Abstract

In this paper I analyse the internal structure of the OE verbal predicates that form the lexical dimensions of touching, tasting and smelling, as well as their extensions to other lexical domains. My starting point will be the semantic classification of these predicates given in the *Thesaurus of Old English*. This taxonomy, based on componential analysis, is implemented here by the introduction of Coseriu’s distinction between semes and classemes. In order to do so, I propose: (1) a semantic definition of each OE predicate; (2) a reconstruction and analysis of all the combinatory possibilities of each lexical; (3) a semantic classification of these units. Finally, different connections with other lexical domains (especially COGNITION) will be established.

1. Functional Grammar and Lexematics in Historical Lexicography

The main aim of this paper is to expound the theoretical foundations of a historical-lexicographical model for the study of the OE verbal vocabulary.¹ This model is based on the Functional-Lexematic Model (FLM), elaborated by Martín Mingorance (1990) and further developed by Faber and Mairal Usón (1994, 1998abc). In the FLM lexicon, the word is considered the central unit of description, and it is presented along with all its pragmatic, semantic, syntactic, morphological and phonological information.

Starting from a careful and systematic analysis of the semantic entries in OE dictionaries and thesauri and of their syntactic complementation patterns, I have attempted to derive the internal hierarchical grading of the lexical subdimensions of TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING. Following Martín Mingorance (1990: 237-240), I will carry out the construction of a small section of a formalized grammatical lexicon organised onomasiologically in semantic hierarchies in four consecutive stages:

(i) Distinction between the primary and derived lexicon.
(ii) Organisation of this vocabulary in lexical domains.
(iii) Analysis of the complementation and derivational patterns of each lexeme.
(iv) Establishment of a hierarchy of semantic, syntactic, morphological prototypes for the lexical domain.

2. OE primary and derived lexicon

The FLM introduces a neat distinction between the primary lexicon (formed by those units which cannot be synchronically derived by word-formation rules) and the derived lexicon.
(formed by the set of productive derivational rules that exist in a language)\(^2\). Productive affixes are treated as independent predicates in the lexicon, and their representation is made by means of lexical frames (on the analogy with primary lexemes; Martín Mingorance 1990: 238).

When dealing with present states of language, the distinction between productive and unproductive affixes (and, consequently, that between derived and primary lexicon) is clear. However, if we want to measure the indexes of productivity of OE affixes, we must necessarily take into account the fact that this label indicates a period of more than four centuries (c750-c1150), with the consequent fluctuation between the old affixes inherited from IE or Gmc and the newly created Anglo-Saxon ones. Broadly speaking, Gmc made use of suffixes in order to create new verbs from old nouns, adjectives or verbs. The suffix Gmc */-ja-/ was responsible for the creation of a new verbal class, the weak verbs, that came to complement the older strong verb classes, allowing the creation of a large number of new verbal lexemes. Differently to Gmc, OE shows a clear preference for prefixes, most of which are derived from IE adjectival or adverbial elements (Lass 1994: 203). However, as Hiltunen (1983) has shown, this system of OE prefixes was in a state of advanced decay already at the end of the tenth century, mainly because of the growing degree of opacity of most of its components. Therefore, it is not surprising that many of these particles had lost their productivity before the end of this period.

In my analysis of OE verbs of TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING, I will introduce a distinction between underived predicates (where I will distinguish between unprefixed strong verbs [marked for class with Arabic numerals] and unprefixed weak verbs [Roman numerals]) and derived predicates (including both prefixed strong and weak verbs; see Table 1). This lexical distinction between unprefixed strong and weak verbs is justified by the assumption that, as Faber and Fernández Sánchez (1996) state, the more central a member is within a category, the more likely it is to have been lexicalised in a former stage of the history of the language. Since prototypicality entails pre-existence in time, one should expect that verbs expressing actions related to TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING already in PGmc will occupy a higher position within this OE lexical hierarchy than those verbs that entered this dimension in a later stage (i.e. weak verbs, which corresponded to Gmc derived lexical units).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY LEXICON</th>
<th>DERIVED LEXICON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOUCHING</td>
<td>strong: hřinan(^1), strčan(^1), tacan(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak: cyssan(^1), grāpián(^3), handlián(^3), hrepián/hreppan(^4), liccian(^4), smacian(^4), strčían(^3), tillían(^1), þaccian(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASTING</td>
<td>strong: teran(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak: byrigan/birgan(^1), gesmačian, sealtán(^1), swětán(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMELLING</td>
<td>strong: drícan(^1), reócan(^2), stincan(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak: ḍěmícan(^3), bladesícan(^4), ḏíaan(^5), hreñían(^3), recelsícan(^3), stěráñ(^1), stencan(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: primary and derived OE predicates of TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING (a semantic interpretation of these predicates is given in Appendix I)

The resulting list of prefixes is composed of the following units: æ-, æt-, be-, ge-, in-, on-land-, on-

\(^2\) Both compounding and affixation are included under this heading.
Although the creation of fully specified lexical entries for these predicates remains out of the scope of this paper, I will present here a preliminary description of one of these units, OE *be*-, with special reference to its function as a verbal prefix:

**AFFIX BE-**

1. **Spelling alternants:** BI- (early OE); BI-/BY- (early ME)
   - Etymological specification: Gmc */bi:/ prep 'by, around'
   - Phonological specification: */bi/ > /be/ > [bə]
   - Stressed location: [be] base
   - Affixal type: # # /X# /

2. **Input conditions:**
   - Phonological: vacuous
   - Categorial: v*v*, n*n*, adj*adj*, adv*adv* prep*prep*
   - Lexico-semantic: Xv: [+ trans] e.g. *begangan, besmocian*

3. **Word-formation rules (be- verbs):**
   - Lexical transformation: \[Xv \Rightarrow \{[be #]_\text{pref} \{Xv\}_\text{Base}\}_v\]
   - Morphosyntactic output: Deverbal verbs

4. **Output restrictions (be- verbs):** Xv: [+trans]

5. **Semantic specification (be- verbs):**
   - example: \[\text{surround}_v (x_1)_{\text{Ag/FO}} (x_2)_{\text{Adj/GO}} (y_1): '<\text{in all directions/with}'> (y_1))_{\text{Loc/Inst}}_{\text{Proc}}\]
     e.g. *berđan* ‘to surround on horseback’; *besmocian* ‘to envelop with incense, to incense’; *befyllan* ‘to surround by speaking, to talk about’; *beyllan* ‘to surround with foulness, to befoul’
   - example: \[\text{do}_v (x_1)_{\text{Ag/FO}} (x_2)_{\text{Adj/GO}} (y_1): '<\text{intensely}'> (y_1))_{\text{Manner}}_{\text{Proc}}\]
     e.g. *becěasan* ‘to fight intensely’; *begnidan* ‘to rub thoroughly’; *bedrīcan* ‘to drink exceedingly, to absorb’
   - example: \[\text{deprive}_v (x_1)_{\text{Ag/FO}} (x_2)_{\text{Adj/GO}}_{\text{Proc}}\]
     e.g. *beheadđian* ‘to deprive of the head, to behead’; *beniman* ‘to deprive’; *bellīian* ‘to deprive of life, to kill’
   - vacuous (e.g. *besencan* ‘to sink’)


OE *a* (a-)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>(a-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[move_v (x_1)<em>{Ag/FO} (y_1): '&lt;\text{out}'&gt; (y_1)]</em>{\text{Loc}} (e.g. <em>berstan</em> ‘to burst’ &gt; <em>aberstan</em> ‘to burst out’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 For a full description of the analytical methodology for the study of word-formation within the FLM, see Martín Mingorance (1985, 1990) and Cortés Rodríguez (1996). The following signs and abbreviations are used here: [\# #] word limit, [\#] syllable limit, [(x\_v)] participant, [(y\_v)] satellite, [Ag] agent, [Fo] focus, [Aff] affected, [Go] goal.
2. \( \text{do} \left(x_1\right)_{\text{AgPo}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{Manner}} \) (e.g. *drygan* ‘to dry’ > *adrygan* ‘to dry up’)

3. vacuous (e.g. *bacan* ‘to bake’ > *abacan* ‘to bake’)

**OE act-**

1. \( \text{be/move} \left(x_1\right)_{\text{AgPo}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{LocDir}} \) (e.g. *standan* ‘to stand’ > *atstandan* ‘to stand close to’)

**OE gen-**

1. \( \text{reach} \left(x_2\right)_{\text{Ag}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{Manner}} \) (e.g. *rildan* ‘to ride’ > *gerildan* ‘to reach as by riding’)

2. vacuous (e.g. *campian* ‘to fight’ > *gecampian* ‘to fight’)

**OE in-**

1. \( \text{be/move} \left(x_1\right)_{\text{AgPo}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{LocDir}} \)

**OE on-**

1. \( \text{be/move} \left(x_2\right)_{\text{GcPo}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{LocDir}} \) (e.g. *hwearfan* ‘to move’ > *andhwearfan* ‘to move against’)

**OE op-**

1. \( \text{move} \left(x_2\right)_{\text{GcPo}} \left(y_1\right)_{\text{Dir}} \) (e.g. *beran* ‘to bear’ > *opberan* ‘to bear away’)

**OE tō-**

1. \( \text{separate} \left(x_2\right)_{\text{GcPo}} \left(x_2\right)_{\text{GcAff}} \) (e.g. *brecan* ‘to break’ > *tōbrecan* ‘to break to pieces’)

### 3. Lexical domains

The classificatory method used by the FLM differs substantially from that found in more traditional dictionaries. In such thesauruses as the *TOE* and *Roget’s* (1982), macro-areas of human experience are established *a priori* by the lexicographer, who then groups lexemes accordingly. Both dictionaries are based on a top-down (or concept-driven) type of processing, so that the inventories of lexical fields proposed by their compilers are at times vague and difficult to define. Following Kay and Chase (1990: 305):

“indeterminacy and overlapping, problems often associated with the meanings of individual lexical items, are also characteristic of lexical fields. Some constituents of a field are felt to be central, others peripheral, and the inclusion or exclusion of items at the periphery will perhaps seem arbitrary at times.”

This indeterminacy can be solved to a certain degree through the introduction of a bottom-up (or data-driven) type of analysis, such as the one proposed by Faber and Mairal (1999: 82). In their lexicographic approach, the tracing and construction of lexical hierarchies is based not on the lexicographer’s arbitrary choice (as in the case of the inclusion or exclusion of items at the periphery of a field), but rather on the analysis of dictionary definitions, by working upwards from words to concepts.

A first problem arises here, regarding the application of this procedure to the analysis of the OE lexicon: since dictionaries of OE are in fact bilingual dictionaries (from OE to NE or L), lexical entries do not always give complete definitions of the corresponding OE items, but rather rough translations of these into NE. Even the use of more complete dictionaries, such as the *OED*, is not free from difficulties. To start with, the *OED* does not include meanings that died out of the English language before the thirteenth century. Furthermore, the *OED* generally omits those lexical items that have dropped out of use by 1150, so that numerous OE verbal
units are not analysed.

In spite of these difficulties, and by combining semantic information from every available source, building the skeleton of a lexical hierarchy is a relatively easy task. Table 2 is a list of dictionary definitions for eight underived OE verbs of **touching**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OED</th>
<th>BT</th>
<th>Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fēlan</td>
<td><em>To handle</em> sth in order to experience a tactual sensation.</td>
<td><em>To feel</em>, <em>perceive</em>, <em>to touch</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grāpiān</td>
<td><em>To touch</em> with the hands; <em>to examine</em> by the touch; <em>to handle</em>, <em>feel</em>.</td>
<td><em>To grope</em>, <em>touch</em>, <em>feel</em> with the hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handliān</td>
<td><em>To touch</em> and <em>feel</em> with the hands, <em>to pass</em> the hand over, <em>stroke</em> with the hand.</td>
<td><em>To handle</em>, <em>feel</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrepiān</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hriṇan</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strīcan</td>
<td><em>To stroke</em>, <em>rub</em> lightly</td>
<td><em>To stroke</em>, <em>smooth</em>, <em>rub</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tacan on</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ge)tillan</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
<td><em>To touch</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: dictionary definitions of OE verbs of touching*

Following these definitions, a preliminary lexical hierarchy can be established, consisting of four degrees of specification: (1) the archilexeme *fēlan* (a verb used to make reference to **physical perception** of any kind); (2-3) its two basic specifications, *handliān* and *grāpiān*; and (4) the affixed predicate *gefēlan*, whose definition relies on the separate interpretation of its two members (i.e. *ge-* and *fēlan*) rather than on lexicographic evidence. As this hierarchy reflects, *fēlan* occupies a more general section of the semantic area (corresponding to the general action of touching), whereas *handliān* and *grāpiān* are used to refer to more specific subareas within this dimension. According to our interpretation of these two verbs, OE *grāpiān* refers to an act of **touching** which normally implies no tactile perception (unless otherwise stated in the sentence), whereas OE *handliān* is used with reference to both **touching** and **feeling**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th><em>fēlan</em>: to <strong>PERCEIVE</strong> with the senses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td><em>grāpiān</em>: to <strong>TOUCH</strong> sth with the hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td><em>handliān</em>: to <strong>TOUCH</strong> and <em>FEEL</em> sth with the hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td><em>gefēlan</em>: to <strong>TOUCH</strong> and <em>FEEL</em> deliberately sth with the hands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: from **general perception** to **tactile perception**.*

As Table 3 shows, the three OE predicates of **tactile perception** are characterised by the occurrence of the verb **TO TOUCH** in their definitions; the semantic differences between these three predicates are expressed through the progressive introduction of new semantic and pragmatic features (underlined in Table 3), that tend to restrict their meanings into more specific areas of the semantic space (Jiménez Hurtado 1994: 69-74; Vázquez González 1999: 349-360).

---

4 According to the dictionary definitions presented in Table 2, perception is less central in the case of OE *grāpiān* than in OE *handliān*. 
4. Complementation and derivational patterns

From a syntactic point of view, these verbs of *tactile perception* share in common a same complementation pattern, characterised by the presence of a human experiencer in the role of Subject and a concrete entity with shape and form as Object. Here is a fully specified analysis of OE grāpiian (where [df] is used to refer to the *definiens* or superordinate term):\(^5\)

(1) OE grāpiian ‘to touch sth with the hands’
\[
df = (ge)fēlan, (x₁)_\text{Exp} \times (x₂)_\text{Phen} (y₁; \text{with the hands})_{\text{Instr}}
\]

\[\text{SVO [Acc]:} \quad S = \text{prototyp. animate (Exp)} \\
O = \text{prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Phen)}\]

*E.g.* *Se cuma his cneow grapode mid his halwendum handum* [ÆcHom II, 10: 82.39]
lit. ‘The stranger touched his knee with his healing hands.’

But differently to the other two OE verbs of *touching* defined above, grāpiian is also found in intransitive constructions, expressing the capacity of a human experiencer to use his or her hands in order to perceive, touch or grasp sth:

(2) OE grāpiian ‘to use the hands in *touching*, *feeling* or *grasping* sth’

\[\text{SV:} \quad S = \text{prototyp. animate (Ag/Exp)}\]

*E.g.* *He mægnes rof min costode, grapode gearofolm* [Beo: 2081]
lit. ‘Proud of him strength, he made proof of me, groped out ready-handed.’

OE grāpiian thus takes a greater number of complementation patterns than *handlian* and *gefēlan*, which supports our claim that this predicate is the most prototypical one within this small group. This idea can be formulated in terms of the ‘Lexical Iconic Principle’ (Faber/Mairal Usón 1994: 210-211):

LEXICAL ICONIC PRINCIPLE: The greater the semantic coverage of a lexeme is, the greater its syntactic variations.

A second difference between OE grāpiian and its two hyperonyms has to do with its capacity to create new derived lexemes from the basic root (mainly by prefixation, as in OE gegrāpiian). In fact, one could claim that as long as we move down the semantic scale, from the most general to the more specific term, the number of semantic specifications that can be expressed through lexical derivation from a single lexical root decreases (Díaz Vera 1999: 80). I will formulate this idea in terms of the following ‘Lexical Productivity Principle’, which acts as a morphological counterpart of the ‘Lexical Iconic Principle’ referred to above:

---

\(^5\) The examples and references used here have been extracted from *The complete corpus of Old English in electronic form* (Healey/Venezky 2000). For a complete list of abbreviations for Anglo-Saxon works see Cameron 1973.
Lexical Productivity Principle: The greater the semantic coverage of a lexeme is, the greater its morphological productivity.

Following these two principles, it is possible to determine the exact location in our hierarchy of the remaining OE verbs of touching, whose dictionary definitions do not allow a full lexical analysis: hrepan, hřīnan, tacan on and getillan (all of which are defined as ‘to touch’ in the three dictionaries used for this research; see Table 2). The results of my analysis of all the occurrences of these four lexical units in DOEC can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE Verbs</th>
<th>Unprefixed Complement. Patterns</th>
<th>Lexical Productivity Verb</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrepan</td>
<td>SVO[Acc]</td>
<td>Hrepan</td>
<td>Hrepan</td>
<td>ungehrepod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hřīnan</td>
<td>SV Adj</td>
<td>Hřīnan</td>
<td>Hřine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVO[Acc]</td>
<td>Hřīnan</td>
<td>Hřīning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVO[Dat]</td>
<td>Hřīnan</td>
<td>Hřīning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVO [Gen]</td>
<td>Hřīnan</td>
<td>Hřīning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tacan [on]</td>
<td>SV Adj</td>
<td>Tacan</td>
<td>Tacan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillan</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Getillan</td>
<td>Getillan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: morphosyntactic iconicity of four OE verbs of touching

As Table 4 shows, OE hřīnan is the most prototypical verb within this semantic category, so that it occupies the archilexematic position in our hierarchy of OE verbs of touching (immediately after OE (ge)fēlan ‘to perceive’ and before OE grāpian ‘to touch with the hands’). Consequently, the selection restrictions of its two arguments will be reduced to the minimum:

(3) OE hřīnan ‘to put a part of the body into contact with sth’

1. SV Adjunct: S = prototyp. animate (Exp)
   Adjunct = place (Loc)

   e.g. Oððæt deaðes wyelm hran æt heortan [Beo: 2267]
   lit. ‘Until the surging of death touched at the heart.’

2. SVO [Gen]: S = prototyp. animate (Exp)
   O = prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Phen)

   e.g. Du his hriñan meaht [Fates: 614]
   lit. ‘You may touch it.’
gefēlan, [(x₁; prototyp. animate)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂; prototyp. a part of sth)\textsubscript{Phen}]\textsubscript{Exp}
\[ df = gefēlan, (x₁)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂)\textsubscript{Phen} (y₁; with a part of the body)\textsubscript{Instr} \]

3. SVO [Acc]:
\[ S = \text{prototyp. animate (Exp)} \]
\[ O = \text{prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Phen)} \]

e.g. *Ne sceolon ge mine ða halgan hrinan* [PPs: 104.13]
lit. ‘I should not touch my holy god.’

gefēlan, [(x₁; prototyp. animate)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂; prototyp. concrete)\textsubscript{Phen}]\textsubscript{Exp}
\[ df = gefēlan, (x₁)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂)\textsubscript{Phen} (y₁; with a part of the body)\textsubscript{Instr} \]

4. SVO [Dat]:
\[ S = \text{prototyp. animate (Ag)} \]
\[ O = \text{prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Aff)} \]

e.g. *Se hælend & hran egum heora* [MiGl (Ru): 20, 34]
lit. ‘The Saviour touched their eyes.’

gefēlan, [(x₁; prototyp. animate)\textsubscript{Ag} (x₂; prototyp. concrete)\textsubscript{Aff}]\textsubscript{Act}
\[ df = gefēlan, (x₁)\textsubscript{Ag} (x₂)\textsubscript{Aff} (y₁; with a part of the body)\textsubscript{Instr} \]

A similar degree of syntactic variation can be calculated for the archilexeme of the subdimension of *tasting*, OE *byrigan/birgan*, which can appear with either accusative or genitive objects, but with a clear preference for the first. All the other verbs in its subdimension show this same preference for the transitive pattern SVO[Acc], which had almost completely replaced the IE/Gmc genitival pattern that characterised verbs of *physical perception* (Mitchell 1985: 449).

(4) OE *byrigan/birgan* ‘to feel sth (esp. food or drink) with the mouth’

1. SVO [Gen]:
\[ S = \text{prototyp. animate (Exp)} \]
\[ O = \text{prototyp. (Phen) <food, drink>} \]
gefe\textsubscript{lan}, [(x₁; prototyp. animate)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂; prototyp. a part of sth)\textsubscript{Phen}]\textsubscript{Exp}
\[ df = gefēlan, (x₁)\textsubscript{Exp} (x₂)\textsubscript{Phen} (y₁; with the mouth)\textsubscript{Instr} \]

e.g. *he him cydde & sægde þæt he ne moste deaðes byrigan ær he mid his eagum dryhten gesege* [LS 19 (PurifMaryVerc 17): 15]
lit. ‘He spoke to him and said that he wouldn’t taste death before he could see the lord with his own eyes.’

2. SVO [Acc]:
\[ S = \text{prototyp. animate (Exp)} \]
\[ O = \text{prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Phen)} \]

e.g. *Pū pines gewinnes wæstme byrgest* [PPs: 127.2]
lit. ‘You taste the fruits of your work.’
Regarding verbs of SMELLING, the situation we find is very different. On the one hand, most of the verbs included in this group express the causative meaning ‘to cause sb to become aware of a smell’; this is the case the historically earlier strong verbs réocan and stincan, and of the weak verbs ṣjmian, bladesian, hrenian and stencan. The expression of non-causative meanings (i.e. ‘to perceive by smell’) corresponds to prefixed verbs, especially gestincan, indicating a relatively recent lexicalization (stincan ‘to emit a smell’ > gestincan ‘to perceive sth as a result of its smell, to smell sth’). Consequently, the pattern SVO[Acc] is practically universal within this subdimension:

(5) OE gestincan ‘to feel sth because of the effect it has on your nose’

1. SVO [Acc]:
   \[S = \text{protyp. animate (Exp)}\]
   \[O = \text{protyp. concrete (Phen)}\]

   e.g. *Ponne ge pa swetan stencas gestincad* [Lch I (Herb) : 63.4]
   lit. ‘When you smell the sweet odours.’

   \[gefēlan, [(x₁; prototyp. animate)_{\text{Exp}} (x₂; prototyp. concrete)_{\text{Phen}}]_{\text{Exp}}\]
   \[df = gefēlan, (x₁)_{\text{Exp}} (x₂)_{\text{Phen}} (y₁; \text{with the nose})_{\text{Instr}}\]

Special mention must be made now of the syntax of OE causative verbs of TASTING and SMELLING. Here, the semantic role of Phenomenon takes the syntactic function of Subject, whereas that of Experiencer appears as accusative Object:

(6) OE teran ‘to cause sb to become aware of a sour taste’

1. SVO [Acc]:
   \[S = \text{protyp. concrete (Phen)} <\text{food, drink}>\]
   \[O = \text{protyp. animate (Exp)}\]

   e.g. *He is swiðe biter on muðe and he þe tirð on ða protan þonne ðu his ærest fandast* [Bo: 22,.51.2]
   lit. ‘It is very bitter in the mouth and it bites you on the throat as you first sample it.’

(7) OE stincan ‘to cause sb to become aware of a smell’

1. SV:
   \[S = \text{protyp. concrete (Phen)}\]

   e.g. *lc stince swote* [ÆGram: 220,13]
   lit. ‘I smell sweetly.’

2. SVO [Acc]:
   \[S = \text{protyp. concrete (Phen)}\]
   \[O = \text{protyp. animate (Exp)}\]
e.g. Paet oreð stincð and afulad þe ær wes swete on stence [HomU 27 (Nap 30): 156] lit. ‘That breath stinks and fouls you with its sweet stench.’

5. Lexical hierarchies

Through the analysis of the semantic and syntactic data presented above, it is possible to give an almost complete reconstruction both of the meanings of the predicates that form these three lexical subdimensions and of the internal structure of each subdimension. However, there remains a small set of predicates whose exact position in the corresponding semantic area and lexical hierarchy cannot be confidently defined by using dictionary definitions and morphosyntactic analysis.

This is the case of OE hrepian/hreppan, tacan, getillan and their derivates, which according to etymological and comparative evidence are the result of relatively recent processes of semantic extension from the original semantic areas into that of PHYSICAL PERCEPTION. The mixed character of OE hrepian/hreppan is best seen from the analysis of its different definitions in the TOE (vol. 2), most of which represent metaphorical extensions from TOUCHING into CAUSING HARM:

(8) OE (ge)hrepian: 02.05.06 Sense of touch
                02.08.04 Hurt, injury, damage
                05.06.04 Damage, injury, defect, hurt, loss
                07.05.01 Censure, reproof, rebuke
                11.07 Use, service
                13.02.03 An attack, assault

It is clear from these definitions that the different actions expressed by this verb focus on the negative effects on the second participant: TOUCHING is seen here as a means of laying hold on sth forcibly or against someone else’s will, which frequently results in damage or even loss of the touched entity. This negativity is also instantiated by most occurrences of the predicate of PHYSICAL PERCEPTION OE hrepian ‘to touch’, which frequently appears in negative imperative statements, or accompanied by verbs expressing prohibition (e.g. OE forbêdan ‘to forbid’). This implies that the type of physical contact expressed by this predicate was evaluated as negative by OE speakers, i.e. ‘to touch sth against someone’s will, against the law, by force’.

The resulting cognitive schema can be reconstructed as:

(9) OE hrepian [var. hreppan]‘to touch sth forcibly’
    \[ df = h\text{repian} (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2)_{Go} (y_1: \text{forcibly})_{\text{Action}} \]

SVO [Acc]: S = prototyp. animate (Ag)
            O = prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Go/Aff)

    e.g. Ne hrepa pu þaes treowes wæstm [ÆCHom I.1: 181.70] lit. ‘Touch not the fruit of the tree.’

OE getillan focuses rather on the action of ‘touching sth briefly/lightly’, occupying the intersection between PHYSICAL PERCEPTION and MOVEMENT:
(10) OE *getillan* ‘to touch sth briefly/lightly’

SVO [Acc]:
S = prototyp. animate (Exp)
O = prototyp. concrete with shape and form (Phen)

e.g. *Weras bloda & facenfulle na heatfe getillad* [OccGl 50.1.2 (Brock): 54.24]
lit. ‘Cruel and deceitful men do not touch a half.’

Finally, OE *tacan* ‘to put the hands into contact with sth’ (*OED*) reflects perfectly the natural semantic advance from *contact* (‘to put the hands on sth’) to *tactile perception* (‘to touch sth’, the only known sense of Gothic têkan), and from here to *possession* (‘to lay hold of sth’), especially in ME:

(11) OE *tacan* ‘to put the hands into contact with sth’ [*contact > perception*]

SVAdjunct
S = prototyp. animate (Ag/Exp)
A= prototyp. concrete, a surface (Loc/Phen)

e.g. *Sona swa hæt ele toc on hæt wæter, hæ aras hær upp swide mycel fyr* [LS 29 (Nicholas): 273]
lit. ‘As soon as the oil touched the water, there arose a great fire.’

(12) OE *tacan* ‘to get sth into one’s hands by force’ [*perception > possession*]

SVO
S = prototyp. animate (Ag)
O= prototyp. concrete (Go)

e.g. *Se kyng nam heora scypa & wæpna...& þa menn ealle he toc, & dyde of heom þæt he wolde* [ChronD (Classen-Harm): 1072.11]
lit. ‘The king took their ships and weapons…and then captured them all and did of them what he liked.’

6. Conclusions

This methodology for the study of the OE verbal vocabulary is based on the analysis and restructuring of different types of information (dictionary definitions, syntactic patterns, lexical productivity, and etymology). Broadly speaking, the more prototypical a verb is, the more prototypical effects it will show, so that verbs with a higher degree of prototypicality will tend to (i) admit more syntactic patterns, (ii) be synchronically underived (and preferably strong), and (iii) be more productive in processes of lexical derivation.

The FLM lexicon thus contains full descriptions of each word, which appears with all its semantic, pragmatic, syntactic, morphological and phonological properties. As a result of this analysis, the full set of lexical entries has been created, corresponding to the OE subdomains of verbs of touching, tasting and smelling (see Appendix I).
APPENDIX I:
Internal structure of OE verbs of TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING

0. General perception:

(ge)feulan: to PERCEIVE sth\{Gen, Acc\} with the senses

1. Tactual perception:

1. hrînan\(^1\): to put a part of the body into contact with sth\[Gen, Acc, Dat\]
   1.1. ahrînan: to TOUCH sth stretching out (a part of the body)
   1.2. aethhrînan: to TOUCH sth moving near
   1.3. gehrînan: to get to sth TOUCHING it
   1.4. onhrînan/andhrînan: to TOUCH sth moving towards it
   1.5. oþhrînan: to TOUCH sth moving away from the original position

1.1. grāpian\(^2\): to use the hands in TOUCHING

1.2. hreppian/hreppan\(^2\): to TOUCH sth\{Acc\} forcibly
   1.2.1. ahreppian: to TOUCH sth forcibly stretching out (a part of the body)
   1.2.2. gehreppian: to get to sth TOUCHING it forcibly

1.3. strîcan\(^1\): to TOUCH sth\{Acc\} softly
   1.3.1. gestrîcan: to get to sth TOUCHING it gently

1.4. grāpian\(^3\): to TOUCH sth\{Acc\} with the hand
   1.4.1. ge-grāpian: to get to sth TOUCHING it with the hand
   1.4.1.1. handlián\(^2\): to TOUCH and FEEL sth with the hand
   1.4.1.1.1. gefeulan: to TOUCH and FEEL deliberately sth with the hand
   1.4.2. smacian\(^4\): to TOUCH sth softly with the hand
   1.4.2.1. gesmacian: to get to sth TOUCHING it softly with the hand
   1.4.2.1.1. strācian\(^4\): to TOUCH sb (esp. sb’s head, body or hair) softly in one direction with the hand, to express a positive emotion or as a method of healing
   1.4.2.2. paccian\(^4\): to TOUCH sth softly and repeatedly with the hand, to express love or affection
   1.4.2.2.1. geþpaccian: to get to express sb love or affection by TOUCHING him or her softly with the hand

1.5. cyssan\(^5\): to TOUCH sth with the lips, to express affection or as a greeting, reverence or salutation
   1.5.1. gecyssan: to get to express sb affection by TOUCHING him or her softly with the lips
1.6. liccianii: to TOUCH sth/sb with the tongue, to taste it, to moisten a surface or to remove sth from it

1.5.i. geliccan: to get to taste sth, moisten its surface or remove sth from it by TOUCHING it softly with the tongue

1.6. tillan: to TOUCH sth[Acc] briefly/lightly

1.3.i. atillan: to TOUCH sth briefly/lightly stretching out (a part of the body)
1.3.ii. getillan: to get to sth TOUCHING it briefly/lightly

1.7. tacan: to PUT the hands into contact with sth[or + Dat] so as to catch it

2. TASTE PERCEPTION:

1. birgan/byrgan: to FEEL sth[Gen, Acc] (esp. food or drink) with the mouth

1.i. gebirgan: to get to TASTE sth[Gen, Acc, often+Dat]
1.ii. inbirgan: to TASTE sth by eating it
1.iii. onbirgan: to TASTE sth

1.1. smæccan: to TASTE sth[Acc] purposively to appreciate its flavour

1.1.i. gesmeccan: to get to sth TASTING it purposively, appreciating its flavour

1.2. gefandian: to TASTE a small amount of sth[Gen, Acc] to try its flavour

To cause sb to become aware of the particular TASTE of sth

1.3. teran: to cause sb[Acc] to TASTE a pungent flavour

1.4. āsfrīran: to cause sb[Acc] to TASTE a sour flavour

To cause sth to TASTE in a particular way

1.5. swetan: to cause sth[Acc] to TASTE sweet

1.6. sealtan: to cause sth[Acc] to TASTE salty

1.7. gewyrtian: to cause sth[Acc] to TASTE in a particular way by using herbs or spice

3. Olfactory Perception:

1. gestincan: to become aware of sth[Gen, Acc] because of the effect it has on your nose

1.i. töstincan: to SMELL out, so as to find sth[Acc]

1.1. geswæccan: to SMELL a particular odour of sth[Acc]
1.2. *ðrian*: to smell by inhaling s\textsubscript{Acc}th

1.2.1. *drican*: to smell by inhaling smoke of s\textsubscript{Acc}th

To cause sb to become aware of the particular smell of s\textsubscript{Acc}th

1.3. *stican*: to cause sb\textsubscript{Acc} to become aware of the particular smell of s\textsubscript{Acc}th (esp. unpleasant, unless otherwise stated)

1.3.1. *æðmian*: to smell of the vapours of s\textsubscript{Acc}th

1.3.1.1. *bladeian*: to smell of the smoke of s\textsubscript{Acc}th (esp. religious)

1.3.2. *stean*: to smell very unpleasantly

1.3.2.1. *rēocan*: to smell very unpleasantly and strongly

1.3.2.1.1. *hrenian*: to smell very unpleasantly and strongly (esp. of wine)

To cause s\textsubscript{Acc}th to smell in a particular way

1.5. *gewyrtian*: to cause s\textsubscript{Acc}th/sb\textsubscript{Acc} to smell pleasantly by using herbs or spices

1.5.1. *besmocian*: to cause s\textsubscript{Acc}th/sb\textsubscript{Acc} to smell pleasantly by burning herbs

1.5.1.1. *rēcelian*: to cause s\textsubscript{Acc}th/sb\textsubscript{Acc} to smell pleasantly by burning incense (esp. religious)

1.5.1.1.1. *stēran*: to cause sb\textsubscript{Acc} to smell pleasantly by burning incense (esp. as a sign of purification)
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