

Old English simile: When *like* was an adjective

Mariana Oleniak

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine <maryana@mail.org >

This paper provides a comprehensive account of Old English similes of equality with the adjectival comparison marker *gelic* in the positive degree and its variants. It briefly traces the history of copulative *gelic* which was formed as a result of grammaticalisation during the pre-English period. The focus of the study is the structural, semantic and chronological peculiarities of Old English similes with the *gelic* component. To demonstrate this, the constructions under discussion are divided into twelve structural patterns, displaying the specifics of their number and the positioning of their elements. Further they are studied from a chronological point of view, the outcome of which gives grounds to trace their gradual distancing from metaphors. A scrutiny of their semantics reveals issues of particular importance for the Anglo-Saxon society.

KEYWORDS: simile, metaphor, Old English, structural type.

1. Introduction

The study of Old English simile can hardly be said to have been indulged in numerous publications. It is a gap to be filled by linguists interested in structures and word order that existed more than a thousand years ago, as well as for those who realise the necessity of knowing the past to account for the present, be it the semantics of language units or linguo-cultural aspects of development.

There is, and has always been, a considerable interest in metaphor, whereas simile has never enjoyed that much of a popularity in language studies, let alone medieval simile. If it were not for the investigation of Middle English simile structure conducted by Nevanlinna (1993), it would be difficult to mention any diachronic research devoted to simile. However, there have been some occasional cases of simile analysis as a part of Old English comparative clauses or dative case functioning studies (Baker 2012, Fisher 1992, Gergel 2008, McLaughlin 1983, Merritt 2013, Mitchel 1985). The semantics of simile as a stylistic device in certain literary works attracted the attention of Margolis (1957), who draws a comparison between simile and related devices; also Walker (2016), Beardsley (1981), Dawes (1998), Tyler (2006); while Amodio (2014), Stodnick (2012) touch upon similes when analysing Old English translations and adaptations of Latin texts.

This paper aims at exploring the ways in which one of the Old English

simile types was formed and used in 7th-11th centuries. The structure in focus is simile marked by the comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic*, one of the predecessors of present-day English similes based on *like*, for example the simile taken from 11th-century *Lapidery*:

- (1) *Opær is saphyrus, se is sunnan gelic, & on him <standað> swilce gildene steorran.*
'The other is sapphire, which is like the sun, and in it stands like golden stars.'

It should be noted, however, that in this paper the Anglo-Saxon simile is not understood as a purely autochthonous phenomenon; it is rather regarded as a symptomatic reflection of the symbiosis of native mentality with the ongoing Christianisation, which inevitably presupposes the influence of Latin since many Old English manuscripts are translations of Latin texts. I assume it is the synergy of the three that contributed greatly to shaping Anglo-Saxons and the language they spoke.

With the aim of examining illustrative empirical material, a freely accessible, representative and reliable corpus of Old English texts was scrutinised, employing the method of continuous sampling. The online database, DOE Web Corpus, which provides tools for automatic selection, consists of at least one copy of every surviving Old English text and represents over three million words of Old English. Therefore, every recorded Old English simile of equality with a *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* component (positive degree forms) has been subjected to analysis. The retrieved sampling was then organised chronologically (mainly based on Helsinki Corpus), classified structurally and semantically. The whole sampled material consists of 70 units.

2. Grammaticalisation of *gelic*

The phenomenon of grammaticalisation has been studied by Lehmann (1995 [1982]), Hopper (1991), Heine (1993), Hopper & Traugott (2003), Porto (2005), who were mainly interested in the modern result of the process. Older periods of languages, however, which might have also displayed the outcome of grammaticalisation, rarely become the research object.

Notwithstanding the fact that *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* are synonyms, the frequency of their usage as comparison markers is not even. *Anlic* and *ongelic* are attested at different points during the Old English period but are rather sparse, while *gelic* is used as a comparison marker with impressive consistency throughout the whole period, actually being the prevalent item of the group. The latter could also be spelled as *geliic* or *gelyc* in individual manuscripts.

Since there are no significant semantic or structural differences triggered by the use of a certain representative of the above-mentioned word family, I will analyse all similes of equality, with an adjectival comparison marker of positive degree, as predecessors of present-day English *like* similes. For practical purposes, *gelic* will further be used as a generic term to indicate the Old English similes' comparison marker expressed by a positive degree adjective.

On its way to the modern form and meaning, *like* has undergone complex and far-reaching changes, the essence of which can be characterised in one word: grammaticalisation. The categorial reanalysis of *like* as a formerly transitive adjective was described in detail by Maling (Maling, 1983), proving the adjectival nature of Old English *gelic* and the pre-positional nature of Modern English *like*. However, on closer inspection of Old English *gelic* and its semantically equivalent *anlic* and *ongelic*, another hypothesis emerges. Not only did this grammaticalisation take place during the intervening centuries, but it might actually have been the second categorial reanalysis of the modern *like* in the history of English. The first one occurred at some time prior to the Old English period. In other words, both Old English *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* and present-day English *like* are the results of grammaticalisation, each of them being born out of reanalyses representing two different stages of the English language development.

Since the units in question belong to different time periods that altogether cover over a millennium and a half, all of them differ conspicuously from their (currently final) derivative *like*. According to the Online Etymology Dictionary, the items *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* may be described as the compounds that developed from the following Proto-Germanic components:

- 1) **ga* 'with, together' + **likow* 'form, shape' gave *gelic* [with the shape of];
- 2) **ainaz* 'one, unique' + **likow* 'form, shape' evolved into *anlic* [one of the shape of];
- 3) *ongelic* stems from the combination of the three (**ainaz+*ga+*likow* 'one with the shape of').

I interpret the term grammaticalisation in its broad sense, as Hopper & Traugott (2003) defined it: "We define grammaticalization as the process whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalised, continue to develop new grammatical functions" (Hopper, Traugott 2003: xv). Since all the Proto-Germanic predecessors which gave rise to the emergence of *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* were initially lexemes that eventually came to serve a grammatical function and, thus, gained the grammatical status of morphemes in Old English, the reanalysis must have taken place prior to the Old English period.

Subsequently, the process affected both morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects of the units in question: **ga*, **ainaz* and **likow* underwent clipping/phonetic modification, lost their syntactic position in the sentence and impoverished their meaning changing into morphological units. Therefore, both the Old English adjectives *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* and the present-day English prepositional item *like* are a vivid consequence of linguistic change. These changes could perhaps be accounted for by linguistic economy. It would have been unproductive to use two words instead of one (which is why the Old English compounds in question appeared), and it would have been also ineffective for a language to have close synonyms that are semantically and functionally similar in most contexts (this is why the whole Old English word family gave rise to a single present-day English word). The first of these reanalyses, unfortunately, cannot be empirically proven due to absence of manuscripts.

3. The structure of Old English simile of equality with a *gelic* component

In order to describe the initial state of English similes, I will start by outlining its structural peculiarities. The constructions at stake display several types of syntactic patterns, which makes it essential to classify them according to certain criteria so that no relevant features are missed. Old English had a relatively free word order, which affected the way simile components were organised into a construction. Thus, my structural classification will be based on the following criteria:

- (i) the number of components actualised in the simile's surface structure: three (tenor, vehicle – cf. Richards 1936 – and a comparison marker)¹ or all four (tenor, vehicle, comparison marker and a ground shared by tenor and vehicle);
- (ii) their grammatical manifestation;
- (iii) the positioning of these elements.

Contrary to Old English similes marked by the comparison marker in the superlative degree *on/gelicost*, the similes in question never employed a vehicle in the nominative case. All similes under consideration contain a dative case-type vehicle, so the case of the vehicle will not serve as a separate criterion. The terms open/closed simile,² borrowed from simile semantics investigations (Margolis 1957, Beardsley 1981, Dawes 1998, Walker 2016), will be employed to describe a simile structure domain, as a useful tool to mark the grammatical non-expression/expression of the simile's ground.

It is worth mentioning that the majority of the similes in question use a

linking verb *to be* to connect the tenor and the vehicle, although it could be omitted as in the 11th-century *Paris Psalter*, translated into Old English from Latin:

- (2) ... *bið him weorðlic setl on minre gesihðe sunnan anlic...*
'... he is worth the throne in my vision to-the-sun like...'

The omission can hardly be called a tendency, though, since only 11 examples out of 70 do not contain a linking *to be*. These 11 examples were taken from different works produced in different centuries, so the individual style hypothesis can be ruled out.

Post-posing the vehicle in a topic-vehicle pair seems to have been a hard-and-fast rule for Old English similes with *gelic*, though there is one exception (out of 70 similes in question). This is found in the late Old English version of *The Phoenix* (9th century), where the vehicle precedes the topic:

- (3) ... *goldfylle gelic glitonap Fenix.*
'... to-a-gold-leaf like glitters Fenix.'

As for the comparison marker, it did not have a fixed position: In 40 out of 70 similes it is found as immediately post-posed to the vehicle (see (1)). There is also a bulk of cases that witness immediate pre-posing of the comparison marker with respect to the vehicle, as in the 11th-century homily:

- (4) ... *and se feorða is gelic godes bearne.*
'... and the spirit is like to-the-god's child.'

There are three similes, however, found in a 10th-century *Lindisfarne version of the Gospel*, which notably have the comparison marker at the very beginning of the construction (the diachritic † indicates that what follows is not a true Old English writing, but an interlinear gloss over a Latin text):

- (5) ... *eft ongelic is ric heofna segne sende in sae*
'... Again, alike is the kingdom of heaven to-a-net, that was cast into the sea,
of all † eghwelc cynn fisca somnende † geadrigende.
and gathered fish of every kind.'

The text in question is a word-for-word interlinear gloss, which could be the reason for the comparison marker to start the simile.

The scope of the Old English similes under consideration can be grouped into two major structural types with a further subdivision: (i) similes of equality with the comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* pre-posed to the vehicle; (ii) similes of equality with the comparison marker *gelic* or *anlic* post-posed to the vehicle.

3.1. Old English similes of equality with the comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* pre-posed to the vehicle

Although Old English *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* have synonymic definitions in the Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, and there are no academic writings concerning the differences they might have displayed, they still seem to have had their own system of usage. The inference may not be fair enough due to a limited number of available examples of *anlic* and *ongelic* in similes (though they are available in surviving manuscripts), but it is possible to establish a certain regularity. The comparison markers under consideration are likely to have been used in different syntactic patterns: While *gelic* is found in the majority of possible positions within simile constructions, except at the very beginning, *anlic* and *ongelic* appear only in certain colligations, that is in particular syntactic pattern. *Ongelic* is the only comparison marker that was used to start the whole simile unit, that is before the tenor, but was never used in inter- or post-position. In the three registered examples it was followed by the verb *to be* and a tenor expressed by a noun phrase, see example (5). *Anlic* was always used after the tenor but was never followed by a syntactically extended part of the construction (a noun phrase, a verb phrase or a clause) as in 11th-century *Paris Psalter*:

- (6) *Forðon ic anlic ætt æscean hlafe, and ic minne drinc mengde wið tearum.*
'So, I alike eat ashes to-bread, and my drinks mix with tears.'

Gelic, on the other hand, could be used either in the middle or final position within a simile, preceded or followed by other simile elements. Anyway, syntactic patterns involving synonymous *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* outside simile await their analysis, which goes beyond the aim of this paper.

The similes under consideration can be opened or closed, which I further subdivide into twelve structural patterns according to the grammatical expression of the simile elements and their positioning in the sentence.

3.1.1. Open Old English similes of equality with the comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* pre-posed to the vehicle

When pre-posed to the vehicle, *gelic* is always followed by a noun phrase and never precedes a noun. This is the only pattern of the open simile where *gelic* precedes the vehicle. It can be generalised as N / Pron + (be) + *gelic* + NP; for example:

- (7) ... *ðonne furþor gin wridað on wynnum, þæt he bið wæstmum gelic ealdum*
'... than he further still flourishes in bliss until he is alike in form to-an-old
earne, and æfter þon feþrum gefrætwad, swylc he æt frymðe
eagle, and after then he is adorned with feathers, as he was at the
wæs, beorht geblowen.
beginning – brightly blossomed.'

In the 9th-century phoenix description, the similarity between the magic bird and an old eagle is expressed by the combination of the pronoun and the noun phrase governed by *gelic*.

In the open similes under consideration, where a vehicle is expressed by a noun and not by a noun phrase, only *anlic* is found as a comparison marker being placed before it. The whole structure corresponds to the pattern N / Pron + (be) + *anlic* + N_{dat}:

- (8) *Yrre heom becu^me anlic nædran, ða aspide ylde nemnað...*
'Anger reach them like to-a-snake's which people call an asp...'

In this example, taken from *Psalm 57*, both the tenor and the vehicle represent anger, but coming from different sources, that is, different types of anger. This structural subtype was not productive. Found in one literary work only (*Metrical Psalms*, a 10th-century translation by one unknown author), it speaks more about an idiosyncratic choice than a general tendency.

3.1.2. Closed Old English similes of equality with the comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic* pre-posed to the vehicle

Semantically, a more complete kind of simile is closed simile with the salient feature expressed explicitly, which inevitably affects the structure of the unit. Thus, in this case the simile verbalises all four of its elements: a tenor, a vehicle, a ground (in bold characters) and a comparison marker. The explication of the ground extends the structure of Old English simile, making it more emphatic. Having a salient feature explicated, simile can attract more attention, producing a particular effect on the reader. Such similes are extremely valuable when we want to find out the true intentions of a writer, the precise reason which motivated Anglo-Saxons when comparing certain notions. Old English simile with an expanded structure manifests itself via several syntactic patterns: the additional (phrasal) elements can appear at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of similes. Expanding elements can be verbs, verb phrases or clauses.

Closed similes with pre-posed *gelic* fall into several structural subtypes, the majority of which are extended by a clause standing in a final position. They can be modelled according to N / Pron + (be) + *gelic* + NP_{dat} + **clause**:

- (9) ... *se apostol sæde se þe soðlice twynað gelic he ys yþe sæ*
'... the Apostle said that truly, the one who-is-in-doubt like he is to-a-sea wave
seo fram winde byð astyrud & byð upp ferud.
that from wind moves and is carried by the wind'

In this example, taken from 11th-century *Defensor's Liber scintillarum*, the simile comparing a doubting man to a sea wave is extended by a clause explaining the reason for the juxtaposition: both being changeable and insecure, led by and dependent on external forces.

The explication of this salient feature could also be expressed by a verb standing in the intermediate position between a tenor and a vehicle. This kind of simile (see (3)) corresponds to the pattern $N_{\text{dat}} + \text{gelic} + V + N_{\text{nom}}$. The only example of this type was taken from the late Old English version of the *The Phoenix*. The reason for a pre-positional use of the vehicle can be accounted for by the fact that *Fenix*, in that context, is a kind of rhyme with respect to *manige* in the next line, while *goldfylle* and *glitonap* would not have made a stressed alliterated pair if *Fenix* had been pre-posed to *goldfylle*.

Several structurally striking examples, taken from the *Lindisfarne versions of the Gospel*, are indicative of the possibility of starting Old English similes with a comparison marker. These are formed according to the pattern $\text{ongelic} + (\text{be}) + N_{\text{nom}} + N_{\text{dat}} + \text{clause}$:

(10) *eft sona ongelic is ric heofna menn ðæm cepe soecende godo meregrotu...*

'Again, alike is the kingdom of heaven to-a-merchant man, seeking goodly pearls...'

All examples of this type explain the notion of the kingdom of heaven by explicating a certain salient feature of a concrete object with which an average Anglo-Saxon would be familiar. This subtype makes use of a clause to specify a too generalised noun (*man*) serving as a vehicle.

3.2. Old English similes of equality with *gelic* or *anlic* post-posed to the vehicle

Old English similes of equality with *gelic* or *anlic* post-posed to the vehicle constitute a larger part of the sampled material. When *gelic* occurs in post-position in a simile it is not restricted to following a noun phrase only. In fact, the majority of open similes with *gelic* in post-position are formed by the combination of *gelic* and a noun in the dative case. The diversity of possible colligations of simile elements with a post-posed *gelic* is demonstrated in several patterns.

3.2.1. Open Old English similes of equality with *gelic* or *anlic* post-posed to the vehicle

All structural types of Old English similes with *gelic* in post-position are modifications of the basic pattern with copulative *lic* in positive degree: $N / \text{Pron} + (\text{be}) + N_{\text{dat}} + \text{gelic}$:

(11) *Se gitsiendra wer þe ne wyrð næfre full is helle gelic...*

‘This covetous man that is not full of intelligence is to-the-hell like...’

In an 11th-century example, taken from Ælfric, a covetous man is compared to hell, though the ground on which it is done remains to be interpreted by the reader.

Another open simile type construction, with post-posed *gelic*, is one where the vehicle is expressed by a noun in the dative case modified by an adjective. This kind of structure will correspond to N / Pron + (be) + NP_{dat} + *gelic*:

(12) *Seofopa sardius haten se is luttran blode gelic*

‘The seventh is called sard. It is to-a-clear blood like.’

Taken from the Old English 11th-century *Lapidary*, this simile witnesses the necessity to modify a vehicle by means of an adjective in order to achieve a higher level of precision: It is not only the colour of blood that serves to specify the gem, but also the extent of its transparency. Thus, the combination of two notional words to represent a vehicle adds to the particularity and precision of the simile.

3.2.2. Closed Old English similes of equality with *gelic* or anlic post-posed to the vehicle

The majority of closed similes with post-posed *gelic* express their grounds by clauses (9 out of 15 examples), which are usually placed in a final position, thus corresponding to the pattern N / Pron + (be) + N_{dat} + *gelic* + **clause**:

(13) *Witodlice mannes ege is smice gelic & hrædlice þonne he astyred bið fordwinð*

‘Truly, human fear is to-a-smoke like in the way that it dissipates quickly when excitation goes away’

This example is taken from a collection of 11th-century homilies. The author makes use of a clause to specify reasons why human fear might be similar to smoke without which the simile would have been rather vague. The post-position of the clause representing the simile ground is by all means reasonable because the notion that calls for the explanation comes naturally before the explanation itself.

A rarely occurring structural subtype that differs from the previous employs a clause in an intermediate position of the simile between tenor and vehicle: N / Pron + **clause** + (be) + NP_{dat} + *gelic*:

(14) *Se ðe his to fela nymð, he bið wodum men gelic*

‘He who takes too much for himself is to-a-madman like.’

The inter-position of the ground is taken from a translation of Bede, who prefers to denote the notion of greediness not by a lexeme but by the whole attributive clause. The deliberate choice of a more extended syntactical unit over a concise lexical one is indicative of an intention to emphasise the excessiveness of immoderation by assigning more time for the reader's attention to the sin.

An interesting example is recorded that employs a clause to express a simile ground but differs from both structural subtypes described above in a number of clauses. It corresponds to the pattern N / Pron + **clause** + (be) + N_{dat} + *gelic* + **clause**:

- (15) ... *se man ðe fæst and singað is ðam deofle gelic þe æfre fæst and æfre singað.*
'... the man that feasts and sings is to-the-devil like that always feasts and always sings.'

The example is taken from the 11th-century *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. It benefits from a double extension of the simile and makes the effect more dramatic by repeating the ground twice.

Less numerous than clauses, verbs and verb phrases served in Old English simile to highlight a salient feature. The structure is shaped in the following way: N / Pron + **V / VP** + N_{dat} + *gelic*.

- (16) *Þa feol sum preost færllice of þam weorce, swa þæt he samcucu læg,*
'Then suddenly a priest fell off the work, so that he lay half-dead
sweltendum gelic, and fleow eall blode
to-a-dead man like, and flew all blood.'

The example is taken from 11th-century *Canons of Ælfric*. The author chose to use a simile with an explicitly expressed vehicle as sentence predicate to specify the immovable position of the tenor's referent and to emphasise the narrow line between life and death.

The last structural subtype, sampled from the 9th-century *Gregory's Dialogue*, is similar to the previous one, differing only in the positioning of the verb containing a commonly shared salient feature, which in this case is post-posed: N + N_{dat} + *gelic* + **V**.

- (17) *Ic eom scuan gelic swyþe ahylded...*
'I them to-a-shadow like quickly protected...'

Judging from the above data, there was a very strong tendency for a vehicle to follow a tenor. The only example structured otherwise (taken from the late Old English version of the poem *Phoenix*) can be explained by the demands of prosody. The comparative marker did not have a fixed position and could be equally placed before or after a vehicle, though the majority of the examples (40 out of 70) witness its post-positional usage.

Structural type	Number
3.1. <i>gelic</i> in pre-position	
3.1.1. open simile	12
3.1.1.1. N / Pron + (be) + <i>gelic</i> + NP	7
3.1.1.2. N / Pron + (be) + <i>anlic</i> + N _{dat}	5
3.1.2. closed simile	18
3.1.2.1. N / Pron + (be) + <i>gelic</i> + NP _{dat} + clause	14
3.1.2.2. N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + V + N _{nom}	1
3.1.2.3. <i>ongelic</i> + (be) + N _{nom} + N _{dat} + clause	3
3.2. <i>gelic</i> in post-position	
1.1.1. open simile	25
1.1.1.1. N / Pron + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>	17
1.1.1.2. N / Pron + (be) + NP _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>	8
1.1.2. closed simile	15
1.1.2.1. N / Pron + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + clause	9
1.1.2.2. N / Pron + clause + (be) + NP _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>	1
1.1.2.3. N / Pron + clause + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + clause	1
1.1.2.4. N / Pron + V/VP + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>	3
1.1.2.5. N / Pron + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + V	1
Total	70

Table 1. Structural types of Old English similes of equality with a comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic*.

The distribution of *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* is not even: the frequency of *anlic* and *ongelic* is conspicuously lower than that of *gelic* – see examples (6), (3) and (61) respectively. Anyway, the nine instances of the less typical comparative markers found in the corpus cannot be dismissed, since they clearly show the existence of a whole word family of a copulative *lic*. As a part of Old English simile *anlic* and *ongelic* are present in two works only (*ongelic* in the 10th-century Gospel, and *anlic* in a collection of 10th-century *Metrical Psalms*), which could be regarded as evidence of a translator's style rather than a common means of comparison. However, since there were other similes in the above-mentioned texts that employed *gelic* as a comparison marker, this inference is not secure. It could be indicative of the fact that the translator simply did not feel that *gelic* was the right word in this particular colligation and made use of *anlic*. The fact of occasional *anlic* and *ongelic* usage within simile is consonant with the conclusion that these comparison markers had the potential to be widely used, at least by speakers of the Mercian dialect. Because translated religious texts had to be universally understood, an interpreter would be unlikely to use an obscure

or contemporary ungrammatical combination of words to impart Christian values. The grounds of the similes in question were mainly expressed by clauses (28 out of 33) with occasional usage of verbs or verb phrases as a common salient feature. For some reason, which might just as well be a coincidence, adjectives or noun phrases were not registered as grounds for the similes under analysis.

4. Chronological characteristics of Old English simile of equality with the *gelic* component

The chronological distribution of Old English manuscripts still remains an issue of speculation in many cases, contributing to a relative uncertainty in terms of the distribution of the structural types of simile within the centuries of this study's interest. Unfortunately, the biggest corpus of Old English, from which the sampling was retrieved, does not provide the exact century of the manuscript's composition: DOEC divides Old English into two periods only (early and late); Helsinki Corpus is more specific in this respect, but it only contains texts in the interval 950-1050. Such a situation leaves us with the mere option to obtain information about a manuscript's composition date from other and different informants. The subdivision into two periods only would be too rough an approach for a study like this. So, since the reference of a manuscript to a certain century is not always perfectly established, some logic had to be imposed on the process of dealing with the disputed texts. Thus, the data from all available informative sources was compared in order to attribute the most possibly exact century for the manuscript in question. In the case of an attribution of a manuscript date to a period comprising more than one century, the latest century was chosen in order to represent the time when the text unquestionably existed. Statistics of the chronological distribution of the similes under analysis is shown in Table 2.

Chronological analysis yields a striking result. It was hypothesised that the similes in question might have been used during the whole period with relative consistency. The corpus data, however, proves otherwise. Even if we take into account the fact that the largest number of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts was written during the last 300 years of the period (9th-11th centuries), it is clear that the comparisons in question show a marked increase in frequency towards the end of the period. As can be observed, Old English similes with a concerned comparison marker are concentrated near the late Old English period. The 9th century was not the era when the first Old English similes using a copulative *gelic* appeared.

Structural type	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	Total
3.1. <i>gelic</i> in pre-position					
3.1.1. open simile					
3.1.1.1. N / Pron + (be) + <i>gelic</i> + NP	1	1	5		7
3.1.1.2. N / Pron + (be) + <i>anlic</i> + N _{dat}			5		5
3.1.2. closed simile					
3.1.2.1. N / Pron + (be) + <i>gelic</i> + NP _{dat} + clause		10	4		14
3.1.2.2. N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + V + N _{nom}			1		1
3.1.2.3. <i>ongelic</i> + (be) + N _{nom} + N _{dat} + clause		3			3
3.2. <i>gelic</i> in post-position					
3.2.1. open simile					
3.2.1.1. N / Pron + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>			16	1	17
3.2.1.2. N / Pron + (be) + NP _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>			8		8
3.2.2. closed simile					
3.2.2.1. N / Pron + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + clause			9		9
3.2.2.2. N / Pron + clause + (be) + NP _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>	1				1
3.2.2.3. N / Pron + clause + (be) + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + clause			1		1
3.2.2.4. N / Pron + V/VP + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i>			3		3
3.2.2.5. N / Pron + N _{dat} + <i>gelic</i> + V	1				1
Total	3	14	52	1	70

Table 2. Chronological appearance of Old English similes of equality with a comparison marker *gelic*, *anlic* or *ongelic*.

Being an adjective in Old English, not only was *gelic* used as a comparison marker but itself was gradable, changing in form to show degrees of comparison. This means that, when used in a simile, it was capable of displaying similarity between some notions as well as the intensity of this similarity. In other words, contrary to present-day English, Old English provided its speakers with the opportunity to say that ‘something/somebody was more like something/somebody’ or ‘something/somebody was the most like something/somebody’. Constructions analogous to those discussed in this paper, with the same comparison marker but in the superlative degree (*gelicost/onlicost*), are recorded as early as the 6th century with relatively constant use throughout the whole Old English period (Oleniak 2018a). There are Old English similes with a comparison marker in the comparative degree (*gelicre*) concentrated around the 9th-11th centuries (Oleniak 2018b). Assuming that metaphors are hidden comparisons which in the form of a simile do not only show similarity but also imply difference, it is logical to claim that Old English similes with copulative *gelic* display a three-level remoteness from metaphors. This is due to the adjectival nature of the comparison marker, with its inherited capability of having degrees of comparison. In other words, the higher the degree of comparison (and therefore the degree of similarity between tenor and vehicle), the closer the simile is to metaphor semantically. Compare:

- (18) *She is like the sun* (simile with a comparison marker in the positive degree)
(19) **She is more like the sun* (simile with a comparison marker in the comparative degree)
(20) **She is most like the sun* (simile with a comparison marker in the superlative degree)
(21) *She is the sun* (metaphor)

As one can observe, in (18-20) there is gradual semantic converging of tenor and vehicle, till they are finally equated in (21).

A chronological analysis of Old English similes with copulative *lic* shows the progressive appearance of the corresponding constructions in manuscripts, displaying gradual remoteness from metaphor: similes with the comparative marker in the superlative degree appear at least 300 years earlier than the analogous constructions with the marker in the positive degree. This overwhelming chronological difference may serve as substantial piece of evidence for the following inference in terms of simile-metaphor correlation: It looks like the limitations of comparative relationships inherited in a simile (as opposed to metaphor) developed step-by-step. It is as if at the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon period writers were more accustomed to express their thoughts in metaphors than in similes. On the one hand, it could speak in favour of their desire to be more persuasive and categorical, in order to make sure that the reader/listener will see exactly the same image the author sees without admitting any differences which a simile inevitably presupposes. On the other hand, the fact could be consonant with theories according to which metaphor is cognitively less complex than simile, where one has to make an extra effort to identify distinctions between the compared notions (Glucksberg & Keysar 1990, Holmquist 2006). Metaphor might be more difficult to explain sometimes; but at the stage of creation, it seems to be easier to name an object metaphorically, which would be taken for granted by the reader, than to produce an accurate simile. In the latter case, one has to acknowledge not only similarities but also differences. So, the considerably later appearance of similes semantically more remote, than similes semantically closer to metaphor, can be another confirmation of the fact that image-thinking precedes logical thinking. Movement from direct observation of reality (images formation) to conformity to logical principles witnesses the development of the associative analysis system. Needless to say, more research is necessary to support or dismiss this inference.

5. Semantics features of Old English similes of equality with the gelic component

In this part of the study I will focus on the semantic intricacies of Old English similes of equality with the comparison marker in the positive degree.

I will approach the issue of simile semantics from a theoretical position according to which a simile is a deliberate, conscious and thoughtful rhetorical strategy that enables the speaker to amplify a given notion by juxtaposing

it with a typical bearer of a certain feature. I thus assume that the simile semantics cannot be arbitrary or neutral. With that in mind, I will consider each element that makes the simile semantics highly significant.

The similes in question lend themselves to a comprehensive analysis whose results will highlight the dependence of this phenomenon on social and historical circumstances that reveal the most prominent domains of Anglo-Saxon experience in figurative thinking. Whereas in modern realia the creation of an accurate simile consists in the choice of a 'right' notion / word as vehicle, in ancient times and in the immediately following centuries this creation process was a way of explaining things through symbols that might reveal the secrets of a worldview. Cirlot (2001) enumerates and quotes a wide range of scholars who highlight the symbolic nature of medieval analogies. In the introduction to his dictionary, Cirlot refers to similes as having an intermediate function somewhere between a symbol and an allegory and describes them in a section called 'symbolic syntax'. Thus, it goes without saying that medieval similes provide a particular insight in terms of their semantics.

In the present analysis of the semantics of Old English similes, no priority is attributed to tenor or vehicle: each is given equal weight, with tenor indicating the notion that calls for the juxtaposition in the first place, and vehicle showing the prototype of the simile ground. Thus, a TENOR identifies the object of greater interest against the background of other objects in the narration, concentrating the recipient's attention on it. This justifies the principle of centric quality in the semantic analysis.

A VEHICLE, on the other hand, shows the similarity of the concerned notion to a prototypical representative of a salient feature, practically bestowing equivalence upon them and almost turning the former into the latter. The mapping of two notions expressed by the tenor and the vehicle calls for the logic of the principle of morphing (changing one concept into another) in the analysis of simile semantics.

The principles of semantic classification of Old English simile in terms of the centric-morphic approach were described in detail in Oleniak (2018a).

5.1. Old English similes with the gelic component juxtaposing actions/states.

These similes can be organised into five types with the further subdivision:

- (i) anthropocentric similes, including anthropocentric-anthropomorphic, anthropocentric-theomorphic, anthropocentric-artefactomorphic, anthropocentric-zoomorphic, anthropocentric-ecomorphic;
- (ii) artefactocentric-ecomorphic simile;
- (iii) ecocentric similes comprising ecocentric-ecomorphic, ecocentric-artefactomorphic, ecocentric-anthropomorphic;
- (iv) zoocentric-ecomorphic simile, including zoocentric-ecomorphic and zoocentric-zoomorphic;
- (v) theocentric similes, comprising theocentric-anthropomorphic, theocentric-theomorphic, theocentric-artefactomorphic, theocentric-ecomorphic ones.

5.1.1. Anthropocentric similes juxtaposing actions/states

Such similes are aimed at shaping a precise and clear understanding of a certain action and/or its characteristics by means of the juxtaposition of two notions based on the similar action they can both perform. The common salient feature in this case may be the action itself or its intensity, the extent of the action or the way it is performed so it may be either explicitly or implicitly expressed by a verb or the combination of a verb and an adverb. Among them the following subtypes can be singled out:

a) Anthropocentric-ecomorphic similes highlight resemblance between the states, actions or deeds of a person to the state or actions of certain natural phenomena. They mainly accentuate the psychological state of a person, see examples (9) and (14), or his virtues as in 11th-century *Æ Admon*:

(22) ... *se gesibsuma wer byð þam winearde gelic þe byrð gode wæstmas*
'... and a peaceful man lived to-the-vineyard like that gave birth to sprouts
wynsumlice growende
which grew blissfully'.

b) Anthropocentric-zoomorphic similes provide an opportunity to highlight certain personal positive or negative characteristics by comparing people's actions with those performed by animals. As a rule, such similes are evaluative and judgemental. High moral standards are typically amplified by employing images of harmless animals. Images of predators, however, are context-dependent: they are basically used to portray vices, but can also be adopted to praise some noble traits; for example:

(23) ... *and þæt ylce eft deð his Drihtne on teonan, þam hunde gelic, þe geet*
'... and he offended the God to-a-dog like and ate
his spiweðan, and ðam swine gelic...
his vomit to-a-swine like...'

(24) *He wearð þa leon gelic on his gewinnum and dædum, and todræfde*
'He then became like a lion in struggles and deeds, and destroyed
þa arleasan, and his eðel gerymde.
the wicked ones and cleared his country'

Both examples were harvested from 11th-century prose (*Æ Homilies*). As surviving manuscripts suggest, dogs and swine generally had a bad press in Old English (see (23)), representing dishonour and disgrace. Their images were used in similes as an instrument of social shame and opprobrium. A lion, however, did not have a 'fixed reputation' – this varied according to context: it could depict cruelty and brutality (Oleniak 2018a) or, as evidenced by (24), authority, respect and courage, shaping a heroic type of person.

c) Anthropocentric-artefactomorphic similes emphasise human helplessness in the face of nature or fate, for example in 11th-century *Paris Psalter*:

(25) *Ic eom hege gelic, þam þe hraðe weornað...*
'I am to-a-hedge like, that withered very quickly...'

Not being numerous, they are typically connected with the dilapidation of a living being, its senility or the most radical form of it – death due to human mortality and, by contrast, spiritual immortality.

d) Anthropocentric-theomorphic simile, the only one of its kind in the sampling (see (15)), juxtaposes a cheerful, reckless and a devil-may-care person with a deity of the underworld.

e) Anthropocentric-anthropomorphic similes compare people in different states or different roles in society, aiming at a precise depiction of a particular mode of being (mainly disabled) or of shaping a decent, pious and obedient person, for example in *Anglo-Saxon Version of Holy Gospels* (close end of the 10th, or the beginning of the 11th century):

(26) *Se ðe gehyrð & ne deþ, he is gelic þam timbriendan men his hus ofer þa*
'But he that hears, and does not, he is like a man that without a
eorþan butan grundwealle, & þæt flod in fleow & hraedlice hyt afeoll
foundation built a house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently,
and immediately it fell;
& wearð mycel hryre þæs huses.
and the ruin of that house was great.'

5.1.2. *Artefactocentric simile juxtaposing action/state/process.*

The only artefactocentric-ecomorphic simile of this kind, taken from 11th-century *Instruction for Christians*, eloquently depicts the frailty of life, comparing everything to a vanishing shadow that depreciates seemingly valuable earthly things:

(27) *Eal þæt þu her sceawast hit is sceaduwe gelic...*
'All that you see here is like a shadow...'

5.1.3. *Zoocentric simile juxtaposing action/state/process.*

Zoocentric-ecomorphic simile is also represented by one example only (see (3)) for which the term zoocentric might be slightly misleading. The simile in question is not completely animalistic since it focuses on a fabulous animal credited with supernatural qualities – the phoenix. So, it is not so much a bird that the narration is about, but the Christian message symbolically carried by it – the allurements and relish of eternal life, which 'glitters like gold leaves'.

5.1.4. *Theocentric similes juxtaposing action/state/process.*

a) Theocentric-artefactomorphic simile was found in two different versions of the Gospel. Differing structurally, the examples represent two structural but one semantic type of Old English simile:

(28) *Eft is heofena rice gelic asendum nette on þa sæ & of ælcum fiscsynne gadrigendum.*

‘Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and fishes of every kind gathered.’

In *Anglo-Saxon Version of Holy Gospels*, the kingdom of heaven is compared with the net, both being the object and the subject of the action: a net needs people to cast it into the sea, just as the kingdom of heaven needs its followers to promote the ideas of Christianity among non-believers to enable them to subsequently perform the action of catching in its direct (in case of net) and figurative (in the case of kingdom of heaven) meaning.

b) Theocentric-anthropomorphic similes represent a set of similes harvested from two late Old English versions of Gospel each explaining what the kingdom of heaven is like:

(29) *Eft is heofena rice gelic þam mangere þe sohte þæt gode meregrot.*

‘Again is the kingdom of heaven like to a merchant seeking good pearls.’

In all examples of this kind the kingdom of heaven is a functional working existence whose endeavour is directed at collecting and selecting the followers in order to subsequently guide them, on which basis it is juxtaposed with people engaged in similar kinds of activities: with a merchant looking for good pearls, a householder hiring workers for his vineyard, or ten maidens illuminating the way.

c) Theocentric-ecomorphic similes are functionally close to the previous subgroup because they are also aimed at an explanation of the nature of the kingdom of heaven. The example was taken from the *Anglo-Saxon Version of Holy Gospels*, translated at the very end of the 10th, or the beginning of the 11th century:

(30) *Heofena rice is gelic þam beorman þone þæt wif onfeng & behydde on*

‘The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a woman took and hid
þrim gemetum melwes oð he wæs eall ahafen.

in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.’

In this subgroup, the kingdom of heaven is displayed as an organism capable of growing with its functions targeted at growing, enlargement and extension.

5.2. *Old English similes with the gelic component juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena*

Old English similes with the *gelic* component juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena compare the latter without an indication of their common

state or a similar action they may be capable of performing. The similarity is found in their shapes, qualities, traits or certain aspects of their nature. The whole scope of Old English similes, with the *gelic* component juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena, can be subdivided into the following groups: anthropocentric, theocentric, ecocentric, zoocentric and artefactocentric.

5.2.1. Anthropocentric similes juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena

a) Anthropocentric-zoomorphic similes compare people with animals by illuminating additional characteristics as in 11th-century psalms:

- (31) *Ic geworden eom pellicane gelic, se on westene wunað.*
'I have become like a pelican who lives in the wilderness.'

The comparison of a person to a bird in this case was clearly not made to illustrate a human's ability to catch and store prey in its body but by the wildness attributed to pelicans in the early Middle Ages.

b) Anthropocentric-theomorphic similes juxtapose people or their emotional or psychological characteristics with deities or notions directly connected to them, for example:

- (32) *Me ymbhringdon sar and manigfeald witu, ful neah anlic helle wutum,*
'Me surrounded sorrows and numerous torments almost like hell's
and deaðes grynu me gefengon.
torments and of-death snares me'.

The psycho-emotional condition of a person is compared here (11th-century psalm) to the analogous one, typical of the underworld in order to amplify its intensity. Actually, the vehicle can be substituted in this case with the words 'were extremely intense'. Other examples of this subgroup comprise similes comparing bad people to hell / God's damnation or good people to angels, all implying great intensity.

5.2.2. Ecocentric similes juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena.

The majority of ecocentric similes were harvested from the 11th-century *Lapidary* containing glosses of stones, the colours of which are described by comparing them to other natural phenomena or everyday artefacts more familiar to people.

a) Ecocentric-ecomorphic simile, taken from the 10th/11th-century *Lapidary*, serves as an explanation of the stones' appearance.

- (33) *Twelfta is carbunculus haten se is byrnende glede gelic.*
'The twelfth is called carbuncle, it is to-a-burning coal like.'

b) Ecocentric-artefactomorphic similes are functionally close to the previous group serving as an explanation outlining the specifics of the outward characteristics of the phenomenon described. The example is also taken from the *Lapidary*:

(34) *Pridde is calcedonius haten se ys byrnendum blacerne gelic.*

‘The third is called chalcedony, it is to-a-burning lantern like.’

5.2.3. *Theocentric similes juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena.*

Theocentric similes are represented by four subtypes:

a) Theocentric-artefactomorphic simile was found in two late Old English variants of the Gospel being one of a series representing a simplified layman versions of the kingdom of heaven, which in this case is compared to a treasure:

(35) *Ongelic is ric heofna strion togedeglede in lond ðone seðe infand*

‘Alike is the kingdom of heaven hid in a field unto treasure; the
onfindes monn gehyðde & fore glædnisse ðæs geongeð gæð & bebyges alle
which when a man has found, he hides, and for joy thereof goes and sells all
ða ðe hæfes & byges lond ðone þæt.
that he has and buys that field.’

The great value of the treasure is emphasised in this simile by an additional extension that characterises the riches as being worth risking everything for the chance of finding even greater riches.

b) The only theocentric-anthropomorphic simile of this type is another illustration of Christian realia in the 11th-century homilies:

(36) *Nu is for ði seo halige gelaðung gelic tyn mædenum. for ðan ðe seo*

‘Now therefore the holy church is like ten maidens because the
gelaðung is gegaderod of ægdres hades mannum. þæt is werhades and wifhades.
church is gathered from its men and women.’

c) Theocentric-theomorphic similes are also aimed at teaching the laity how Christian principles work:

(37) *Wa me, forþam þe ic sceal to helle for þinum yfeldædum and þu hafast*

‘Alas, because I shall go to hell for your evil deeds, and you have
gedon, þæt ic eom deofles bearn and deoflum gelic.
done me wrong, so that I’m the child of the devil and similar to the devil’s one’.

This simile, found in 11th-century homilies, is one of many that sound like a threat, a warning against wrongdoing. The example proves that similes appealing to one of a person’s most basic instincts, fear (‘not to make someone a devil’s child’ or many others), appear to have been a useful tool in shaping a good Christian.

5.2.4. Zoocentric similes juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena.

a) The only harvested zoocentric-zoomorphic simile seemingly focuses on an animal, though in fact it revolves around a fabulous symbolic creature, the phoenix, a Christian symbol of eternal life (see (7)).

b) Zoocentric-ecomorphic simile found in the 10th-century poetic description of a whale compares it to a huge stone:

(38) *Is þæs hiw gelic hreofum stane.*

'Its appearance is like that to-a-rough boulder.'

5.2.5. Artefactocentric simile juxtaposing things/people/animals/phenomena is represented by one example only (see (2)) that indirectly speaks about a deity by comparing his possession (throne) to a cosmic object (sun).

The semantic characteristics of Old English similes with the *gelic* component in terms of the centric-morphic principle of classification are shown in Table 3:

Type of similes \ Scope of similes	Similes juxtaposing actions / states	Similes juxtaposing things / people / animals / phenomena	Total
Anthropocentric			38
Anthropocentric-ecomorphic	6		6
Anthropocentric-zoomorphic	8	4	12
Anthropocentric-artefactomorphic	2		2
Anthropocentric-theomorphic	2	7	9
Anthropocentric-anthropomorphic	9		9
Artefactocentric			2
Artefactocentric-ecomorphic	1	1	2
Ecocentric			12
Ecocentric-ecomorphic		8	8
Ecocentric-artefactomorphic		3	3
Ecocentric-anthropomorphic	1		1
Zoocentric			3
Zoocentric-ecomorphic	1	1	2
Zoocentric-zoomorphic		1	1
Theocentric			15
Theocentric-ecomorphic	2		2
Theocentric-artefactomorphic	2	2	4
Theocentric-anthropomorphic	6	1	7
Theocentric-theomorphic		2	2
Total	40	30	70

Table 3. The paradigm of the semantic characteristics of the Old English similes of equality with the *gelic* component.

Reading this table vertically we can see that actions and states are more often subjected to comparison than things, people and phenomena in the concerned constructions, but only somewhat so (57% and 43% respectively). If we read the table horizontally, we can observe spheres of interests which were a primary focus for Anglo-Saxons, whose social and cultural identity was largely influenced by Latin texts, mainly religious in character, where anthropocentrism is indisputably dominant (38 units or 52% of all examples). It is worth mentioning, however, that the anthropocentrism of Old English simile is primarily categorising, descriptive and didactic in nature. By comparing people mainly to animals, deities or some definite types of people, the positive and negative characteristics were highlighted to distinguish good people (usually in terms of Christian values) from bad ones. Thus, a person with positive qualities was associated with a calf, an eagle, a lion, a vine, an angel, a wise man building his house with a foundation, whereas a person with negative features, by contrast, was associated with a mouse, a swine, a dog, a snake, hell or the devil, a stupid girl or an unwise man building his house without any foundation. Personifying good and evil in this way, Old English similes served as a moralising rhetoric device aimed at shaping good Christians.

The second frequent semantic type of similes in question is the group of theocentric similes falling into ecomorphic, artefactomorphic, anthropomorphic and theomorphic subgroups (15 items or 21% of all examples). The distinctive feature of these similes is their explanatory character concerned chiefly with describing what the kingdom of heaven is like. The latter is compared to a net capable of catching fish, leaven affecting the whole meal, ten maidens lighting the way, a merchant looking for good pearls, a king inviting people to the wedding or a hidden treasure. Apart from the comparison with a treasure hidden in the field, the kingdom of heaven is always associated with some active existence capable of performing certain activities: spreading itself by extending the area of its influence or collecting something by seeking and acquiring it. It is always interpreted in positive terms.

The third frequent semantic type is the set of ecocentric similes categorised into ecomorphic, artefactomorphic and anthropomorphic subtypes (12 units or 17% of all examples). Most of them were harvested from the 11th-century *Lapidary* devoted to the description of precious stones, though, unlike in the case of anthropomorphic similes, these similes are purely depictive without any classificatory or evaluative context. They impart the appearance (usually colour) of the stones, which are associated either with blood or gold, golden stars, shining stars, burning coal, burning lantern, sea or white crystal. They are mainly familiarising, carrying out a heuristic function.

The least represented semantic subtype is a group of zoocentric similes divided into ecomorphic and zoomorphic (3 items or 4% of all examples), two of which can be regarded as zoocentric only in the conventional sense

since they describe a fabulous bird, the phoenix, which is closer to spiritual than animalistic life.

6. Conclusions

As a result of the first stage of grammaticalisation *gelic*, *anlic* and *ongelic* coexisted in Old English as adjectives, but *gelic* was used much more frequently to the detriment of *anlic* and *ongelic*. It could be used in all the configurations of the basic simile pattern N + N_{dat} + *gelic* except for the initial position of the construction inasmuch as that was a natural and, indeed, the only place for *ongelic*. Positionally *anlic* was more similar to *gelic*, but the former never colligated with syntactically extended formations. Later the second stage of the grammaticalisation process came into force and, subsequently, present-day English *like* emerged as a pre-posed marker. In Old English similes there was a strong tendency to place the topic before the vehicle, if the prosodic parameters did not demand otherwise. Clauses were often employed as extensions of the constructions representing their grounds, the final positioning of which can be accounted for by their explanatory character. Semantically, Old English similes with the *gelic* component cover a wide range of life aspects with a clear focus on a person in the context of Christian religion and an explanation of the basis of Christianity. People, being compared to living beings (other people, deities, animals) are not the object of interest; they are rather the object of judgement. A personified heavenly kingdom is typically illustrated as a functioning existence, inasmuch as theomorphism is always associated with power, intensity and strength. The rhetoric realised by the concerned constructions is mainly didactic and moralising, being also explanatory at times. A purely descriptive function is fulfilled only occasionally, mainly depicting nature-related objects.

Notes

¹ In the simile *Her lips are red like roses*, the tenor is *lips* (the subject of comparison, the thing we are talking about); the vehicle is *roses* (the object, to which we compare the tenor); the ground is *red* (the salient feature that both the tenor and the vehicle share).

² *Her lips are like roses* is an open simile because it does not explain the basis for the comparison, it does not say why the lips are similar to roses, whereas *Her lips are red like roses* is a closed simile because it explains the basis for the comparison by explicitly mentioning the shared salient feature (*red*).

Bibliographical References

- Amodio, Mark 2014. *The Anglo-Saxon Literature Handbook*. Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Baker, Peter Stuart 2012. *Introduction to Old English*. Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Beardsley, Monroe Curtis 1981. *Aesthetics: problems in the philosophy of criticism*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Bosworth-Toller = Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. <bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/014981> (9 February 2020).
- Cirlot, Juan Eduardo 2001. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. London: Routledge.
- Dawes, Gregory 1998. *The body in question: metaphor and meaning in the interpretation of Ephesians 5: 21-33*. Leiden: Brill.
- DOEC = Dictionary of Old English Corpus 2009 [1981]. <www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html> (9 February 2020).
- Fisher, Olga 1992. Syntax. In Norman Blake (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. 2 (1066-1476). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 207-407.
- Gergel, Remus 2008. Comparatives and Inversion in English: A (Necessarily) Diachronic Account. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 14,1. 177-190.
- Glucksberg, Sam & Keysar, Boaz 1990. Understanding metaphorical comparisons: Beyond similarity. *Psychological Review* 97,1. 3-18. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.1.3> (9 February 2020).
- Heine, Bernd 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmquist, Kelly 2006. Shifting meanings, forgotten meanings: metaphor as a force for language change. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Linguística Teórica e Aplicada* 22. 95-107. <dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502006000300008> (9 February 2020).
- Hopper, Paul & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization: Volume I. Theoretical and methodological issues*. 17-35.
- Lehmann, Christian 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Maling, Joan 1983. Transitive Adjectives: A Case of Categorical Reanalysis. *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 19. 253-289.
- Margolis, Joseph 1957. Notes on the Logic of Simile, Metaphor and Analogy. *American Speech* 32,3. 186-189.
- McLaughlin, John 1983. *Old English Syntax*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Merritt, Carlton Charles 2013. *Descriptive Syntax of the Old English Charters*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Mitchel, Bruce 1985. *Old English Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nevanlinna, Saara 1993. The Structure of Middle English similes of equality. In *Early English in the Computer Age: Explorations Through the Helsinki Corpus*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 139-170.
- Oleniak, Mariana 2018a. Old English Simile of Equality: The Highest Degree of

- Similarity. *Research in Language* 16,4. Germany: De Gruyter. 471-493.
- Oleniak, Mariana 2018b. Dawnioangliyski obrazni porivniannia z komponentom gelicra. In *Modern Scientific Challenges and Trends*. Warsaw: iScience. 82-84.
- Online Etymology Dictionary. <www.etymonline.com> (9 February 2020).
- Porto, Lucía Loureiro 2005. *The Semantic Predecessors of need from Old to Early Modern English*. PhD dissertation. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Richards, Ivor Armstrong 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stanburrough Cook, Albert 1916. *The old English Elene, Phoenix, and Physiologus*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stodnick, Jacqueline & Trilling, Renee 2012. *A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Studies*. Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tyler, Elizabeth 2006. *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England*. York: York Medieval Press.
- YCOE = The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose. 2003. > (9 February 2020).
- Walker, Marilyn 2016. Automatically Inferring Implicit Properties in Similes. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*. San Diego, California. 1223-1232.

