

ONGITAN: A CASE STUDY OF EVIDENTIALITY IN OLD ENGLISH PERCEPTION VERBS

0. INTRODUCTION

Studies on evidentiality from a historical point of view are comparatively scarce, particularly in languages such as English, where evidentiality, though not grammaticalized, is mapped by some other means, such as specific lexical items. Among them, perception verbs are particularly relevant. This study focuses on the evidential usage shown by the Old English verb *ONGITAN*, the meaning of which is ‘perceive’. Thus, this verb is the hyperonym of the category of perception verbs in Old English.

The category of evidentiality concerns the different linguistic resources speakers use to qualify the information rendered in a proposition. The qualification of that information may be broadly defined according to the following parameters: a) source of information; b) speakers’ attitude towards the information conveyed in the proposition; c) combination of a) and b). Our point of departure is, however, the narrow definition of evidentiality as the study of linguistic means to express the origin or source of knowledge of the information presented in a proposition. That is, the parameter of source of information is taken as the main focus of study, as well as the consequences of its usage. This view does not ignore the well-known view that evidentiality overlaps with other grammatical categories such as epistemic modality. However, in this paper, due to the type of texts and data available for the study of Old English, as well as to the fact that there have been quite few studies on this topic, we think, following Willet (1986: 55) that before studying interaction between evidentiality and other grammatical areas, it is important to deal first with evidentiality itself. The study of the interaction between the evidential uses of perception verbs in Old English and modality is, thus, out of the scope of this paper.

This research is based on the study of more than 500 contexts related to ONGITAN collected from the Toronto Microfiche Concordance and the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. In these texts, mainly narrative, the speaker or narrator does not reflect his own attitudes nor does he give direct justification for the information presented in the proposition, not even in those texts written in the first person such as the Dialogues of Boethius. Actually, the speaker's evaluation of the facts can be seen in the evaluation of the actions developed by the narrative characters. Consequently, there is a transfer of perspective from the actual speaker to that of the character that experiences the actions narrated. Therefore, when studying Old English texts for evidentiality we prefer to talk about the conceptualizer, following Langacker (1987, 1991) so we can cope with not only those cases where the speaker is the main character as in letters, but also with those where the speaker's attitudes towards knowledge are given through the actions performed by the characters of the stories.

1. ONGITAN IN OLD ENGLISH

As most Old English lexical items ONGITAN is a polysemous word. The following synonyms are found in the Bosworth-Toller Old English dictionary:

ONGITAN/ONGIETAN:

Forms: ongiotan, ongeotan; p. -geat, -get; pl -geaton, getan; pp. ongiten, -gieten

Meanings:

1. Perceive
2. Perceive, see
3. Perceive by hearing
4. Perceive, feel (pain etc)
5. Feel, be of opinion, judge
6. Know, hear of, find out
7. Perceive, understand

8. Recognize, know

8.1 To take a person or thing to be what really is

8.2 To recognize a fact or circumstance

As observed in the first four definitions, this verb refers primarily to the general act of perceiving by means of direct sensory perception that is, by the perception through one sensory mode i.e., visual, auditive or touch (*feeling*).

In this sense it is related to other Old English verbs of perception such as:

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Perceive, see | OE (ge-) seon |
| 2. | Perceive by hearing | OE (ge-) hyran |
| 3. | Perceive, feel (pain etc) | OE felan |

On the other hand, there are other definitions where the perception is related to the outcome of an intellectual process. It is the act of perceiving by means of a thinking process that leads to the 'knowing' result. This intellectual process can be closer to the conceptualizer's experience or to the conceptualizer's stored knowledge as far as it is the outcome of the perception process, that is, the final 'knowing' situation. In this sense, ONGITAN is related to other intellectual verbs, or verbs of knowing such as:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | feel, be of opinion, judge | OE deman, wenan |
| 2. | know | OE cunnan, witan |
| 3. | perceive, understand | OE understandan |
| 4. | recognize, know | OE oncnawan |

In addition, there is one sense of ONGITAN which is closely connected to the idea of 'coming to know something' by means of the information obtained from other people: 'hear of', which in Old English could also be rendered by the sensory verb Old English *hyran*. Another sense which means that the information is obtained by an intentional process on the part of the speaker is *cunian* 'find out'.

2. CRITERIA FOR EVIDENTIAL / NON-EVIDENTIAL USAGE

In the selection of our corpus, our criteria for distinguishing the evidential *versus* the non-evidential usage of ONGITAN basically follows Anderson (1986). However, we have adapted the criteria to make them suitable to be applied to the usage of a lexical item that has not been grammaticalized, and more specifically to an Old English lexical element. The identification of the evidential function is based on the following points:

(a) The lexical element shows the kind of justification for a factual claim available to the conceptualizer making that claim, the conceptualizer being either the speaker or a character.

(b) The lexical element is not the main predicate of the proposition. It is a specification added to a factual claim about something else. This is specially clear when the lexical element is followed by a proposition which refers to an event or state of affairs, although we cannot exclude the possibility of an event being nominalized rather than rendered by a proposition. But we will not go into this topic in this paper.

(c) The lexical element is not grammaticalized and the evidential function is not necessarily its primary meaning.

On the other hand, the criteria to distinguish the non-evidential use of ONGITAN are the following:

1. The verbal lexical element is the main predication of the sentence

2. The lexical element does not refer to an event or situation, but to a concept, simple or complex. For example, in the case of a Modern English perception verb the difference between *I perceive your fear* [non-evidential] and *I perceive you are afraid* [evidential].

3. CORPUS ANALYSIS

3.1. NON-EVIDENTIAL USAGE

As a perception verb, ONGITAN can be found in non-evidential use, as shown in these examples:

(1) hie Geata clifu **ONGITAN** meahton (*Beo* 1907)
they could PERCEIVE [= see] the cliffs of the Gauts^()*

(2) hie ... bearhtm **ONGEATON**, guðhorn galan (*Beo* 1425)
they ... the noise PERCEIVED [= heard], the war-horn singing.

(3) fær **ONGETON** (*Ex* 452)
fear PERCEIVED [= felt]

In these cases, the hyperonymous verb **ONGITAN** can be rendered by more specific sensory verbs, as ‘see’ in example (1), ‘hear’ in example (2), and ‘feel’ in example (3). In all these examples, **ONGITAN** is the main predication of the sentence.

3.2. EVIDENTIAL USAGE

On the other hand, evidential uses of **ONGITAN** show different types of source of information that can be classified according to the way the information was acquired. The typological classification here proposed, as shown in the following table, is based, among others, on Willet’s (1986):

| DIRECT/ATTESTED EVIDENCE | INDIRECT EVIDENCE |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Direct perception <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • visual observation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From oral language: hearsay ▶ Inferred <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inference from direct perception of evidence ▶ Mental construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoning • Deduction • Belief |

(*) The Present-day English version of the contexts included in this paper tries to maintain the original structure as close as possible. No proper translation is intended. However, slight changes in word order have been occasionally introduced to help easier understanding.

3.2.1. DIRECT/ATTESTED EVIDENCE

► Direct perception

• Visual observation

(4) Ða þæt ða **ONGEATON** ða ærran gewinnan þæt se Romanisca here wæs onweg gewite, ða coman hi sona... (Bede 1 9.44.20)

*Then, when the former enemy that **PERCEIVED**, that the Roman army had retreated away, then they came soon...*

3.2.2. INDIRECT EVIDENCE

► Reported

• From oral language: hearsay

(5) ic **ONGEAT** (...) swa swa me sædon his forecwedenan geongran þæt sum wer wunne on þære hefigestan hatunge his gesacan (*GD 2 (C) 27.158.21*)

*I **PERCEIVED** ... as (it) was said to me by his followers, that a certain man suffered in the oppressive hating of his enemy.*

(6) ic hit **ONGEAT** smeaðancollice fram þam cnihte, (...) þæt se ylca arwyrða mæssepreost aras of his ræste & (...) asettum his handum ofer hine (...) and him wæs sona sæl (*GD Pref and 3 (C) 35.247.19*)

*I it **PERCEIVED** thoroughly from that servant (...) that this same honourable priest rose from his rest and (...) he set his hands over him (...) and he was soon healthy.*

We can also include in this category those examples where the knowledge obtained by the conceptualizer was acquired by hearsay, but where the volitional act of acquiring the information by those means is explicitly marked, as for example:

(7) He þa **acsiende smeaðancollice ONGEAT**, þæt on ða ylcan tid wæs þæs biscopes forðfore.....(*GD 2(C) 35.172.15*)

*He then, **inquiring thoroughly, PERCEIVED** that at that same time was the departure of that bishop...*

► Inferred

- Inference from direct perception of evidence

(8) Ða sona se ilca storm eft hwearf & cwom, se ðe ... medmicel fæc gestilde, ond ealne þone dæg swiðe micel & strong wæs, þætte men sweotolice **ONGEATON** meahton, þætte se medmicla fyrst þære stilnesse, þe ðær becwom... heofonlice forgifen wæs (Bede 5 1.386.14)

*Then soon the same storm again returned and came, which ...rested for a short time and all that day very great and strong was, so that men could clearly **PERCEIVE** that the brief respite of that calm, that happened there ... was heavenly granted.*

(9) Ond æfter his æriste (...) him ætwyde ða wunda on his handum and on his fotum, þa gewundedan sidan, þæt hi þy soðlicor **ONGEATON** þæt hit wæs soðlice his agen lichoma ðæt þær of deaðe aras. (Mart 5 (Herzfeld-Binz) 562)

*And after his resurrection (...) [Christ] showed them the wounds in his hands and in his feet and the wounded side so that they more truly **PERCEIVED** that it was truly his own body that had arisen after his death.*

► Mental construction

This category is characterized as the outcome of the conceptualizer's mental process. It embraces the different types of evidential marking according to what they have in common, that is, the fact that they point to the result of a mental process as the main source of knowledge. It aims at grouping categories such as *deduction* and *belief* (Chafe 1986), or *reasoning* (Willet 1986). Willet classifies *reasoning* as a 'mental construct'. Mental constructs are thoughts, beliefs or dreams, but he does not consider them as forming a subcategory. He includes them all within the category of *reasoning* which, in turn, is a subcategory within indirect evidence. However, what we suggest here is that *belief* should be integrated within a mental construction category within the indirect evidence type, but different from that of *reasoning*.

- Reasoning

(10) Ic **ONGEAT** þæt ðes middangeard wæs of swiðe manegum & mislicum þingum gegaderod (*Bo 35.96.12*)

I PERCEIVED (understood) that this world was from many and diverse things gathered.

• Deduction

(11) Þa þæt halige child **ONGEAT** þæt heora lifes ende tonealehte ... (*Mart 5(Herzfeld-Binz) 1380 [JY15/A/11]*)

When the holy child PERCEIVED (realized) that the end of his life was approaching...

• Belief

(12) ic **ONGITE** ðæt þis is swiðe riht racu þæt þu nu recst (*Bo 38.123.4*)

I PERCEIVE (think, believe) that this is a very right telling that you now tell (have told)

(13) **ONGITE** & gelefe þæt wit on riht spyrigen (*Bo 38.118.12*)

I PERCEIVE and believe that we two rightly have investigated.

3.3. COLLOCATIONS OF ONGITAN WITH SENSORY AND INTELLECTIVE VERBS

Once a first typology of the evidential usage of ONGITAN has been presented, a deeper study of this usage is found when analyzing its collocations with other verbs, with which it establishes semantic relationships. This enables us to set up the link between this hyperonymous verb and other perception verbs in evidential usage. Moreover, collocations with other verbs shed light on their semantic specificity.

The collected data allow us to propose the following classification:

a) + Sensory verb (V_S)

a.1) ONGITAN + V_S

a.2) V_S + ONGITAN

b) + Intellective verb (V_I)

b.1) ONGITAN + V_I

b.2) V_I + ONGITAN

Two types of word order can be distinguished in each subgroup. These types are important in the first group, since they are iconic to the sequence of actions and, therefore, they add information about the path towards the perception process itself. However, in the second group, the one including intellective verbs, the subdivision is not conceptually relevant, so this difference is only maintained at the formal level.

a) ONGITAN + Sensory Verb

In the first group, the sensory verbs that collocate with ONGITAN are *(ge)seon*, and *(ge)hyran*. We find two different orders of occurrence, one in which ONGITAN precedes the sensory verb and another one in which ONGITAN follows it. In this case, the word order is relevant for the conceptual interpretation of ONGITAN.

a.1. ONGITAN + V_S

For the first type of combination, we may mention the following contexts:

(14) He drihten þæt **ONGEAT and geseah**, þæt se deofol þone
Iudas lærde, þæt he hine belæwde (*HomS 22 (CenDom 1) 66*)

*He, the Lord, that PERCEIVED and saw, that the devil taught that
to Jude, so that he betrayed him.*

(15) þa **ONGEAT** ic selfa & **geseah** of dæle þæt me þa earfeðu
becwoman (*Alex 166*)

*I myself PERCEIVED and saw from my part that that trouble was
coming to me.*

(16) þær stodon mid Wulfstane wigan unforhte, Ælfere and Maccus,
modige twegen, þa noldon æt þam forða fleam gewyrca, ac hi
fæstlice wið ða fynd weredon, þa hwile þe hi wæpna wealdan

moston. þa hi þæt **ONGEATON** and georne **gesawon** þæt hi þær
bricgeweardas bitere fundon, ongunnon lytegian þa laðe gystas
(*Beo* 79-86)

*There fought with Wulfstan warriors fearless, Aelfere and Maccus,
two great in courage, who would not at this fjord take to flight,
but stoutly against the enemy defended themselves while with their
weapons they might wield. Then they **PERCEIVED** that and
clearly **saw** that this guarding of the causeway was a fierce
encounter.*

In these examples, the source of information conveyed by **ONGITAN** is less specific than that expressed by the sensory verb, which clearly states the perceptual process that acts as the source of evidence available to the conceptualizer. The path of information is an inference closer to the field of experience than to the result of a pure intellectual process. Here the hyperonym **PERCEIVE** could be narrowed to the ‘awareness’ process rather than to the ‘understanding’ one.

The examples also show that the action of **ONGITAN** is the result of an intellectual process confirmed by a direct sensory process specified by the second verb. That intellectual process is related to the act of ‘becoming aware of something’ which is also confirmed by direct sensory perception. The evidence of the inferential process is not necessarily expressed, although we may find some cases in which it is expressed, as can be seen in context (16). In addition, this inferential process is supported by a visual one explicitly stated by the specific sensory verb. What is common to all these contexts can be expressed in the following terms:

From whatever I /we/they know and have experienced, I/we/they
become aware of a certain event which I/we/they also see with our
eyes

a.2. $V_S + \text{ONGITAN}$

Examples of **ONGITAN** occurring after the sensory verb are:

(17) ... ac ða ða he nane fotswaðe on þam snawe ne **geseah** ða
ONGEAT he þæt secuma wæs engel and na mann (*ÆCHom II*, 10
83.69)

*...but he no footsteps in the snow saw, then he **PERCEIVED [realized]** that the stranger was an angel and not a man.*

(18) Ða cyrdon þa englas to ure sybbe & to ure lufan þa hie **gesegon** and **ONGEATON** ðæt Dryhten Crist wæs gecyrred & ymbesald mid mennisce lichoman (*LS 19 (PurifMary) 154*)

When the angels returned to our peace and to our love then they **saw** and **PERCEIVED [realized]** that Christ had returned & (was) surrounded with a man's body.

In these contexts, the specific perception verb preceding ONGITAN contributes to the narrowing of the semantics of the hyperonymous verb as a more intellectual process. In fact, the previous sensory verb highlights that the source of information that leads to the inference process is a sensory one. In most cases, ONGITAN in this position can be rendered by the modern English 'realize' or 'understand'.

In these examples, the direct perception of the situation by the conceptualizer followed by the subsequent inferential process is brought out. This can be paraphrased as:

I/We/They perceive a situation directly and then I/we/they understand and realize that situation

The path to the conceptualizer's knowledge is the direct sensory experience although the mode of knowledge is an intellectual one. In fact, two examples that clarify this relationship between source of knowledge and mode of knowing is found in the corpus, since they show that the direct perception of an event does not necessarily always refer to the mode of knowledge:

(19) Heo wæron stænenre heortan and flintenre, þæt heo þæt **ONGITAN** ne mihton, þæt heo þær **gehyrdon**, ne þæt na cweðan ne mihtan þæt hy þær gesawon (*HomS 40.1 (Nap 49) 21*)

*They had a stony and rocky heart so that they could not **PERCEIVE** what they **heard** there, neither could they say what they saw there.*

(20) *Ær hie wæron stænener heortan & blinde, þæt hie þæt
ONGITAN meahton, þæt his ðær gesawon (HomS 40.3
(McCaveVerccHom 10) 32)*

*Before they had a stony heart and were blind, so that they could not
PERCEIVE what they saw there.*

In addition, it is important to notice the relationship between both perceptual verbs in terms of sequenced actions, since ONGITAN acquires a more intellectual sense, therefore pointing to the mode of knowing, in contrast with the more specific perception verbs, which convey the source of knowledge.

b) ONGITAN + Intellectual Verb

Another group of interesting combinations of ONGITAN is that in which this verb collocates with what can be categorized as intellectual verbs, more specifically those belonging to the subcategory of ‘knowing’. The most frequent verbs in these combinations are *witan* and *oncnawan*; *cunnan* is also found, but less frequently.

As in combinations with sensory verbs, two different orders occur, one in which ONGITAN precedes the intellectual verb and another one in which ONGITAN follows it. The interaction between these verbs, obviously, leads to the interpretation of ONGITAN as carrying more perceptual than intellectual load. However, in this interaction, the experiential basis of the source of knowledge conveyed by this verb is downplayed. Therefore, the intellectual load of ONGITAN is stronger than in collocations with sensory verbs.

b.1. ONGITAN + V_i

Some of the contexts in which verbs of ‘knowing’ follow ONGITAN are:

(21) *Ða þa onsittendas þara horsa mid langum geþersce hyra hors
geswencton, þa ONGEAT & oncneow hyra an, þæt hy gehindrode
wæron for þam gylte, þe hi þone odes man ær on wege his horses
bereafedon & hine his siþes agældon. (GD 1 (H) 2.15.10)*

*Then the riders of those horses, with beats for a long time,
outwearied their horses, then one of them PERCEIVED and knew
that they were hindered for that guilt, that they deprived the man of*

God of his horses before, in the way and had delayed him in his journey.

(22) Sohte he mid fultum of Angolþeode, þe he geara **ONGEAT** & **wiste**, þæt hi ða æfestnesse geleornad & onfongen hæfdon to bysene þære halgan Romanisca cyrican & ðære apostolican (*Bede* 5 19.470.9).

*He tried to find help for him from the people of the Angles of whom he previously **PERCEIVED** and **knew** that they had learned and ...*

(23) Ac se ælmihtega dryhten afyrde him þæt unrihte wrigels of hyra heortan onbyrhte hie mid leohte andgyte, þa hie þæt **ONGEATON** & **oncawan** meahton hwa him to helpe & to feorhnere on þas woruld astah. (*HomS* 40.3 (*McCabeVercHom* 10) 34).

*But the almighty Lord removed those unright coverings from their hearts and illuminated them with the light of understanding and then they **PERCEIVED** and could **know** who sent him to help and nourish in that world.*

b.2. V_1 + *ONGITAN*

There are quite a lot of examples with *ONGITAN* collocated after the verb of knowing:

(24) þurh lac þære halwendan onsægdnesse he **oncneow** & **ONGEAT** heofon lice him forgifen weosan (*Bede* 4 23.330.13)

*Through favours of these saviours sacrifices he **knew** and **PERCEIVED** heavenly for him being forgiven.*

(25) Cuðlice ic þæt ær **wiste** & **ONGEAT**, þæt ðis wæs riht weorðung soðra Eastrana (*Bede* 5 19.470.9)

*Truly I that before **knew** and **PERCEIVED**, that this was the right honouring of the true Easter.*

(26) Ac we þæt cuðlice **oncneowon** & **ONGETON**, þætte þæt tuddur growan ne weaxan meahthe of swylcum geniscipe. (*Bede I* 16.70.6)

*But we that truly **knew** and **PERCEIVED**, that that offspring can increase not grow from such species.*

The collocation of ONGITAN previous to the verb of ‘knowing’ (contexts 20-23) seems to narrow the perceptual path of obtaining information as closer to an unspecified experience from which the information was inferred. This can be paraphrased as:

I/We/They become aware/are aware of a situation and that has become part of my/our/their knowledge.

In contexts 24-26, the source of knowledge seems to be supported by the ONGITAN process, which is then understood as an inference of unspecific reference. This inference is not confirmed by direct sensory experience, but it is related to information already stored in memory. This can be expressed as:

I/We/They realize the situation and that is supported by my/our/their previous knowledge.

3.4. INFERENTIAL ONGITAN: GRAMMATICAL MARKERS

ONGITAN frequently occurs with a number of grammatical markers such as conjunctions, adverbs or prepositions. In these contexts, two functions can be distinguished: the introduction of the evidence (3.4.1.) and the introduction of the ONGITAN process (3.4.2.)

3.4.1. GRAMMATICAL MARKERS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE

The situations or facts that lead to the ONGITAN process are placed either before or after the verb. However, these facts are occasionally highlighted. When this is the case, the evidence is introduced by different lexical grammatical markers, mainly conjunctions and prepositions. The use of these grammatical markers characterizes the status of that evidence in relation to the evidential verb. The evidence can be introduced as:

- a. a means towards the ONGITAN process
- b. a reason that leads to the ONGITAN process

a. The evidence is introduced as a means towards the *ONGITAN* process

þurh [through]

(27) ... hie **ongeaton** þæt he wæs Hælend Crist, **þurh** þæt wundorgeweorc þe he Lazarus awehte of deape... (*HomS 21(BIHom 6) 8*)

... they *perceived* that he was the Holy Christ, *through* that miracle, that he had Lazarus brought from death.

forþy [by that]

(28) **Forðy** he **ongeat** ðæt he ma mehte ðonne ænig oðer (CP 17.113.14)

By that he perceived that he had more strength than any other...

be þam [by that]

(29) **Be þam** we magon **ongitan** & oncnawan þæt we synd ealle gebroðra & eac geswustra þonne we ealle to anum heofenlicum fæder swa ofte clypiað (*Whom 8b 61*)

By that we can perceive and know that we are all brothers and also sisters when we all to one heavenly father so again speak.

midþy / mid þy [by, by means of, through]

(30) **Mid þi** þæt **ongeat** se eadiga Andreas þæt hie to Drihtene wæron gehwyrfede (*LS 1.1 (AndrewBright) 284*)

By that the blessed Andreas perceived that they had turned to the Lord

b. The evidence is presented as the reason that leads to the *ONGITAN* process

forþon þe [BECAUSE]

(31) Halige men þonne **ONGEATON** þæt he wæs soþ Godes sunu;
forþon þe God Fæder stemn wæs gehyred æt his fulwihte, þus
cweþende: þis is min se leofa Sunu, on þæm me wel gelicode
(HomS 10(BIHom 3) 56)

*The holy men then **PERCEIVED** that he was the true son of God,
because the voice of God Father was heard in his baptism, then
saying: this is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.*

sipþan [SINCE]

(32) Ic wende ðæt ic ære swiðe strong on mænegum cræftum, ac ic
ONGEAT swiðe hraðe, **siððan** ðu me forlete, hu untrum ic wæs
(CP 65.465.20)

*I thought that I was strong in many crafts but I **PERCEIVED** it very
quickly **since** you forlet me how weak I was.*

In all these contexts the ONGITAN process is an inferential process whose experiential basis lie in the evidence introduced under the scope of the grammatical markers. The scope of these markers embraces the previous situations or states of affairs that constitute the evidence of the inferential process.

3.4.2. GRAMMATICAL MARKERS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF INFERENTIAL ONGITAN

The evidence, however, may not lie within the scope of grammatical markers. In this case, the inferential process is observed as a consequence or result of some previous situation or state of affairs. This instantiation of the inferential process is often marked grammatically by means of adverbs or correlatives.

forþon [therefore, consequently]

(33) **Forðon** he **ongeat** þæt heo on monegum þingum Godes cirican
ungeþwærodon (Bede 2 4.106.30)

*Therefore /consequently he **perceived** that they in many things of the Church of God differ.*

Forþyþe [therefore, consequently]

(34) Gif he ne **ongate** ðæt him wæs ðæs wana, ac **forðyðe** he **ongeat** ðæt sio ungeðyld oft dereð ðæm mannum ðe micle forhæfdnesse habbað (CP 43.311.25)

*If he did not **perceive** that he had that need, but **therefore/consequently** he **perceived** that often impatience damages other men that have great continence.*

þa ... þa [when...then]

(35) **Þa** þa onsittendas þara horsa mid langum geþersce hyra hors geswencton, **þa ongear** & oncneow hyra an, þæt hy gehindrode wæron for þam gylte, þe hi þone odes man ær on wege his horses bereafedon & hine his siþes agældon. (GD 1 (H) 2.15.10)

*When the riders of those horses, with beats for a long time, outwearied their horses, **then** one of them **perceived** and knew that they were hindred for that guilt, that they deprived the man of God of his horses before, in the way and had delayed him in his journey.*

þæt [so that]

(36) Þy us sealde Dryhten þæt ondgyt, þe he wolde, **þæt** we **ongeaton** his willan & ure sawle hælo ... (HomU 9 (VercHom 4) 88)

*The Lord gave us the advice that we wanted, **so that** we **perceived** his will and the salvation of our soul ...*

þa [then]

(37) Se **þa ongear** þa manigfealdan yfel þe se cyning ðeodric wið þam cristenandome and wið þam romaniscum witum dyde (Bo 1.7.13)

*This **then** he **perceived** the many evils that the king Theodoric did against the Christendom and against the Roman wise men.*

4. CONCLUSION

In the study of the OE hyperonymous perception verb ONGITAN both evidential and non-evidential uses have been found. The more basic non-evidential use gives way to a range of evidential functions.

A typology of evidential functions has been established according to the way the information is acquired (cf. Table 1). Direct evidence involves a direct sensory process for the conceptualizer's acquisition of information, namely, visual perception. The indirect evidence category involves three subcategories which show three sources of inference that differ in degree of detachment from pure sensory experience. It ranges from the most experiential basis of *hearsay* to the more intellectual processes such as *reasoning*, *deduction* and *belief*, which rely on stored knowledge.

The analysis goes on with the study of collocations of ONGITAN, which deepens into the distinction between sensory and intellectual processes that constitute the two main categories of the conceptual structure of the verb. The collocations with both sensory and intellectual verbs reveal a process of specialization of the evidential functions of this verb as an inferential process: according to the input information which triggers the inferential process, the mode of knowledge, basically intellectual, will fluctuate towards either the more sensory end (relying on experiential basis) or towards the more intellectual end of the conceptual structure.

The last section shows a classification of the grammatical markers according to whether they introduce the evidence (conjunctions and prepositions) or the ONGITAN process (adverbs and correlatives). The study of the grammatical markers occurring with an evidential verb is not frequently considered in evidentiality research. However, the relevance of this aspect should be stressed if we consider specific characteristics of the use of the evidential verb.

In the range of evidential uses of ONGITAN presented in this paper, the inferential process seems to acquire a special relevance. This relevance is mainly due to a flexibility inherent to the semantic space of our verb, derived from the oscillation between a more experiential and a more intellectual pole.

Ana Laura Rodríguez & Eugenio Contreras
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L.B. 1986: Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Assymetries. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Eds. W. Chafe and J. Nichols. Ablex, Norwood. 273-312.
- Chafe, W. 1986: Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Eds. W. Chafe and J. Nichols. Ablex, Norwood. 261-272.
- Langacker, R. 1987: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* vol. 1, *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Langacker, R. 1991: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 2, *Descriptive Application*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Willett, Th. 1986: A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12-1: 51-97.
- Corpora*
- Healey, A. and R. Venezky. 1980: *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*. Toronto University Press, Toronto
- The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* 1991: Department of English. University of Helsinki, Helsinki
- Bosworth J. and T.N. Toller 1808 [1983]: *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

* † *