

JAVIER E. DÍAZ VERA

RECONSTRUCTING THE ONOMASIOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF OLD ENGLISH VERBS: THE CASE OF TOUCHING, TASTING AND SMELLING

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

¹ The following abbreviations will be used here: IE = Indo-European; L = Latin; Gmc = Germanic; OE = Old English; ME = Middle English; NE = New English.

(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 opaqueness 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).

	PRIMARY LEXICON	DERIVED LEXICON
TOUCHING	strong: hřinan ¹ , strıcan ¹ , tacan ⁶ weak: cyssan ⁱ , grāpian ⁱⁱ , handlian ⁱⁱ , hrepian/hreppan ⁱⁱ , lıccian ⁱⁱ , smacian ⁱⁱ , strācian ⁱⁱ , tillan ⁱ , þaccian ⁱⁱ	āhrepian, āhřinan, ātillan, æthřinan, gecyssan, gefelan, gegrapian, gehrepian, gehřinan, gelıccian, gesmaccian, getillan, geþaccian, onhřinan/andhřinan, oþhřinan
TASTING	strong: teran ⁴ weak: byrigan/birgan ⁱ , gesmæccan ⁱ , sealtan ⁱ , swētan ⁱ	asūrian, gebirgan, gefandian, gesmæccan, gewysrtian, inbirgan, onbirgan
SMELLING	strong: drincan ¹ , reocan ² , stincan ³ weak: æþmian ⁱⁱ , bladesian ⁱⁱ , ēþian ⁱⁱ , hrenian ⁱⁱ , recelsian ⁱⁱ , stēran ⁱ , stencan ⁱ	æsmocian, gestincan, geswæccan, gewyrtian, tōstincan

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: *ā-*, *æt-*, *be-*, *ge-*, *in-*, *on-/and-*,

² Both compounding and affixation are included under this heading.

op- and *tō-*. 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:³

AFFIX *BE-*

1. a. Spelling alternants: BI- (early OE); BI-/BY- (early ME)
 b. Etymological specification: Gmc */bi:/_{prep} ‘by, around’
 c. Phonological specification: */bi/ > /be/ > [bə]
 d. Stress location: [be]’base
 e. Affixal type: # # /X#/_{pref}

2. Input conditions:
 a. Phonological: vacuous
 b. Categorical: \sqrt{X}_v , n X_n ,⁷ adj X_{adj} ,⁸ adv X_{adv} ,⁹ prep X_{prep}
 c. Lexico-semantic: \sqrt{X}_v : [± trans] e.g. *begangan*, *bescmōcian*

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

4. Output restrictions (*be-* verbs): \sqrt{X}_v : [+trans]

5. Semantic specification (*be-* verbs):
 a. [surround_v (x₁)_{Ag/Fo} (x₂)_{Aff/Go} (y₁: <‘in all directions/with’> (y₁))_{Loc/Instr}]Proc
 e.g. *berīdan*: ‘to surround on horseback’: *bescmōcian* ‘to envelop with incense, to incense’;
besprecan ‘to surround by speaking, to talk about’; *befyllan* ‘to surround with foulness,
 to befoul’
 b. [do_v (x₁)_{Ag/Fo} (x₂)_{Aff/Go} (y₁: <‘intensely’> (y₁)_{Manner}]Proc
 e.g. *becēasan* ‘to fight intensely’; *begnidan* ‘to rub thoroughly’; *bedrincan* ‘to drink
 exceedingly, to absorb’
 c. [deprive_v (x₁)_{Ag/Fo} (x₂)_{Aff/Go}]Proc
 e.g. *beheafdian* ‘to deprive of the head, to behead’; *beniman* ‘to deprive’; *belifian* ‘to
 deprive of life, to kill’
 d. vacuous (e.g. *besencan* ‘to sink’)

The semantic specifications corresponding to the remaining OE verbal prefixes can be summarised as follows (full lists of OE verbal prefixes appear in Lass 1994: 203-204, Kastovsky 1992: 377 and Mitchell/Robinson 1992: 58-59):

OE *ā-* (*a-*) 1. [move_v (x₁)_{Ag/Fo} (y₁: <‘out’> (y₁))_{Dir}] (e.g. *berstan* ‘to burst’ > *aberstan* ‘to burst out’)

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_n)] *participant*, [(y_n)] *satellite*, [Ag] *agent*, [Fo] *focus*, [Aff] *affected*, [Go] *goal*.

2. [$\text{do}_v(x_1)_{\text{Ag/Fo}}(y_1: \langle \text{'completely'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Manner}}$ (e.g. *drygan* 'to dry' > *adrygan* 'to dry up')
3. vacuous (e.g. *bacan* 'to bake' > *abacan* 'to bake')
- OE *æt-* 1. [$\text{be/move}_v(x_1)_{\text{Ag/Po}}(y_1: \langle \text{'near/at'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Loc/Dir}}$ (e.g. *standan* 'to stand' > *ætstandan* 'to stand close to')
- OE *ge-* 1. [$\text{reach}_v(x_2)_{\text{Ag}}(y_1: \langle \text{'as a result of'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Manner}}$ (e.g. *ridan* 'to ride' > *geridan* 'to reach as by riding')
2. vacuous (e.g. *campian* 'to fight' > *gecampian* 'to fight')
- OE *in-* 1. [$\text{be/move}_v(x_2)_{\text{Ag/Po}}(y_1: \langle \text{'inside'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Loc/Dir}}$
- OE *on-* 1. [$\text{be/move}_v(x_1)_{\text{Go}}(y_1: \langle \text{'against'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Loc/Dir}}$ (e.g. *hweorfan* 'to move' > *andhweorfan* 'to move against')
- OE *op-* 1. [$\text{move}_v(x_1)_{\text{Go/Fo}}(y_1: \langle \text{'away from'} \rangle (y_1))_{\text{Dir}}$ (e.g. *beran* 'to bear' > *opberan* 'to bear away')
- OE *tō-* 1. [$\text{separate}_v(x_1)_{\text{Go/Fo}}(x_2)_{\text{Go/Aff}}$ (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:

	<i>OED</i>	<i>BT</i>	<i>Hall</i>
fēlan	To <i>handle</i> sth in order to experience a tactual sensation.	To <i>feel, perceive, touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .
grāpian	To <i>touch</i> with the hands; to <i>examine</i> by the touch; to <i>handle, feel</i> .	To <i>grope, touch, feel</i> with the hands.	To <i>touch, grope</i> .
handlian	To <i>touch</i> and <i>feel</i> with the hands, to <i>pass</i> the hand over, <i>stroke</i> with the hand.	To <i>handle, feel</i> .	To <i>handle, feel</i> .
hrepian	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .
hrīnan	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .
strīcan	To <i>stroke, rub</i> lightly	To <i>stroke, smooth, rub</i> .	To <i>pass</i> lightly over the surface, <i>strike, rub, wipe</i> .
tacan on	To <i>touch</i> .	-	To <i>touch</i> .
(ge)tillan	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .	To <i>touch</i> .

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, *handlian* and *grāpian*; 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 *handlian* and *grāpian* are used to refer to more specific subareas within this dimension. According to our interpretation of these two verbs, OE *grāpian* refers to an act of *touching* which normally implies no tactile perception (unless otherwise stated in the sentence), whereas OE *handlian* is used with reference to both *touching* and *feeling*.⁴

LEVEL 1	felan: to PERCEIVE with the senses
LEVEL 2	grāpian: to TOUCH sth <u>with the hands</u>
LEVEL 3	handlian: to TOUCH and <u>FEEL</u> sth with the hands
LEVEL 4	gefēlan: to TOUCH and FEEL <u>deliberately</u> sth with the hands

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 *grāpian* than in OE *handlian*.

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 *grāpian* (where [df] is used to refer to the *definiens* or superordinate term):⁵

(1) OE *grāpian* ‘to touch sth with the hands’

df = (ge)fēlan_v (x₁)_{Exp} (x₂)_{Phen} (y₁: with the hands)_{Instr}

SVO [Acc]:

S = prototyp. animate (Exp)

O = 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, *grāpian* 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 *grāpian* ‘to use the hands in TOUCHING, FEELING OR GRASPING sth’

SV:

S = prototyp. animate (Ag/Exp)

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

OE *grāpian* 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 *grāpian* 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 *gegrāpian*). 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: *hrepian*, *hrīnan*, *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:

OE VERBS	UNPREFIXED COMPLEMENTS	PATTERNS	LEXICAL PRODUCTIVITY		
			VERB	NOUN	ADJECTIVE
Hrepian		SVO[Acc]	<i>Ahrepian</i> <i>gehrepian</i>	<i>Hrepung</i>	<i>ungehrepod</i>
Hrīnan		SV Adj	<i>Ahrīnan</i>	<i>Hrine</i>	-
		SVO[Acc]	<i>andhrīnan</i>	<i>Hrīning</i>	-
		SVO[Dat]	<i>æthrīnan</i>	<i>Æthrine</i>	-
		SVO [Gen]	<i>gehrīnan</i>	<i>Handhrine</i>	-
			<i>onhrīnan</i> <i>ophrīnan</i>	<i>Hrinenes</i> <i>Gehrinenes</i> <i>Onhrine</i>	-
tacan [on]		SVAdj	-	-	-
Tillan		SVO	<i>Atillan</i> <i>getillan</i>	-	-

Table 4: morphosyntactic iconicity of four OE verbs of TOUCHING

As Table 4 shows, OE *hrīnan* 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 *hrīnan* ‘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 wylm **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. *Ðu his **hrinan** meht* [Fates: 614]
lit. ‘You may **touch** it.’

e.g. *Pæt oreð stincð and afulað þe ær wæs 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 derivatives, 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 *forbēodan* ‘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 = $hrinan_v(x_1)_{Ag}(x_2)_{Go}(y_1: \text{forcibly})_{Action}$

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

e.g. *Ne hrepa þu þæs 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 healfe **getillað*** [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 þæt ele **toc on** þæt wæter, þa aras þær upp swiðe 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).

Javier E. Díaz Vera
Facultad de Letras, Filología Inglesa
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
Avda Camilo José Cela, S/N
13071 Ciudad Real, Spain
jediaz@fimo-cr.uclm.es

APPENDIX I:

Internal structure of OE verbs of TOUCHING, TASTING and SMELLING

0. GENERAL PERCEPTION:

(ge)fēlan: to PERCEIVE sth_[Gen, Acc] with the senses

1. TACTUAL PERCEPTION:

1. hrīnan¹: to put a part of the body into contact with sth_[Gen, Acc, Dat]

1.i. **āhrīnan:** to TOUCH sth stretching out (a part of the body)

1.ii. **æthrīnan:** to TOUCH sth moving near

1.iii. **gehrīnan:** to get to sth TOUCHING it

1.iv. **onhrīnan/andhrīnan:** to TOUCH sth moving towards it

1.v. **ophrīnan:** to TOUCH sth moving away from the original position

1.1. **grāpianⁱⁱ1:** to use the hands in TOUCHING

1.2. **hrepian/hreppanⁱⁱ:** to TOUCH sth_[Acc] forcibly

1.2.i. **āhrepian:** to TOUCH sth forcibly stretching out (a part of the body)

1.2.ii. **gehrepian:** to get to sth TOUCHING it forcibly

1.3. **strīcan¹:** to TOUCH sth_[Acc] softly

1.3.i. **gestrīcan:** to get to sth TOUCHING it gently

1.4. **grāpianⁱⁱ2:** to TOUCH sth_[Acc] with the hand

1.4.i. **gegrāpian:** to get to sth TOUCHING it with the hand

1.4.1. **handlianⁱⁱ:** to TOUCH and FEEL sth with the hand

1.4.1.1. **gefēlan:** to TOUCH and FEEL deliberately sth with the hand

1.4.2. **smacianⁱⁱ:** to TOUCH sth softly with the hand

1.4.2.i. **gesmacian:** to get to sth TOUCHING it softly with the hand

1.4.2.1. **strācianⁱⁱ:** 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. **paccianⁱⁱ:** to TOUCH sth softly and repeatedly with the hand, to express love or affection

1.4.2.2.i. **gebaccian:** to get to express sb love or affection by TOUCHING him or her softly with the hand

1.5. **cyssan¹:** to TOUCH sth with the lips, to express affection or as a greeting, reverence or salutation

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

1.6. tillanⁱ: 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. tacan⁶: to PUT the hands into contact with sth_[on + Dat] so as to catch it

2. TASTE PERCEPTION:

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

1.i. gebirgan: to get to TASTE sth_[Gen, Acc, of/ro+Dat]

1.ii. inbirgan: to TASTE sth by eating it

1.iii. onbirgan: to TASTE sth

1.1. smæccanⁱ: to TASTE sth_[Acc] purposely to appreciate its flavour

1.1.i. gesmæccan: to get to sth TASTING it purposely, appreciating its flavour

1.2. gefandian²: 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. teran⁴: to cause sb_[Acc] to TASTE a pungent flavour

1.4. āsūrianⁱⁱ: to cause sb_[Acc] to TASTE a sour flavour

To cause sth to TASTE in a particular way

1.5. swetanⁱ: to cause sth_[Acc] to TASTE sweet

1.6. sealtanⁱ: to cause sth_[Acc] to TASTE salty

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

3. OLFACTORY PERCEPTION:

1. gestincan³: to become aware of sth_[Gen, Acc] because of the effect it has on your nose

1.i. tōstincan: to SMELL out, so as to find sth_[Acc]

1.1. geswæccanⁱ: to SMELL a particular odour of sth_[Acc]

1.2. ēþianⁱ: to SMELL by inhaling sth_[Acc]

1.2.1. drincan¹: to smell by inhaling smoke of sth_[Acc]

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

1.3. stincan³: to cause sb_[Acc] to become aware of the particular SMELL of sth (esp. unpleasant, unless otherwise stated)

1.3.1. æþmianⁱ: to SMELL of the vapours of sth

1.3.1.1. bladesianⁱ: to SMELL of the smoke of sth (esp. religious)

1.3.2. stencanⁱ: to SMELL very unpleasantly

1.3.2.1. rēocanⁱ: to SMELL very unpleasantly and strongly

1.3.2.1.1. hrenianⁱ: to SMELL very unpleasantly and strongly (esp. of wine)

To cause sth to SMELL in a particular way

1.5. gewyrtianⁱ: to cause sth/sb_[Acc] to SMELL pleasantly by using herbs or spices

1.5.1. besmocianⁱ: to cause sth/sb_[Acc] to SMELL pleasantly by burning herbs

1.5.1.1. rēcelsianⁱ: to cause sth/sb_[Acc] to SMELL pleasantly by burning incense (esp. religious)

1.5.1.1.1. stēran²: to cause sb_[Acc] to SMELL pleasantly by burning incense (esp. as a sign of purification)

References

- Cameron, Angus (1973), "A list of Old English texts", in: Frank, Roberta / Cameron, Angus (eds.), *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, Toronto: The 'Dictionary of Old English Project', Centre for Medieval Studies; p. 25-306
- Cortés Rodríguez, Francisco J. (1996), "Outline of an analytical methodology for the study of word formation", in: Pérez Guerra, Javier et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIXth International Conference of AEDEAN*, Vigo: Universidade de Vigo; p. 205-210.
- Díaz Vera, Javier E. (1999), "El concepto de iconicidad léxica en los procesos históricos: algunas implicaciones micro y macroestructurales", in: Feu Guijarro, M^a José / Molina Plaza, Silvia (eds.), *Estudios funcionales sobre léxico, sintaxis y traducción. Un homenaje a Leocadio Martín Mingorance*, Cuenca: UCLM; p. 75-90.
- Faber, Pamela / Fernández Sánchez, Eulalia (1996), "The lexical field of *possession* as a construction of conceptual primitives", in: Pérez Guerra, Javier et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the XIXth International Conference of AEDEAN*, Vigo: Universidade de Vigo; p. 263-268.
- Faber, Pamela / Mairal Usón, Ricardo (1994), "Methodological underpinnings for the construction of a functional lexicological model", *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 15: 193-217.
- Faber, Pamela / Mairal Usón, Ricardo (1998a), "Towards a typology of predicate schemata in a Functional-Lexematic Model", in: Wotjak, Gerd (ed.) *Toward a Functional Lexicology. Hacia una lexicología funcional. Papers in Honor of Leocadio Martín Mingorance*, Berlin: Peter Lang; p. 120-150.
- Faber, Pamela / Mairal Usón, Ricardo (1998b), "Towards a semantic syntax", *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 36: 37-64.

- Faber, Pamela / Mairal Usón, Ricardo (1998c), "The paradigmatic and syntagmatic structure of the lexical field of FEELING", *Cuadernos de investigaciones filológicas* 23-24: 35-60.
- Faber, Pamela / Mairal Usón, Ricardo (1999), *Constructing a Lexicon of English Verbs*, Berlin: Mouton.
- Hiltunen, Risto (1983), *The Decline of the Prefixes and the Beginnings of the English Phrasal Verbs*, Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- Jiménez Hurtado, Catalina (1994), *El componente pragmático en el léxico verbal del español, alemán e inglés*, Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Kastovsky, Dieter (1992), "Semantics and vocabulary", in: Hogg, Richard (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language I: The Beginnings to 1066*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; p. 290-408.
- Kay, Christian J. / Chase, Thomas J. (1990), "Semantic approaches to an historical thesaurus", in: Tomaszczyk, Jerzy / Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara (eds.), *Meaning and Lexicography*, Amsterdam: Benjamins; p. 303-326.
- Lass, Roger (1994), *Old English: a Historical Linguistic Companion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martín Mingorance, Leocadio (1985), "Bases metodológicas para un estudio contrastivo del léxico derivado", *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* 1: 37-54.
- Martín Mingorance, Leocadio (1990), "Functional grammar and lexematics", in: Tomaszczyk, Jerzy / Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara (eds.), *Meaning and Lexicography*, Amsterdam: Benjamins; p. 227-253.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1985) *Old English Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mitchell, Bruce / Robinson, Fred C. (1992), *A Guide to Old English*, 5th ed., Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vázquez González, Juan Gabriel (1999), *El campo de la posesión en inglés antiguo y medio: aplicación del modelo lexemático-funcional al cambio lingüístico*, Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba.
- Dictionaries, Thesauri and Corpora**
- Bosworth, Joseph / Toller, T. Northcote (1898), *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hall, J. R. Clark / Meritt, Herbert D. (1960), *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Healey, Antonette di Paolo / Venezky, Richard L. (2000), *The Complete Corpus of Old English in Electronic Form*, Toronto: The 'Dictionary of Old English Project', Centre for Medieval Studies.
- Oxford English dictionary 2 on CD-Rom* (1994), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rissanen, Matti / Ihalainen, Ossi / Kytö, Merja (1991), *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Diachronic and Dialectal*, Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Roberts, Jane / Kay, Christian J. (1995), *A Thesaurus of Old English*, 2 vols., London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies.
- Roget, P. M. (1982), *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*, revised by Susan M. Loyd, Harlow: Longman.

