

# Old English *mōdig*: Cognitive Semantics and Cultural Contact

Hans-Jürgen Diller  
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

## 1. Introduction

When we say Cognitive Semantics we tend to think of Prototype Semantics. Somewhat strangely, Prototype Semantics has become extremely popular in Historical Semantics. Dirk Geeraerts published *Diachronic Prototype Semantics* 11 years ago (1997), and there cannot be many works in Historical Semantics without a reference to his book. As Koivisto-Alanko puts it, linguists

took to prototypes with great enthusiasm and fairly little theoretical background. They *feel* right, even though proving their existence is difficult and often futile in terms of providing exact answers. (2000: 26)

The basic tenet of Prototype Semantics is that our categories are structured, fuzzy and flexible. They have a centre and a periphery. The fuzziness of the periphery is important in semantic change: it enables us to adapt our categories to new realities, whether material or intellectual, and to integrate foreign concepts into our system by extending the meanings of native words. The function of the prototypical centre may be seen as imposing limits on those semantic changes, protecting them against the potential anarchy of Wittgensteinian family resemblances (cf. Diller 2001: 6–9). The problem for Historical Semantics is of course that these categories are formed in our minds and that the minds of the past are not accessible to us. In my experience this problem does not always receive sufficient attention. Very often the structure of the categories is inferred from a historical dictionary like the OED, Geeraerts (1997) himself uses the historical dictionaries of Dutch. But the purpose of historical dictionaries is to provide 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century readers with translation equivalents in specific types of context, not with the semantic spaces of the original word-users.

The structures of the categories employed by modern speakers are established in psychological experiments. Leaving methodological refinements aside, psychologists ask their subjects: what do you think of first when I give you word *X* as a stimulus? In a historical context the only possible equivalent to this question is: what did people say or rather write about the concepts or entities which they labeled with word *X*? A very poor equivalent, of course, but the best we have.

Presumably some things are said very often, others only on very special occasions. And we will not be far wrong if we conclude that the things often said are typical, and those rarely said are more marginal. The prototype approach may be applicable in Historical Semantics in this rather extenuated sense. But the information needed to establish these prototypes cannot be given in dictionaries; it can only be found in corpora. This is probably why Geeraerts and his team have combined the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics with a research method which is corpus-based.<sup>1</sup>

Students of Old English are uniquely fortunate to have a virtually complete corpus of extant texts known as the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (DOEC) which has been compiled at the University of Toronto in preparation for the new *Dictionary of Old English*.<sup>2</sup> It is tempting to trace the semantic changes undergone by a much discussed lexeme like OE *mod* and to explain them in terms of foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://wwwling.arts.kuleuven.be/qlvl/profile.htm>, last visited 17/1/09.

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the corpus see <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/oec/about.html>.

cultural influence. A search of the DOEC for the string *mod* (and the much rarer *mood*) returned the figures shown in Table 1:

Table 1: OE <i>mod</i> : matches, search strings, morphemes					
	“matches” <sup>3</sup>	strings <i>mood</i> or <i>mod</i>	N of morphemes { <i>mod</i> }	N of OE words <sup>4</sup>	{ <i>mod</i> }/1000 OE words
Poetry	946	996	851	177,496	4.8
Prose	5,055	5,739	5,448	2,125,808	2.6
Glosses	2,812	3,020	1,173	698,863	1.7
Total	8,813	9,755	7,472	3,002,167	2.5

Clearly the sheer number of occurrences makes any close analysis impossible. I will therefore concentrate on the adjective, *modig*, which was found 81 times in the verse and 86 times in the prose part of the DOEC. My leading question is: Who or what is called *modig*, in what contexts, and by whom? I understand ‘context’ in a very broad sense, including syntax, (extra-linguistic) situation, and (literary) genre. This procedure will enable me to postpone the much-discussed question of various ‘traditions’ which may have influenced the Anglo-Saxons’ psychological understanding to the very end and to draw on the contextual evidence for my decision.<sup>5</sup> *Modig* occurs frequently enough to be found in a large variety of texts, but not so frequently that we get drowned in the data: just right for a detailed analysis. The evidence will demonstrate the well-known fact that in different genres different characters are called *modig* and that different senses of *modig* owe their existence to different cultural traditions. One of the purposes of this paper is to show a common semantic core ‘behind’ these senses as well as the procedures that enable readers (both contemporary and modern) to construe those different senses as clearly distinct and normally unambiguous.

## 2. *Modig* in OE Poetry

I begin with the poetry, which I sub-divide into three main categories:

- Secular heroic poetry (*Beowulf*, *Battle of Maldon*, *Widsith*)
- Old Testament poetry (*Genesis A and B*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, *Judith*)
- Saints’ Lives and other religious poetry (*Andreas*, *Guthlac A and B*, *Juliana*, *Elene*, *Dream of the Rood*).

### 2.1. Secular poetry

*Widsith* and *The Battle of Maldon* can be dealt with very briefly, because they yield a much simpler picture than *Beowulf*. In *Widsith* only Alewih, ruler of the Danes, is called *modig*:

se wæs þara manna modgast ealra. (ASPR 3:150, l. 36)<sup>6</sup>  
 (“he was of all those men the most *modig*”)

*The Battle of Maldon* shows two instances of *modig* (ASPR 6:7ff., ll. 80, 149). Both times it is predicated of warriors, both times it refers to courage in the fight — as presumably it does in *Widsith*.

<sup>3</sup> The number of strings exceeds that of matches, because the search string(s) may occur more than once in a “match”.

<sup>4</sup> For these figures I owe thanks to the kindness of the DOE project team (personal communication Professor Antonette diPaolo Healey, 17 November, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Godden (1985) distinguishes between a “classical” and a “vernacular” tradition. Kiricsi (2005: 21-60) gives an extensive account of these as well as of the earlier distinction between “Germanic” and “Christian” traditions.

<sup>6</sup> OE poetry is quoted from ASPR. Volume and page references are given only when considered helpful.

In *Beowulf* the word occurs 15 times. Again, only warriors are *modig*. Beowulf himself seven times, Grendel and his dam, never. But sometimes the word occurs in contexts where courage in a fight is not at issue: Hrothgar and Beowulf are “brave in the council” (*modige on meþle*, ASPR 3, 1.1876), once a warrior goes “brave to the beer” — to the mead rather (*to medo modig*, 1.604). One instance is especially interesting: on leaving the Danes Beowulf returns the sword which Unferth had given him to kill Grendel’s dam and which had proved useless in the event. Beowulf does not mention this failure, and the poet comments: *þæt wæs modig secg* (“that was a *modig* man”, 1.1812). We would call Beowulf’s behaviour generous, but hardly brave. What does our example have in common with the other occurrences? Perhaps: it is “befitting a warrior”. It befits a warrior not only to fight, to risk his life and to take the lives of others, but also to drink mead, to speak in the council, and to be discreet on the right occasion. It is only in *Beowulf* that *modig* is used in this wide sense. But then, it is only in *Beowulf* that we are given such a broad picture of the heroic way of life. To use the language of *1066 and All That*, in secular heroic poetry *modig* is always “a good thing”.

## 2.2. Old Testament Poetry

When we turn to Old Testament poetry, this is no longer absolutely true. In *Exodus* the Red Sea is called *modig*, and the verb *modigian* is applied to it as well (ASPR 1:91ff., ll. 469, 458). And even God himself is called *modig*, by Moses (1.273).<sup>7</sup> The problems are reflected in the Everyman translations of Anglo-Saxon poetry:

**Q.1a:** *Exodus* 275 (about God): *modig* and *mægenrof* [“power-bold”];

Gordon (p. 116): fearless and famed for might;

Bradley (p. 57): valiant and renowned for strength.

**Q.1b:** *Exodus* 459: mere *modgode*;

Gordon (p. 117): the sea raged;

Bradley (p. 62): the ocean raged.

**Q.1c:** *Exodus* 469: merestream [“sea-stream”] *modig*;

Gordon (p. 117): the raging sea;

Bradley (p. 62): the moody swirl of the sea.

In my native German “mutig” sounds just as awkward as “brave” seems to sound to Gordon and Bradley. Why is that so? Bravery or courage implies the readiness to run a risk, in a fighting situation even to risk one’s life, which is something an immortal god and a natural phenomenon cannot do. This constraint does not seem to operate in OE.

Another difference between Old Testament poems and secular poems, which is also important in the poetic Saints’ Lives, is that the adversaries are also called *modig*. In *Exodus* 465 Pharaoh’s troops are called *modige*, just before drowning in the Red Sea. Only 10 lines earlier their fear was described in gloating detail (ll.453–5). Things are different in *Genesis*, however, since there the adversaries are called *modig* before the outcome is clear, and their behaviour inspires fear in Abraham,<sup>8</sup> “fear-inspiring” might be a good translation. On one occasion *modig* is used by Abraham himself (ASPR 1:3ff.: *Genesis A* 1907). It seems appropriate that Abraham himself should never be called *modig*, neither by the poet nor by any other character. In *Genesis* and *Exodus* we are made to sympathize with those who feel or might feel that fear. In this the Old Testament poems differ from *Beowulf* and *Maldon*. The implications for the lexical meaning of the word will be discussed later.

<sup>7</sup> As he is in *PPs* 110,3 [=ASPR 5:95]: mildheort he is and *modig*; mihtig drihten [Misericors et miserator Dominus]. Ps. 111,4 [Authorized Version]: the Lord is gracious and full of compassion.

<sup>8</sup> In *Genesis A* 1907 (Gen. 13,3.7) Abraham refers to the neighbouring peoples, the Canaanites and Perizites, who force him and Lot to emigrate from the land around Beth-el. The other time (1.1850; Gen. 12,14f.) the poet characterizes the Egyptian thanes whose interest in Sara’s beauty disturbs Abraham.

In *Daniel* and *Judith*, *modig* is even more difficult to translate than in *Genesis* and *Exodus*. Judith herself is called *modig*, after having cut off Holofernes's head. No doubt she is brave, but Holofernes is also called *modig*, even twice (ASPR 4:99ff., ll.26, 52). The instances are clearly related to his unchaste and violent attempts at Judith. In *Daniel* (ASPR 1:111ff., l.105) Nebuchadnezzar is called *modig* at a particularly unreasonable moment: he asks his wise men to interpret a dream which he cannot remember (Dan. 2,5). He even threatens to cut them to pieces if they cannot do what he asks.

The presence of these contrary valuations presents a puzzle. As Ágnes Kiricsi asks (2005: 53): How is it possible that one word can denote genuinely positive ideas just as well as negative ones? Kiricsi's question concerns OE *mod*, but the same question is asked about *modig* by Gretsche (1999: 417f.). I will return to the Gretsche-Kiricsi paradox at the end of the paper. For the moment it is sufficient to claim that moral goodness is not part of the core meaning of *modig*, as it seems to be of ModE *brave*. The goodness or badness of a *modig* person is construed from the context.<sup>9</sup> Holofernes and Nebuchadnezzar, as well as Beowulf and Byrhtnoth, are unrestrained by fear. This seems indeed to be the common denominator of all senses of *modig*. If that is the basic meaning of the word, it leaves two questions open which have to be answered by the context: unrestrained from doing what? and: fear of what or who? Beowulf and Byrhtnoth have no fear of their enemies and are thus unrestrained from fighting; Nebuchadnezzar and Holofernes lack the fear of God and are thus unrestrained from sin.

### 2.3. Saints' Lives and other religious poetry

The apparent ambivalence of *modig* is still more acute in the poetic saints' lives and other religious poetry. As is well known, the disciples are often called Christ's thanes, and other saints are treated similarly (*Cristes cempa: Guthlac* 153 [ASPR 3:54], *Andreas* 991 [ASPR 2:3ff.]; *halig cempa Andreas* 461). Christ himself is *modig* and a "young hero" (*geong hæled*) when he climbs (*gestah*) the Cross in *the Dream of the Rood* (ll.39–41 [ASPR 2:61ff.]). The climbing of the Cross becomes one of six *modig* leaps which structure Christ's earthly existence in *Christ B* (l.746 [ASPR 3:23]). The saints, too, can be said to be unrestrained by fear, but their fearlessness is not unlimited: it is their fear of, and confidence in, God which makes them brave in a hostile world.

In the epilogue of *Juliana* Cynewulf asks his readers for a *modig* prayer (l.721 [ASPR 3:113]). Why, we may ask, do you have to overcome fear to pray for Cynewulf? Cynewulf foresees the day of his judgement and visualizes God as a "wrathful king" (*cyning ... reþe*, l.704). At the same time he describes himself as "stained with sins" (*synnum fah*, l.705) and "terrified" (*acle*, l.706). Praying for such a sinner might run the risk of God's wrath. Asking for a *modig* prayer is a clever humility device: I, sinful and terrified, dare not pray: you, brave reader, must help me. In the Roman Catholic liturgy, the invocation "pray for us" is addressed to saints. Cynewulf's request is not an easy one.

The ambiguity of *modig* which we found in the Old Testament poems remains in the poetic saints' lives. A good example is *Andreas*, which uses *modig* 10 times; Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are called *modig* for testifying to God's miraculous power (l.801), but so are the Mermedonians for planning to slaughter one of their number for their cannibalistic meal (l.1096). We should note in passing that their cannibalism is motivated here not by presumptuousness or arrogance, but by sheer hunger.

A more circumscribed and hence more interesting use of *modig* is to be found in *Juliana* and *Guthlac A*. Here the saints are called *modig* by their opponents, i.e., by devils, and they are so called in dialogue with the saints. The fact, well-known to literary historians, that dialogue takes the place of combat, has its consequences for the contexts, and hence for the sense, of *modig*. It makes the construal fairly ambiguous: do the devils express respect for a bold aggressor, or do they chide an arrogant trespasser? Since the same ambiguity occurs in prose legends, the question will be postponed until section 3.

<sup>9</sup> Holofernes's drinking mates are his *wea-gesipbas*, companions in misery (l.16), they are 'doomed' (*fæge*, l.19), and Holofernes is unaware of this (l.20f.). Nebuchadnezzar does not observe the law, but lives "presumptuously in every way" (Bradley, p. 70, *No he æ fremede, // ac in oferhygde / æghwæs lifde*, l.106f.).

## 2.4. Poetry: Conclusion

In section 1 it was said that experiments in prototype psychology can be reduced to the question: what do you think of first when I give you word *X* as a stimulus? Our evidence suggests that the audiences of OE poetry would have answered “hero”, had they been given *modig* as a stimulus in such an experiment. The very pious might have said “saint”, but, having read our Greenfield (1966, 1986), we are familiar with the Christian Saint as Hero and would not be perturbed by such an answer. The hero is fearless because he trusts in his own strength, the saint because he trusts in God. But what about the villains? What do Nebuchadnezzar and Holofernes have in common with Saints Andrew, Guthlac, Judith, and Juliana? I suggested that all of them are unrestrained by fear. To be without fear is admirable when it prompts you to oppose a formidable and murderous enemy. It is contemptible when it prompts you to perpetrate violence on the defenseless. Perhaps remarkably, “fearless” is to be found neither in Clark Hall nor in Bosworth-Toller as a translation of *modig*, though we did find it in one translation (Gordon, Q.1a). The translation equivalents given by dictionaries are equivalents only in specific contexts. We could not say “Holofernes made a fearless pass at Judith’s virtue”, any more than we would say “Fearlessly the boy swatted the fly.”

This interpretation would also explain why we do not find *modig* in situations where ModE *brave* seems quite adequate. OE heroes are *modig* in mead-drinking, in giving council, and even in returning swords, but when Andrew, for instance, worships his God in prison or holds on to his faith under torture, he is not called *modig*. He is *ellenrof* (l.1392) — which Ælfric uses to translate Lat. *robustus* — or bears his lot *mid elne*, “with strength” (l.1486; — also Matthew, l. 54). Abraham in *Genesis A* (l.1844) is also called *ellenrof*. As far as I can see, what is true of Andrew and Abraham is also true of other saints. *Modig* has a component of initiative, of aggression, of non-restraint as we said, which makes it unsuitable for a person reduced to passivity. *Ellenrof* seems to connote *patientia* and *fortitudo*, qualities somewhat alien to *modig*. This discovery confirms me in my belief that “unrestrained by fear” is a good description of the meaning of *modig*, since a restraint presupposes an action impulse on which the restraint may come to bear. That impulse is absent from those situations in which someone is *ellenrof*.

So much for the poetry. The progression from hero to villain and saint looks fairly neat, but we should not mistake it for an accurate picture of historical development. *Maldon*, after all, is much later than most religious poetry. The composition of the codices of OE poetry suggests synchronic variation rather than diachronic linear evolution. Still, it is not meaningless to regard the hero as primary and the villain and the saint as secondary. It seems much more natural to define the villain and the saint with reference to the hero than the other way round. It also makes more sense in terms of contemporary reception. If the Anglo-Saxons had taken the saint as their reference point from which to judge the hero, they could hardly have appreciated the hero as other than a defective saint. Our model allows them to appreciate the saint as a superior hero. The literary and historical evidence I am aware of points in the same direction. In that sense the hero can be regarded as the prototypical carrier of the quality called *modig* in OE poetry.

## 3. *Modig* in OE Prose

The treatment of the prose can be much shorter, although the ratio of prose to verse is about 12:1 (cf. Table 1). It can be shorter because most prose is hortatory or expository rather than narrative, and narrative contexts tend to be more complex than hortatory ones, hence requiring more detailed analysis. Luckily we can confine our study of prose narrative to saints’ legends, because the small body of secular narrative does not seem to contain our adjective. This provides us with a stark and important contrast. While the poets call every saint *modig* except Helen (in Cynewulf’s *Elene* [ASPR 2:66ff.]), no prose saint is ever called *modig* by the author. Twice a saint is called *modig* by the antagonist,<sup>10</sup> which reminds us of Guthlac and Juliana and gives us an opportunity for the answer promised in section 2.3. We must distinguish between *Juliana* on the one hand and *Guthlac A* and the two prose legends on the

<sup>10</sup> Laurentius by Decius (Clemoes, ed., 1997: 425, l. 205); Cecilia is accused by prefect Almachius of speaking *modelice* (Skeat, ed., 1900, repr. in 2 vols.: 1966:2:374, l. 323).

other. Juliana's devil uses the word when he has already admitted defeat, he is in fact acknowledging her superiority, he is recognizing her fearlessness as justified. The speakers in *Guthlac A* and the two prose legends do not know yet the outcome of the encounter; they are saying in effect: you are (foolishly) unafraid of us or me, and you will regret it. But the recipients, both Anglo-Saxon and modern, know better. And because we know better, we can appreciate the irony of the situation: the antagonists are exhibiting exactly that false confidence of which they are accusing the saints. This is particularly clear in one of the prose legends: Cecilia is here giving the cruel prefect a lecture on the difference between pride (*modignyss*, l.324) and steadfastness (*anrædnyss*, l.325).

Just in passing I mention a difference in syntactic detail with semantic implications: in prose *modig* occurs occasionally with a reason phrase: you can be *modig* because of something (as you can be proud of something). In the poetry you are *modig*, full stop. I will return to this in a moment.

#### 4. Conclusion

The examples mark the difference between poetry and prose rather well: in poetry to be *modig* was ambivalent, in the prose we have seen so far it is always a thoroughly "bad thing". This difference was noted by Hans Schabram as early as 1965, who found that almost throughout the poetry *modig* is not part of the lexical field of *superbia* (p. 123). Schabram's findings have been confirmed by Mechthild Gretsch (1999: 417–20), even though I hope I have shifted the balance a little from "throughout" to "almost". And of course I also hope I have indicated the mechanisms that make such semantic variation plausible in terms of reception psychology: moral judgment need not be part of the lexical meaning, since it can be inferred from the context. Schabram also shows that the establishment of *modig* as the main *superbia* term in prose began around the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. This claim is fully borne out by the evidence of the DOEC corpus. The triumph of *modig* has to be seen in connection with the establishment of an OE standard language. The importance in this connection of Winchester and the Benedictine Reform, and the Benedictine Rule in particular, has been demonstrated by Helmut Gneuss and his pupils. Their findings are also supported by the corpus. In the prose, *modig* and *modigian* seem to be exclusively used in the *superbia* sense, and about 90% of all attestations can be attributed to Benedictines, most of them to Abbot Ælfric.

What remains to be shown is why *modig* replaced *ofermodig* in the first place — a question also asked by Gretsch (*loc.cit.*). Before the translation of the Benedictine Rule it seemed perfectly serviceable, and with its prefix *ofer-* it is even closer to the Latin *superbus*. Gretsch (418) sees the replacement as a bold and rigorous re-evaluation of a heroic ideal from a Christian perspective.

I would qualify this a little: the Christian perspective is really a Benedictine one. To support my position, a quick look at Alfred may be useful. In his translation of Pope Gregory the Great's *Cura Pastoralis* (ed. Sweet), *modig* appears only three times (ch.32, p.209, ll.4 and 8, ch. 41, p.302, l.13). It never translates *superbus*, on one occasion (41.302.13) it even contrasts with *ofermod*: *þa modgan* should be admonished lest they become defenders of *ofermod*. *þa modgan* translates *elati*, *ofermod* renders *superbiæ*. Gregory's morality is not black-and-white, it allows for shades of grey. The *elati* should be admonished, not punished. Even humility is not an absolute ideal to him. The *humiles* should be admonished lest they become more abject than they should be.

In contrast, the Benedictine Rule turns humility into an absolute ideal. Even craftspeople who have the abbot's permission to practise their craft are not allowed some pride in their work. The Winteneý Version here adds the phrase & *modigað for hyre cræfte* (p. 115, l. 4).<sup>11</sup> Cap. 33, v.4, reminds the monks that they are not allowed to have their own wills, and the Latin *voluntates* becomes *mod* in the two major English versions; but the heart of the Benedictine ethos is in Cap. 4, which treats of the "Instruments for Good Works". Among these instruments we read: "when he [the monk] does something good, he shall all of it attribute to God, when he does evil he shall know that it comes from himself." (Schröer/Gneuss p. 17, ll. 17–19) In such a framework there is no room for Gregory's distinction between still acceptable *elatio* and sinful *superbia*. To be *modig* is bad in itself, not only in

<sup>11</sup> The manuscript is dated early 13<sup>th</sup> century (Schröer, p. ix), but Gretsch calls the text "the revised copy of an OE document" rather than "an original ME prose text" (*op. cit.*, p. 189). The Latin original of Winteneý's *modigað* is *extollitur*, a word also used in the modern versions of the Rule (and which is close to Gregory's *elatio*).

excess. Monks and nuns have always to be fearful — of God and of Christ’s representative in the community, the abbot or abbess (Cap. 2, v. ii). There is not one Christian perspective, but two: one moderate and pastoral, the other rigorous and monastic.

This minor qualification apart, we can see that historical semantics working within the philological tradition is quite capable of identifying the moral and intellectual forces that are responsible for the two main senses of *modig*, “brave” and “proud/arrogant”. The impact of the Christian culture has clearly caused the shift from the first to the second sense. What, then, is the contribution of Cognitive Semantics? In the version developed by Croft & Cruse it enables us to account for the seeming paradox that on the one hand word meanings are fuzzy, i.e., they are not “small discrete chunks of conceptual structure” (Croft & Cruse 2004: 30), while on the other hand sense boundaries are “sharp” although they are “subject to construal” (p. 109). Against earlier studies, including Geeraerts (1993), Croft & Cruse see

the total meaning potential of a word as a region in conceptual space, and each interpretation as a point therein. Understood in this way, the meaning of a word is typically not a uniform continuum: the interpretations tend to cluster in groups showing different degrees of salience and cohesiveness, and between the groups there are relatively sparsely inhabited regions. (2004: 109f.)

In the case of *modig* the conceptual space has been defined as “unrestrained by fear (from acting)”. Actions which are normally prevented by fear will be important actions — and will therefore call for value judgement. They will be either good or bad: they are unlikely to be morally indifferent. Hence the boundary between the two main senses of *modig*, while “subject to construal”, will still be “sharp”. In Cognitive Semantics of the Croft & Cruse variety the Gretsche-Kiricsi paradox is no longer a paradox. Fuzzy lexical meanings do not necessarily prevent unambiguous interpretations.

## Abbreviations

ASPR: Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.  
 Dan.: Daniel (the Old Testament book).  
 DOE(C): *Dictionary of Old English* (Corpus).  
 EETS: Early English Text Society.  
 Gen.: Genesis (the Old Testament book).  
 l.: line; ll.: lines.  
 ModE: Modern English.  
 OE: Old English.  
 OED: *The Oxford English Dictionary*.  
 O.S.: Original Series (of EETS).  
 PPs: *The Paris Psalter*.  
 S.S.: Supplementary Series (of EETS).

## References

- Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies The First Series, Text*. 1997. Ed. by Peter Clemoes. EETS s.s. 17, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ælfric’s Lives of Saints*. 1881–1900. Ed. by Walter W. Skeat. 4 vols., EETS o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114, London: Oxford University Press, repr. in 2 vols. 1966.
- Angelsächsische Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel, Die*. 1885–88. Ed. by Arnold Schröer. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1964 with an appendix by Helmut Gneuss. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records. 1931–1942. Ed. by George Philip Krapp & Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie. New York: Columbia University Press, London: Routledge & Keagan Paul. 6 vols.
- Bradley, S.A.J. (transl., intr.). 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (Everyman’s Library). London: Dent.
- Clemoes: see *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies*.

- Croft, William, & D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen. 2001. *Genre* in linguistic and related discourses. In Hans-Jürgen Diller and Manfred Görlach (eds.), *Towards a History of English as a History of Genres*. Heidelberg: Winter, 3–43.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1993. Vagueness's puzzles, polysemy's vagaries. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 223–72.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1997. *Diachronic Prototype Semantics. A Contribution to Historical Lexicology* (Oxford Studies in Lexicography and Lexicology). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Godden, Malcolm R. 1985. Anglo-Saxons on the Mind. In M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (eds.), *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 271–98.
- Gordon, Robert Kay (transl., intr.). 1926, revised and reset 1954. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (Everyman's Library 794). London: Dent.
- Greenfield, Stanley B. 1965. *A Critical History of Old English Literature*. London: University of London Press.
- Greenfield, Stanley B., & Daniel G. Calder. 1986. *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gretsch, Mechthild. 1999. *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care. With an English translation, the Latin text, notes, and an introduction.* 1871. Ed. by Henry Sweet. (Early English Text Society, o.s. 45 and 50). London: Trübner.
- Kiricsi, Ágnes. 2005. *Semantic Rivalry of Mod/Mood and Gemynd/Minde in Old and Middle English Literature.* , Ph. D. diss. Budapest Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences, Faculty of Humanities.
- Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi. 2000. *Abstract Words in Abstract Worlds. Directionality and Prototypical Structure in the Semantic Change in English Nouns of Cognition* (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 58). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Oxford English Dictionary, The.* 1989. Second Edition.
- Schabram, Hans. 1965. *Superbia I. Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz. Teil I: Die dialektale und zeitliche Verbreitung des Wortguts.* Munich: Fink.
- Schröer, Arnold: see *Angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel.*
- Schröer, Arnold: see *Wintenev-Version der Regula S. Benedicti.*
- Skeat, Walter W.: see *Ælfric's Lives of Saints.*
- Sweet, Henry: see *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care.*
- Wintenev-Version der Regula S. Benedicti, Die.* 1888. Ed. by Arnold Schröer. Reprint 1978 with an appendix by Mechthild Gretsch. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

## Websites

Dictionary of Old English Corpus: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/oec/>

*Oxford English Dictionary*: <http://www.oed.com/>

Quantitative Lexicology and Variational Linguistics: <http://wwwling.arts.kuleuven.be/qlvl/profile.htm>

# Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)

edited by R. W. McConchie,  
Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö

Cascadilla Proceedings Project    Somerville, MA    2009

## Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)  
© 2009 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-430-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

## Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.  
To place an order, go to [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com) or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA  
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com). Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Diller, Hans-Jürgen. 2009. Old English *mōdig*: Cognitive Semantics and Cultural Contact. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 41-48. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Diller, Hans-Jürgen. 2009. Old English *mōdig*: Cognitive Semantics and Cultural Contact. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 41-48. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.  
[www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #2165.