted the state of being lively. Still, by the time it was recorded in a 1702 dictionary, its meaning had shifted to simply a subsistence or livelihood (Kersey the Younger, 1702). This shift suggests that the term had become a fixed lexical item, as indicated by its higher frequency relative to its base form.

Early Modern English has 18 adjective-based formations, with *neighbourhood* showing a notable metonymic shift to mean a surrounding area or district. Historical sources confirm this usage, such as Thomas Willis’s definition of the *neighbourhood* in 1684. The overall frequency and variety of -HOOD formations decline significantly in this period. E3 features few hapaxes, indicating low productivity compared to Middle English, where the suffix was more diverse and frequent.

By Early Modern English, -HOOD had become a well-established suffix with reduced productivity, maintaining core meanings like *office* and *state* while developing new

connotations, such as 'time' in childhood and 'area' in the neighbourhood. This shift marks the transition of -HOOD from a free morpheme to a stable, integrated suffix.

5.4. -HOOD in Modern English (ModE).

In Modern English, the -HOOD suffix remains productive, forming common and rare concepts. High-frequency terms like childhood, neighbourhood, and womanhood represent universal experiences or societal roles, while niche terms like hackerhood and toddlerhood reflect more specific stages or newer concepts. Most formations are based on nouns related to people or life stages, though -HOOD has also extended to animals (e.g., puppyhood, kittenhood).

The use of -HOOD has evolved, with metonymic shifts seen in terms like neighbourhood (now meaning surrounding area) and childhood (denoting a life stage). The suffix has also broadened its base types compared to earlier periods, reflecting more creative and flexible word formation. Despite a decline in specific older meanings, such as office (except in words like priesthood), -HOOD continues to create new abstract nouns, as seen in rare terms like thinghood and only-childhood.

The British National Corpus (BNC) data reveals 78 distinct types of -HOOD formations with a notable productivity measure, showing that the suffix remains actively used in forming new words. The shift from professional to more personal or abstract meanings, such as in clienthood and patienthood, highlights ongoing relevance of -HOOD in Modern English word formation.

6. Conclusions.

The comprehensive analysis presented in this study sheds light on the evolution of the suffix -HOOD from its origins as a free morpheme in Old English to its status as a fully integrated suffix in Modern English. The findings demonstrate the dynamic nature of morphological change and how a morpheme transitions from an independent element to a bound suffix, expanding its usage and adapting to new linguistic and cultural contexts.

From Old English through Middle English and Early Modern English to Modern English, the suffix -HOOD has undergone significant phonological and semantic transformations. Initially functioning as a free-standing morpheme (*hād*) expressing concepts such as state, rank, or condition, -HOOD gradually became a productive suffix that could form nouns indicating various states of being, qualities, or even roles within social structures.

In Old English, -*HĀD* was commonly used in combination with nouns to describe states, roles, or conditions, often within religious or societal contexts, such as *biscopphād* (bishophood) or *mægðhād* (maidenhood). The transition to Middle English saw the emergence of -*HĒDE* and -*HŌD* as alternative forms, influenced by factors like borrowing from continental Germanic dialects or phonological changes. The suffix began to attach to adjectives, leading to new abstract nouns that conveyed qualities like falsehood or likelihood. This period also marked the increase in the productivity of adjectival formations, reflecting a broader expansion in the usage of -HOOD.

As the English language moved into the Early Modern English period, -HOOD became more standardized, consolidating its forms and meanings. The suffix is increasingly attached to nouns and adjectives, reflecting not just states or conditions but also more abstract or symbolic concepts, such as neighbourhood evolving to signify a surrounding area rather than merely the state of being a neighbour. However, the overall frequency and variety of new formations with -HOOD declined, indicating that while the suffix had become well-integrated into the language, its novelty as a productive element was waning.

In Modern English, -HOOD continues to demonstrate productivity. However, it is

predominantly associated with well-established terms that convey significant life stages, roles, or enduring attributes, such as childhood, motherhood, and womanhood. Nonetheless, new terms like hackerhood or thinghood reveal the suffix capacity to adapt to contemporary contexts, expanding to cover concepts outside its traditional scope.

The suffix evolution also reflects broader sociolinguistic trends, where changes in social structures, cultural interactions, and linguistic preferences influence the creation and adoption of new words. The study of -HOOD underscores the importance of considering multiple historical, morphological, phonological, and sociocultural factors in understanding how language evolves.

Overall, this paper highlights the suffix -HOOD as a case study in language adaptive and evolving nature, offering insights into the complex mechanisms of morphological change and the interplay between language, culture, and society. Future studies could explore the productivity and adaptation of other suffixes, such as -DOM and -SHIP, to better understand morphological processes in English and other languages.

References:

- Baayen, H. (1992). Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity. In G. E. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1991* (pp. 109–149). Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2516-1_8
- Baayen, H. (1993). On frequency, transparency and productivity. In G. E. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1992* (pp. 181–208). Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3710-4_7
- British National Corpus (BNC). (2001). *British National Corpus*. Oxford University Press.
- Bosworth, J., & Toller, T. N. (1898). *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary* (with supplements). Clarendon Press.
- Clark Hall, J. R. (1996). *A concise Anglo-Saxon dictionary* (9th ed.). University of Toronto Press.
- Cowie, C. (1999). *Diachronic word-formation: A corpus-based study of derived nominalizations in the history of English* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge]. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.16202>
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (1996). *The French influence on Middle English morphology: A corpus-based study of derivation*. Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110822113>
- Dobson, E. J. (1968). *English pronunciation 1500–1700*. Clarendon Press.
- Faiß, K. (1989). *Englische Sprachgeschichte* [History of the English Language]. Francke. [in German].
- Freeborn, D. (2006). *From Old English to Standard English: A course book in language variation across time* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hogg, R. (Ed.). (1992). *The Cambridge history of the English language* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Gradon, P. (Ed.). (1979). *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyte* (Vol. II). Oxford University Press for the Early English Text Society (EETS 23).
- Hay, J., & Baayen, R. H. (2002). Parsing and productivity. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2001* (pp. 203–235). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hopper, P. (1991). On some principles of grammaticalization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (Vol. 1, pp. 17–35). John Benjamins. doi.org/10.1075/tsl.19.1.04hop
- Hopper, P., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kroch, A. (1989). Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change*, 1, 199–244. doi.org/10.1017/S0954394500000168
- Kroch, A., Santorini, B., & Delfs, L. (Eds.). (2004). *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)* [Corpus]. University of Pennsylvania.
- Kroch, A., & Taylor, A. (Eds.). (2000). *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, Second Edition (PPCME2)*. Corpus. University of Pennsylvania.
- Marchand, H. (1969). *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation* (2nd ed.). C. H. Beck.
- Markus, M. (1990). *Mittelenglisches Studienbuch*. [Middle English Study Book]. Francke. [in German].

- Martin, F. (1906). *Die produktiven Abstrakt suffixe des Mittelenglischen* [The Productive Abstract Suffixes of Middle English]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Strasbourg. [in German].
- Messing, E. E. J. (1917a). Das Suffix -schaft (Eng. -ship, NL. -schap) nach Ursprung und Entwicklung; Wirtschaft, Wirt [The suffix -schaft (Eng. -ship, NL. -schap) according to origin and development; Economy, Host]. *Neophilologus*, 2, 185–190. [in German]. doi:[10.1007/BF01509133](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01509133)
- Messing, E. E. J. (1917b). Das Suffix -schaft (Eng. -ship, NL. -schap) nach Ursprung und Entwicklung; Wirtschaft, Wirt [The suffix -schaft (Eng. -ship, NL. -schap) according to origin and development; Economy, Host]. *Neophilologus*, 2, 272–283. [in German]. doi:[10.1007/BF01509150](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01509150)
- Minkova, D. (1996). Nonprimary stress in early Middle English accentual-syllabic verse. In C. B. McCully & J. J. Anderson (Eds.), *English Historical Metrics* (pp. 95–119). Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, B., & Robinson, F. C. (2003). *A guide to Old English* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Mossé, F. (1969). *Handbuch des Mittelenglischen* [Handbook of Middle English]. Max Hueber Verlag. [in German].
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. (2008). Oxford University Press. URL : <https://www.oed.com>
- Pintzuk, S., Taylor, A., Warner, A., Plug, L., & Beths, F. (Eds.). (2001). *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*. Corpus. University of York.
- Sauer, H. (1992). *Nominalkomposita im Frühmittelenglischen: Mit Ausblicken auf die Geschichte der englischen Nominalkomposition* [Nominal Compounds in Early Middle English: With Perspectives on the History of English Nominal Composition]. Beihefte zur Anglia, 30. Max Niemeyer Verlag. [In German].
- Scherer, C. (2003). *Wortbildungswandel und Produktivität: Eine empirische Studie zur nominalen -er-Derivation im Deutschen* [Word-Formation Change and Productivity: An Empirical Study on Nominal -er Derivation in German]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Mainz.[in German].
- Skeat, W. W. (1892). *A concise etymological dictionary of the English language*. Clarendon Press.
- Taylor, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S., & Beths, F. (Eds.). (2003). *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*. Corpus. University of York.
- The Dictionary of Old English Project (Ed.). (2003). *Dictionary of Old English A–F*. Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.
- Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2005). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Trips, C. (2006). Syntactic sources of word-formation processes: Evidence from Old English and Old High German. In J. M. Hartmann & L. Molnárfi (Eds.), *Comparative studies in Germanic syntax (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today)*, 97, 299–329. John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.97.14tri>
- Trips, C. (2009). Lexical Semantics and Diachronic Morphology: The Development of -hood, -dom and -ship in the History of English. *Linguistische Arbeiten*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, Vol. 527, 267. doi:[10.1515/9783484971318.bm](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484971318.bm)
- Voyles, J. B. (1992). *Early Germanic Grammar*. Academic Press.
- Wiesner, J. (1968). Das Wort *heit* im Umkreis althochdeutscher *persona*-Übersetzungen: Ein Beitrag zur Lehnwort-Theorie [The Word 'heit' in the Context of Old High German Translations of 'persona']. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 90, 3–67. [in German].

Бібліографічний опис:

Саттарова, М. М., Зернецька, А. А. (2025). Еволюція суфікса -HOOD в англійській мові. *Науковий часопис Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 29, 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2025.29.07>.

Анотація

Стаття надає глибокий аналіз історичного розвитку та семантичних трансформацій суфікса -HOOD у англійській мові. Це морфологічне дослідження простежує суфікс від його коренів у староанглійській мові до сучасного вжитку, ілюструючи, як він впливав на мову і сам зазнав впливу суспільних та культурних змін протягом століть.

Спочатку суфікс -HOOD, що походить від староанглійського -hād, означав стан, умову або якість і зазвичай використовувався в поєднанні зі словами, що позначають соціальні стани або

життєві етапи, такі як maidenhood (дівоцтво) або priesthood (священство). Стаття детально аналізує етимологію та первинні контексти вживання -HOOD, підкреслюючи роль суфікса у вираженні індивідуальної ідентичності та колективного досвіду.

З розвитком англійської мови вживання суфікса -HOOD вийшло за межі традиційних рамок, охоплюючи ширший спектр значень, не обов'язково пов'язаних із суспільними ролями. Автор розглядає важливі лінгвістичні зміни періоду середньоанглійської мови, коли суфікс -HOOD почав використовуватися більш узагальнено для позначення різних умов або якостей. Це підкреслюється на прикладах таких слів як likelihood (ймовірність) та falsehood (неправдивість), що абстрактно описують властивість бути ймовірним або неправдивим відповідно.

Стаття також розглядає сучасні прояви вживання суфікса -HOOD в англійській мові, зокрема його здатність адаптуватися для вираження нових суспільних реалій та концептуальних категорій. Це видно у новостворених термінах, таких як neighbourhood (сусідство) та sisterhood (сестринство), які відображають сучасні соціальні структури та форми колективної ідентичності.

Забезпечуючи всеосяжний аналіз історичних текстів, лінгвістичних тенденцій і впливу соціокультурних трансформацій, ця стаття не лише простежує еволюцію суфікса -HOOD, але й поглиблює розуміння динамічної природи морфологічних процесів у англійській мові. Через це дослідження автор запрошує читачів оцінити складні шляхи мовного розвитку у відповідь на змінні людські потреби та перспективи, роблячи вагомий внесок у галузі історичної лінгвістики та етимології.

Ключові слова: етимологія, суспільні ролі, лінгвістичні зміни, соціокультурні трансформації, морфологічні процеси.