The concept of KÆRLIGHED (love) as represented in data from Old Danish

Aleksander Kacprzak (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań)

Abstract

The article aims to reconstruct the conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED (LOVE) in Old Danish (1100–1515). In the first part of the study, the structure of the concept in Old Danish is analyzed, and parallels are drawn to the modern-day concept of KÆRLIGHED, the most significant differences being registered in the subcategories of PATRIOTISM and ROMANTIC LOVE, as well as in connection with the sense 'love to do'. In the following parts of the study, the most important aspects and conceptual metaphors of Old Danish KÆRLIGHED are revealed, demonstrating a great influence of Christian values. Lastly, the nouns *ælskhugh* and *kærlikhet* are analyzed, and the difference between them is described as a different profiling of the various aspects of KÆRLIGHED, such as JOY and PLEASURE.

Keywords: Old Danish, the concept of LOVE in Danish, metaphors of LOVE, language of LOVE, cognitive linguistics

1. INTRODUCTION

Although LOVE has been a highly popular topic in various branches of science, there exists little culture-specific research on the concept of KÆRLIGHED ('love') in Denmark, particularly in the field of linguistics. The present paper attempts to fill this void and reconstruct the conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED present in a collection of notes from the period 1100–1515[1] containing either of the three main lexical representations of the concept (the verb *ælske* together with the nouns *kærlikhet* and *ælskhugh*). More specifically, the study aims to focus on:

a) the structure of the category KÆRLIGHED;
b) the most important aspects of KÆRLIGHED;
c) the metaphors that served to conceptualize and verbalize KÆRLIGHED;
d) the semantic difference between the nouns *ælskhugh* and *kærlikhet*.

In the light of the remarks made by James Underhill who pointed out that the current shape of the category in most of the European languages derives its roots from the Christian idea of LOVE (Underhill 2012:69), the chosen period seems to be particularly relevant for understanding the origins of the category of KÆRLIGHED, as Christianity in Denmark was introduced and reinforced in the times of Old Danish.

2. CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE

LOVE has received attention in various branches of science, spanning from anthropology (Buss 1988) and neurobiology (Bartels & Zeki 2004, Magon & Kalra 2011) to philosophy (Fromm 2012), Lewis (1960) and cultural studies (Jankowiak & Fischer 1992:154). What most of the mentioned approaches have in common is that they treat LOVE from the universal perspective and downplay the culture- and language-specific aspects of the concept. This is why linguistic research on LOVE, highlighting the uniqueness of the ways in which every culture conceptualizes it, seems to be an important part of the pursuit to understand this complex emotion.

There have been plenty of linguistic studies on LOVE involving different approaches, such as componential analysis (Wierzbicka 1971, 1986; Zaron 1985), analysis of conceptual metaphors (Kovecses 1986), or discourse analysis (Underhill 2012). Perhaps the most comprehensive research has been carried out by Bogusław Bierwiaczonek (2002) whose analysis of the English concept of LOVE embraces the whole category and explains its structure in terms of three cognitive models – the erotic model, the parental model, as well as the biblical model – that receive different prominence within the single subcategories of LOVE.

Unfortunately, there exist no linguistic studies of the concept of KÆRLIGHED in Danish. Perhaps the most relevant contributions in the present context have been written by Kai Aalbæk-Nielsen (1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2003) who, over the span of four volumes, demonstrates how LOVE in general and Danish KÆRLIGHED in particular have evolved over centuries. Outside of that, there is also a compendium published by Thomas Nielsen (2011) that presents the Danish reader with various, mostly American, studies on LOVE conducted across different branches of science. In the light of the above, it seems desirable to widen the current state of knowledge about the Danish conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED and focus more on the culture- and language-relative side of the concept.

---

[1] The vast majority of the analyzed notes, however, covers a much narrower time frame, mostly between 1400 and 1515.

3. MATERIAL

The empirical material employed in the present study is based on a collection of short notes from the period 1100–1515 that eventually will serve to develop a dictionary (*Gammeldansk Ordbog*) covering the Danish language in the Middle Ages. At the time of writing, *Gammeldansk Ordbog* is yet to be published, but the short notes containing original texts from the mentioned period provide a unique insight into how the lexical representations of the concept were used in the Old Danish. Overall, the material consists of 971 notes: 418 for *kærlighed*, 383 for *ælske* and 170 for *ælskhugh*. The notes are usually 4–8 verses long.

An important advantage of the material is that it includes the majority of all written texts from the examined period and thus can be said to be fairly representative of the concept functioning at that time. Nevertheless, we need to point out that the sources are in many instances of religious origin. On the one hand, this undoubtedly reflects the spirit of medieval times where religion played a much greater role than it currently does in Denmark. Therefore, the number of notes with religious background should be treated as a natural result of the way the concept was profiled during the period in question. But we also need to acknowledge the fact that the dominance of religious and, for that matter, institutional texts is also a consequence of the level of literacy in medieval Denmark. Thus, many "everyday conceptualizations" of KÆRLIGHED may have been omitted and not conveyed because an average speaker of Old Danish was not given a voice in these texts. This means that we should be very careful when drawing further conclusions from the notes and need to realize that we may analyze a certain discourse rather than the general conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED in Danish.

Nevertheless, the texts seem to offer a considerably varied perspective on the conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED in the Middle Ages as they allow to establish all the main sub-categories of KÆRLIGHED and provide the researcher with many basic collocations containing the lexical representations of the concept – the verb *ælske* and the two nouns *kærlikhet* and *ælskhugh*[2].

4. ETYMOLOGY AND THE CONCEPT OF KÆRLIGHED IN MODERN DANISH

In order to appreciate the uniqueness of the Old Danish conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED present in the gathered material, it seems necessary to provide a quick sketch of how it functions in the modern language. For this purpose, we will rely on data coming from the most comprehensive contemporary dictionary of Danish language *Den Danske Ordbog* (further referred to as DDO) as well as collocations occurring in the corpus of Danish language (*Korpus.dk*) built based on texts from the period 1990–2000. On the other hand, we also need to go even further back in time and present the origins of the concept, particularly the etymology of its lexical representations.

Starting with the latter of the two tasks, the most comprehensive elaborations of the etymology of the three representations of the concept can be found in *Dansk etymologisk ordbog*. According to the dictionary, the Danish *elske* is related to the norrøn [or Old Norse] *elska* where it originally meant 'to nourish/nurture, cultivate' (Nielsen 1969:82). The suffix *-hugh* in the noun *ælskhugh* is also related to Old Norse and means 'will, intention, mind' (Nielsen 1969:160). The noun *kærlighed*, on the other hand, is derived from the adjective *kærlig*, developed from the adjective *kær* 'precious, valuable' and the suffix *-legh*, *-lek* 'that has a certain appearance, figure, attribute' (Nielsen 1969:218–219, 230). In reference to the

---

[2] The spelling of the lexemes varies greatly in the analyzed texts. We shall use the mentioned forms, which serve as default in *Gammeldansk Ordbog*.

etymological models of LOVE in languages of Proto-Indo-European origin created by Mariola Jakubowicz (2000:233–236), we must conclude that all three lexemes originally lacked the sexual aspect and focused on aspects such as CARE, TENDERNESS and AFFECTION.

The situation is different in Modern Danish where only two of the above-mentioned words (the noun *kærlighed* and the verb *elske*) can be categorized as the main lexical representations of the concept, while the noun *elskov* (Old Danish *ælskhugh*) bears only a specialized meaning 'sex' and is most often used in poetic contexts. Most importantly, the modern category of KÆRLIGHED is divided into several distinct subcategories, each standing for a different type of relation, which is reflected in compounds, e.g. *broderkærlighed/næstekærlighed* 'brotherly love'*, egenkærlighed/selvkærlighed* 'self-love'*, faderkærlighed* 'fatherly love'*, moderkærlighed* 'motherly love', *forældrekærlighed* 'parental love'*, fædrelandskærlighed* 'amor patriae'*, søskendekærlighed* 'love between siblings' as well as highly conventionalized collocations such as *romantisk kærlighed* 'romantic love', *Guds kærlighed* 'God's love'*,* and *kærlighed til Gud* 'love of God'[3]. Here, we can draw parallels to Bierwiaczonek's study of the English concept of LOVE where similar subcategories are distinguished (Bierwiaczonek 2002:85–103), and conclude that the Danish category of KÆRLIGHED shares plenty of similarities with its modern English counterpart.

Moreover, similar to the concept of LOVE in other European languages (e.g. English LOVE or Polish MIŁOŚĆ), the Danish concept of KÆRLIGHED is mainly based on two major image schemas – the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL image schema with KÆRLIGHED IS FIRE (*tænde gnisten, kærlighed brænder, gnisten forsvinder*) and KÆRLIGHED IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER (*kærlighedsbølge, fyldt med kærlighed, eksplodere af kærlighed*) as the most prominent metaphors, and the LINK image schema where KÆRLIGHED is often perceived in terms of a BOND (*et stærkt bånd, kærlighed binder*), ATTACHMENT (*at tiltrække*) or POSESSION (*du er min, min elskede* X). In the light of the corpus data, a special place within the whole concept is reserved for a certain ideal of "true" KÆRLIGHED (*ægte/ sand/ virkelig/ rigtig/ oprigtig kærlighed*) that consists of aspects such as, among others, CLOSENESS (*kærlighed og nærhed, nærmeste personer*), TRUST (*kærlighed og tillid*), RESPECT/ACCEPTATION (*kærlighed og respekt, kærlighed og accept*), WORK (*arbejde for kærlighed, kærlighed kræver arbejde*), ALTRUISM (*uselvisk/ uegennyttig/ altruistisk kærlighed*) and SACRIFICE (*kærlighed og opofrelse, opofrende kærlighed*). Moreover, it is important to note that the modern-day category of KÆRLIGHED spans over more than only various relations between people and embraces senses 'love to do' (*elske* + activity), 'a weakness/passion for' (*kærlighed for*), 'a beloved person' (often pos. pronoun + *kærlighed*) or 'sex' (the verb *elske* in monovalent contexts or the construction *elske med*).

5. THE STRUCTURE OF THE CATEGORY

The analysis of collocations involving the predicate *ælske* shows that most of the main subcategories of KÆRLIGHED that occur nowadays existed already in Old Danish. Below, we present a list of all the possible relations between the subject and the object of KÆRLIGHED that can be distinguished based on the available material:

a) GOD'S KÆRLIGHED FOR HUMANS
b) HUMANS' KÆRLIGHED FOR GOD
c) ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED (KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN)
d) PARENTAL KÆRLIGHED[4]
e) A CHILD'S KÆRLIGHED FOR PARENTS

---

[3] As registered in *Den Danske Ordbog* and *Korpus.dk*.
[4] PARENTAL KÆRLIGHED can be further divided into MOTHERLY KÆRLIGHED and FATHERLY KÆRLIGHED.

f) KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN FRIENDS
g) BROTHERLY KÆRLIGHED
h) SELF-KÆRLIGHED
i) A RULER'S KÆRLIGHED TOWARDS THE SUBJECTS
j) KÆRLIGHED OF THE SUBJECTS TOWARDS THEIR RULER
k) KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN KINGDOMS AND PEOPLES
l) KÆRLIGHED FOR THINGS (both abstract and physical)

As we look at the list, one of the most noticeable differences between the modern-day concept and the concept of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish can be traced in the subcategories (i) and (j). This is, of course, a result of the political and social changes that have taken place in the last 500 years. A similar difference can be observed in the subcategory (k), where KÆRLIGHED nowadays prototypically binds two democratic nations, opposed to kingdoms in Old Danish.

Significant changes can be also noted in the category of ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED. One of the noteworthy differences is the link between KÆRLIGHED and MARRIAGE that occurs in the texts from Old Danish:

(1) Ok thog hænnæ til husfrw, ok swo møghet ælste han hænne
'and made her his wife and loved her so much' (2Mos. .. (GldBib.))[5]

KÆRLIGHED outside of marriage as well as adultery was strictly forbidden (2), and with regard to women, one of the most desirable virtues was virginity (3):

(2) Tw skalt ey attraa thin jeffncristens Hustruæ æy hans datter eller tyæniste quinnæ
'You shall not desire your neighbour's wife nor daughter nor servant' (DiplChrI)

(3) fforthij so som legemet thæt hælict gørs wed iomfrvdomæn
'because the body becomes sacred in virginity' (Gregor.Tract)

According to the following sentence (4), such "good women" should be respected and loved, but the mere possibility of asking a question "whether one should love or hate women" reveals much about the perception of women in the medieval times:

(4) skal man ælskæ quinner eller skal man them hadæ? Godhe quinner skal man ælske, lowæ ok hedhre
'shall one love women or hate them? Good women shall one love, glorify and honor' (Sydr)

Nonetheless, it is important to note, that KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN was commanded in the Bible and intended by God (5). Moreover, we need to keep in mind, that the Bible is the primary source of the perception of man and woman as ONE BODY, which also finds reflection in one of the texts (6).

(5) Mannen skall ælske quinnen, Fforthi gudh hawe thet […] Ok qwinnen skal ok ælske mannen J ære ok tucht
'The man shall love the women. Because God wants it […] And the women shall love the man with honor and decency' (Sydr)

(6) ælstæ han hennæ so som sit eyæt legæmæ
'he loved her as his own body' (KlosterB)

---

[5] For detailed information about the sources of the examples referenced in this paper see the reference list at the end.

Besides the changes in the conceptualization of subcategories (c), (i), (j), and (k), the most important difference between the category of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish and its modern Danish equivalent concerns the sense 'love to do'. It cannot be ruled out definitely that the construction *elske at gøre* 'love to do', derived metonymically from several aspects of KÆRLIGHED such as PASSION, JOY and PLEASURE, may have existed in Old Danish, but none of the 383 notes provide evidence for this fact. This stands in stark contrast to the modern-day use of the predicate *elske* where the pattern *elske* + ACTIVITY has become highly popular. A similar semantic extension can also be observed with regard to the subcategory (l). In this case, Old Danish already gave its speakers the possibility to combine the verb *elske,* as well as the nouns *kærlikhet* and *ælskhugh,* with non-human objects, but it seems that the combination possibilities were limited by two fairly clear usage patterns. Firstly, in all positively-valued cases found in the texts, the object of KÆRLIGHED was an abstract concept, perceived as an undeniable virtue, e.g. RIGHTEOUSNESS, PEACE, CHASTITY, TRUTH, WISDOM, HUMBLENESS, COMMANDMENTS:

(7) Then her visdom ælste iegh
    'I loved this wisdom' (KlosterB)

(8) O herræ, see at iek elskte thine budordh
    'O lord, see that I loved your commandments' (BønneB.III.003-175)

In this positive sense, the verb *ælske* combined with an abstract noun denoting a virtue meant primarily 'to follow/ to live in'.

On the other hand, if the object of KÆRLIGHED was a material thing, the sentence would always have strongly negative connotations, as in the sentence below:

(9) Thinæ høffdhingæ ære wtro, ok alle ælskæ mutæ ok gaffwer, ok astundæ werldz løn.
    'Your people were unfaithful and loved bribery and presents and desired the worldly rewards'
    (SøndEv.001-169)

In this type of cases, the meaning of the verb seems to have been based metonymically on some of the aspects of passionate KÆRLIGHED, such as DESIRE and LUST. Even in the cases where the object of KÆRLIGHED was a concrete material object or a set of such objects, it usually served to stand metonymically for earthly goods in general that were perceived as vanity and an obstacle on one's path to the true KÆRLIGHED of God.

Furthermore, there seems to have been an inclination to establish a clear hierarchy of the different subcategories of KÆRLIGHED. One of the sources names nearly all the subcategories explicitly and organizes them according to their place in the hierarchy:

(10) først ælske thin gudh ffor all tingh, ther nest tegh sielff, ther nest thin høsfrwæ, Ok sa thine
     børn, Ok sa thinæ frender ok venner, Ok sidhen alle menniske.
     'Firstly love your God over all things, next yourself and then your wife, and then your children,
     and then your relatives and friends, and then all people' (Sydr)

Another note from the same source, on the other hand, highlights the significance of KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN and considers it equally important as KÆRLIGHED TOWARDS GOD and SELF-KÆRLIGHED:

(11) én man skal ælske sin høsfrwe meer æn noghen annen tingh, Fforthii han skal ælske henne
     næst syn gudh og segh sielff
     'a man shall love his wife more than any other thing because one shall love her
     next to God and himself' (Sydr)

However, there is a lot of evidence from other notes that backs up the initial hierarchy in which KÆRLIGHED TO GOD should be prioritized before all the other types of love: *j alle thine dyghd oc makt ælska Gudh* 'with all your power love God', *at ælskia Gudh aff allo hjerta* 'love God with all your heart', *Ælsk thin Gudh aff allo thino hiærta, oc aff alle thine siæl, oc aff allum thinum hugh* 'Love God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might' which stands in stark contrast to the situation nowadays.[6]

6. MAIN ASPECTS AND VALUING OF KÆRLIGHED IN OLD DANISH TEXTS

The collected material concerning all three lexical representations of the concept provides a fairly good insight into the basic characteristics of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish. Based on collocations with the nouns *kærlikhet* and *ælskhugh* that follow the pattern "*kærlikhet* and X" or "*ælskhugh* and X", it is possible to distinguish the main notions that were associated with the concept of KÆRLIGHED: EFFORT (*umage og kærlighed*), WILL (*villie och kerligheidt*), PEACE (*frid ogh kerlighet*), GOODWILL (*god villiæ ok kerlighet*), KINSHIP (*kjerlighedh och frendskab*), UNITY (*endrecht, friid oc kerligheit*), GOODNESS (*hiertens kerlighedh oc vgrundeligh godhedh*), FAITH and HOPE (*then helighe troo, stadicht hop oc fulkommen kerlighedh*), GRACE (*for gundst og kærlighed*) and MERCY (*kærligheth oc nadhen*). Some other aspects are also provided by the sources citing St. Paul's first letter to Corinthians that link KÆRLIGHED to GOOD DEEDS, PATIENCE and KINDNESS. All the above-presented aspects can be divided into three fairly distinct groups, relative to the context in which they occur.

a) The first group of collocations pertains mostly to the relation between people and God (FAITH, HOPE, GRACE, MERCY).
b) The second group is centered around the Christian idea of BROTHERLY LOVE and highlights its most important aspects, such as GOODWILL, GOOD DEEDS, AGREEMENT, EFFORT, WILL, KINDNESS.
c) The third group concerns the state of KÆRLIGHED that should exist between kingdoms or internally between the ruler and his subjects as well as the mutual KÆRLIGHED between a kingdom's population (FRIENDSHIP, UNITY, AGREEMENT, PEACE)

As we can see, the concept of KÆRLIGHED in the analyzed Old Danish notes was closely connected with the Christian idea of LOVE in that most of the related concepts mentioned above are also central for the preaching of the Bible, and the link is also mentioned explicitly in the expression *then helighe troo, stadicht koph oc fulkommen kerlighedh* 'the holly faith, continuous hope and complete love'. Moreover, the "true" Christian KÆRLIGHED (*sandh kærlighet*) was perceived as the most important virtue in human life, and especially the KÆRLIGHED that God gave to people was ascribed a tremendous value:

(12) ær kærlegheth ywer alle dydhær
    'love is over all virtues' (Post)

(13) guthelikin kærlichet ær meghet wærdugh
    'God's love is much worth' (SøndEv.001-169)

---

[6] According to a questionnaire conducted on the initiative of the Center for Kirkeforskning (The Center for Church Studies) at the Univeristy of Copenhagen, only 28% Danes believe that God exists. https://teol.ku.dk/cfk/yougov-undersoegelse/ (access 21.04.2020)

With reference to Bierwiaczonek's theory of three models of LOVE (Bierwiaczonek 2002:188–202) mentioned in section 2, there is little doubt that the biblical model was dominant in the analyzed part of the Old Danish discourse on KÆRLIGHED. The analysis of collocations following the pattern adj + *kærlighed/ælskhugh* allows us to confirm the observations made in the previous paragraph and conclude that especially one subcategory – GOD'S KÆRLIGHED (*gudelig kærlikhet*) – played a special, foundational role for the whole category. His KÆRLIGHED was perceived as GREAT (*th[e]n store kærlighet*), ENORMOUS (*vhørelig kærlighet*), EVER-LASTING (*ewighe kierlighedh*) as well as INCOMPREHENSIBLE (*wbegribelige kerlighedh*). Moreover, God's KÆRLIGHED was not only the most frequently mentioned type of KÆRLIGHED, but was also conceptualized as a source of all other types of KÆRLIGHED. It was God who showed people the path to "true" KÆRLIGHED, and especially highlighted in this context was the sacrifice of Jesus (*hans pynes kerlighedh* 'the love of his pain'). The other two subcategories that are central to the Biblical model of LOVE – HUMANS' KÆRLIGHED FOR GOD and BROTHERLY LOVE – are also richly represented in the texts. With regard to the former of the two, KÆRLIGHED FOR GOD was given the most important place in humans' hearts. This type of KÆRLIGHED was the ultimate priority for humans, who should willingly sacrifice all their earthly goods and temptations and devote themselves to loving God (14):

> (14) Hon gaff alt sit godz for min ælskogh sigher Christus
> 'She gave all her goods for my love says Christ' (JyTingsv)

This, however, does not mean that the other subcategories of KÆRLIGHED became unimportant, and especially BROTHERLY KÆRLIGHED was inevitable for people to understand and achieve God's KÆRLIGHED.

But sentence (14) holds even more essential information about the Old Danish KÆRLIGHED, as it points towards the contrast between material goods and spiritual values, which was already mentioned in paragraph (4). As observed by Underhill, "words define themselves in opposition to one another" (Underhill 2012:124), and this seems to hold true also in our case, as the gathered material provides us with a handful of anti-values functioning in opposition to the Old Danish KÆRLIGHED. Also in this regard, much of the available information comes from St. Paul's letter to Corinthians:

> (15) Kerlighed høfferder sig icke / Hwn forsmaar ingen Hwn acther icke all eniste sit æget gaffn /Hwn forhaster sig icke Hun tencker icke at gøre ilde / Hwn glæddiss icke aff synd eller ondskaff
> 'Love does not boast, she does not disdain anyone, she is not self-seeking, she is not easily angered, she does not intend to do bad things, she does not rejoice sin or evil' (Sydr)

The first group of the opposite concepts is centered around the Christian notions of SIN and EVIL (SIN, EVIL, BAD DEEDS), which, again, shows the influence that the Christian philosophy had on the conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED in Medieval Denmark. Among other antonyms of KÆRLIGHED occurring in the texts we can also name HATRED, PRIDE and SELF-CENTEREDNESS. But perhaps the most visible and highlighted opposition that can be concluded from the texts is the dichotomies between KÆRLIGHED and VANITY, BODY and SPIRIT as well as EARTH and HEAVEN. Within this point of view, especially feelings such as LUST and DESIRE were perceived as temptations that could lead people away from their path to the righteous KÆRLIGHED given by God.

> (16) Forlot Gutz ælskoghe for werdænne ælskoghe
> 'Left God's love for worldly love(s)' (SøndEv.001-169)

(17) Hon skal frelse mik aff all ondh begeringh oc wskykkeligh kærlighed
    'She shall save me from all evil lust and indecent love' (Kempis)

This type of KÆRLIGHED was always perceived as UNCLEAN (*vren ælscugh*) or BAD (*darlighe ælskoff*) and was most often symbolized by THE BODY and THE WORLD that seem to have had exclusively negative connotations in the context of KÆRLIGHED. This division was further reinforced by the use of the adjectives "true" and "right" – it was only the purely spiritual KÆRLIGHED that could be perceived as "true":

(18) Sandh gutz kærlighet hwn bortsændher all forfængh
    'God's true love she dismissess all vanity' (KærlSt)

This negative valuing of the bodily aspects of KÆRLIGHED together with the quest for "true" KÆRLIGHED is still partially enrooted in the modern conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED in Danish. Although much has changed in the last 500 years, and sex dominates the contemporary Danish discourse on ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED, the passionate aspects of KÆRLIGHED have not been able to break into the semantic core of the category and are still perceived as secondary to the notion of "true" KÆRLIGHED[7]. On the other hand, as demonstrated in paragraph (4), the key Christian concepts such as SACRIFICE and ALTRUISM are still part of the ideal of "true" KÆRLIGHED. This indicates that, likewise in the case of the English concept of LOVE, the Christian idea of LOVE has had crucial influence on how the category of KÆRLIGHED is organized in the modern-day Danish language, and that many of the most important changes to its structure may have been introduced in the period of Old Danish.

7. METAPHORICAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF KÆRLIGHED IN OLD DANISH TEXTS

Most of the basic conceptual metaphors related to the concept of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish can be easily recognized by the modern-day speaker of Danish language (as well as other European languages). Firstly, the Old Danish KÆRLIGHED was perceived as an OBJECT that people could HAVE and then GIVE to other people. Sometimes the objectification of KÆRLIGHED was very literal, as in (19):

(19) all myn kærlighet legger iegh i tyne hændher
    'I put all my love in your hands' (KærlSt)

Other fundamental ontological metaphors, such as LOVE IS FIRE and LOVE IS LIQUID are also present in the analyzed texts:

(20) miyn siel maa brende i hans kerlighetz yld
    'my soul shall burn in the fire of his love' (BønneB.I.076-151)

(21) O siel op fylt med kiærlighet
    'Oh the soul filled with/full of love' (KærlSt)

---

[7] Based on the results from Korpus.dk, none of the collocations involving the notion of "true" KÆRLIGHED (*ægte/sand/oprigtig kærlighed*) referred to its passionate aspects.

The logical consequence of the metaphorical conceptualizations mentioned above is that KÆRLIGHED can be PUT and STORED in a CONTAINER. Nowadays, KÆRLIGHED is typically mostly associated with THE HEART[8] and this conceptualization was also present in Old Danish.

(22) medh kierlighet aff hiertens grwnde
    'with love from the bottom of the heart' (KlosterB)

But, as shown in sentences (20) and (21), THE HEART was not the only CONTAINER where KÆRLIGHED could be stored as THE SOUL seems to also have played an important role in this regard. This may stand in contrast to the modern-day conceptualization of KÆRLIGHED where THE HEART has dominated other conceptualizations pertaining to the CONTAINER metaphor (although it is still possible to use THE SOUL metaphor). This development may be connected with the shift of focus that the category has undergone in the last 500 years, as KÆRLIGHED TO GOD has lost its prominent role in favor of ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED. Typically, it is THE SOUL that binds humans with the metaphysical world, while THE HEART stands for emotion and desire, which could explain why THE SOUL was so important in the times when KÆRLIGHED TO GOD was perceived as the main value in human life. But also KÆRLIGHED itself could be perceived as a CONTAINER (*i kærlikhet*):

(23) then som mik fylgher j kerlikhet
    'the one who follows me in love' (Post)

The above example also reveals one more important metaphor of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish – KÆRLIGHED as a PATH – but although it certainly awakes associations with a popular modern metaphor KÆRLIGHED IS A JOURNEY (Kovecses 2000:26), as it profiles the same image schema (SOURCE–PATH–GOAL), there are actually not many aspects that they share in common. In this instance, KÆRLIGHED is a PATH (also reflected in the expression *kerlighedzenss vey* meaning 'the path of love') that has been shown to humans by God. By following it, they can reach the GOAL that is heaven. At this point we can only speculate that the SOURCE of the PATH is probably the ORIGINAL SIN that humans need to overcome by living in KÆRLIGHED.

Besides profiling the SOURCE–PATH–GOAL image schema, the Old Danish KÆRLIGHED also involved the other image schema regarded as vital for the conceptualization of feelings – the LINK image schema (Nowakowska-Kępna 2000:43). This is revealed in expressions such *kærlighetz bondh* 'the bond of love', or *kærlighet mellem them* 'love between them'. The other metaphor that needs mentioning in this context is THE OBJECT OF LOVE BELONGS TO THE LOVER, that is most often revealed by the use of possessive pronouns, such as *min/mit* or *din/dit* (*Myn gudh!* 'my God', *myn ælskool* 'my beloved', *thu æst alt sammen myn, og iak alt sammen thin* 'you are all mine and I am all yours')

Another metaphor that was used frequently in the discussed notes is LOVE IS SWEETNESS. It is important to remark that this metaphor, nowadays probably mostly associated with ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED and MOTHERLY KÆRLIGHED, could be used in various contexts and was very productive with regard to the KÆRLIGHED binding God and his people (25):

(24) modærligs ælskogæns søtmæ
    'the sweetness of motherly love' (BønneB.II.287-330)

---

[8] E.g. in collocations *kærlighed i hjertet* 'love in the heart', *give hele sit hjerte* 'to give one's whole heart', *knust hjerte* 'broken heart', etc.

(25) honnixflydendæ Ihesu, O hiærtens ælskow, alzsødestæ Ihesu ladh mek nydæ tek hær
   'lit. honey + flowing Jesus, Oh love of my heart, the sweetest Jesus let me savour you, my lord'
   (BønneB.II.021-283)

Among other metaphors that occur in the texts (rather occasionally), we can name LOVE IS A FLOWER, LOVE IS LIGHT, LOVE IS SICKNESS and LOVE IS A GAME. The two latter metaphors were probably mostly related to the subcategory of KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN. Also the expression *ælskowens piill* 'the arrow of love', awaking clear associations with Eros' Bow, seems to have pertained exclusively to the subcategory of KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN.

It is also interesting to observe that in a few instances the feminine personal pronoun *hun* occurred in connection with KÆRLIGHED (as in sentences 15 and 18). This could indicate the existence of a metaphor KÆRLIGHED IS A WOMAN, but it seems more likely that the phenomenon is a result of the gender system of the Old Danish where the division between masculine and feminine nouns had only been phased out (Skautrup 1944:270). Also, the texts provide no evidence for any creative elaborations of the metaphor that could prove that it was still productive in Old Danish.

8. THE NOUNS *KÆRLIKHET* AND *ÆLSKHUGH*

Seemingly, modern Danish offers its speakers perfect equivalents to the lexical representations of the concept of KÆRLIGHED in Old Danish. But, under the surface, there have happened major semantical changes, most notably with regard to the nominal representations of the concept, i.e. *elskov* and *kærlighed*. Nowadays, it seems that only the noun *kærlighed* can be regarded as the main lexical representation of the concept while *elskov* is a poetic expression metonymically highlighting one certain aspect – SEX – of one certain subcategory – ROMANTIC KÆRLIGHED. As it turns out in the light of the analyzed texts, the situation may have been much different in Old Danish where both nouns could refer to every subcategory and neither of them was exclusively bound to any certain aspect or group of aspects of KÆRLIGHED. However, some differences in the usage patterns of *ælskhugh* and *kærlikhet* may be traced, and they will serve as the main point of focus in the current section. The verb *ælske* (currently *elske*) has been subject to several changes as well, the most noteworthy being the emergence of the pattern *elske* + inf ('love to do') as well as the expanding of its collocation potential to material objects and prosaic concepts. These changes have been described in section 5, which is why the present section focuses primarily on the nominal representations of the concept.

One could expect that the Old Danish *ælskhugh* already showed signs of developing in the direction of the current meaning of *elskov*. Nevertheless, the notes indicate a nearly full equivalence between the nouns *ælskhugh* and *kærlikhet*. Just like *kærlikhet*, *ælskhugh* could be used to describe all the subcategories of love:

(26) han gør ælskugh ok godwillie folk i melliom
   'he does love and goodwill between people' (HarpStenbK) (29)

(27) Hon gadd alt sit godz for min ælskogh sigher Christus
   'He gave all his goods for my love says Christ'

(28) modærligs ælskogæns søtmæ
   'the sweetness of motherly love' (JyTingsv)

In the analyzed notes, the sexual and passionate aspects of KÆRLIGHED were not specifically profiled by any of the two nouns as they both could be used in collocations such as *legemlig*

kærlighet 'bodily love' or *werldenæ ælskoghæ* 'worldly love' and both used the FIRE metaphor approximately equally often:

(29) op tændhæ i mith hiærte sin alzo sødistæ ælskow
'ignited his sweetest love in my heart' (HarpS)

(30) miyn siel maa brende i hans kerlighetz yld
'my soul must burn in the fire and his love' (HarpS)

Also, sometimes, *ælskhugh* stood explicitly in stark contrast to lust and worldly goods:

(31) som wskællik diwr, thy at ykyschetz lustæ ær ij theræ hiærte ok æy myn ælskoghe
'as a naughty/wild animal because the lusts of unchasteness are in your heart and not my love' (SøndEv.001-169)

Interestingly enough, the linguistic material present in the analyzed Old Danish notes leads us in a slightly different direction and indicates that the noun *ælskhugh* could, in fact, be used to profile different aspects of KÆRLIGHED – JOY and PLEASURE. This can be concluded based on collocations such as *glædelige ælskugh* 'joyful love' or *ælskghæns och gledærne* 'love and happiness', *gør them wæl samen at wæræ* 'makes them feel good with each other', *ladh mek nydæ tek* 'let me savour you' and the fact that the metaphor KÆRLIGHED IS SWEET, highly frequent in the gathered material, was triggered almost exclusively by the noun *ælskhugh* (*modærligs ælskogæns søtmæ, mæth sødhæ ælskughæ*). More generally, in the notes *ælskhugh* can be said to highlight the emotional side of KÆRLIGHED as it also embraces the strong, negative emotions such as SORROW and DESPAIR:

(32) *Ælskogs leeg ær glædhe oc sorg*
'The game of love is joy and sorrow' (Hofregnsk.001-002,13)

(33) iek er sywgh aff ælskow
'I am sick of love' (MariagerL)

This may be the reason why *ælskhugh* was used slightly more often with regard to KÆRLIGHED BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN. It also seems justified to assume that the elements of PLEASURE and JOY, often perceived as undesirable in the Middle Ages, were the reason why the noun *ælskhugh* collocated more often with negatively-laden adjectives, as in *darlighe ælskoff*, *vren ælscugh* or *fanyte ælskoghe*. *Kærlikhet*, on the other hand, was seldom used in such negative contexts. To sum up, it is fair to say that the split between the two nominal representations of the concept had already existed in Old Danish (as proved explicitly by sentence 34), but it was not as apparent as at the later stages of the development:

(34) Then ælskogh ær icke kærlighet, men darskap.
'Your *ælskogh* is not *kærlighet* but foolishness' (KærlSt)

9. SUMMARY

The analyzed material has provided us with an insight into how KÆRLIGHED was conceptualized in the medieval Denmark. As it turns out, the current structure of the category of KÆRLIGHED was, in a large part, already established in Old Danish, and the same relates to the main aspects of KÆRLIGHED. Also the conceptual metaphors occurring in the texts overlapped greatly with the presently used metaphors of KÆRLIGHED (OBJECT, CONTAINER, FIRE, LIQUID, FLOWER, LIGHT, SICKNESS, GAME).

Nevertheless, we could also conclude several major differences between the conceptualization of Kærlighed present in the analyzed material and the modern-day concept of Kærlighed. Firstly, although the subcategories have roughly remained the same, there has been a major shift in their grade of centrality. The religiously based subcategories that seem to have played a vital role in the Old Danish Kærlighed have nowadays been pushed out to the fringes of the whole category and substituted by the once tabooed and downplayed subcategory of Romantic Kærlighed. Also, the subcategories centered around the relation between the ruler and his subjects have been naturally replaced by the subcategory of Patriotism that better reflects the current reality. The other major change can be traced in the use of the three representations of the concept. Firstly, the contexts in which the verb *ælske* occurred in the analyzed material suggest that it may have had a narrower scope than its modern-day equivalent *elske* that can collocate freely with material objects as well as activities. With regard to the nominal representations of the concept, *ælskhugh* has lost its place to the noun *kærlighed* and now, when used, serves to express the sexual aspect of Kærlighed in a poetical way. On the other hand, much indicates that in Old Danish both nouns could be said to represent the whole concept while profiling it differently (in the texts *ælskhugh* was used to highlight the elements of Kærlighed such as Pleasure and Joy, while *kærlighed* focused more on the spiritual aspect of the concept).

REFERENCES

Aalbæk-Nielsen, K. (1999a). *Kærlighed i antikken*. København: Gyldendal.

Aalbæk-Nielsen, K. (1999 b). *Kærlighed i middelalderen*. København: Gyldendal.

Aalbæk-Nielsen, K. (2001). *Kærlighed i det 15.-18. århundrede*. København: Gyldendal.

Aalbæk-Nielsen, K. 2003: *Kærlighed i det 19. og 20. århundrede*. København: Gyldendal.

Bartels, A., Zeki, S. (2004). The neural correlates of maternal and romantic love. *Neuroimage 21*, 1155–1166.

Bierwiaczonek, B. (2002). *A Cognitive Study of the Concept of LOVE in English*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Fromm, E. (2012). *O sztuce miłości*. Poznań: Rebis.

Jakubowicz, M. (2000). Dwa oblicza miłości. Porównanie językowych obrazów miłości tkwiących w etymologii i frazeologii. *Język a Kultura 14*, 233–243.

Jankowiak, W., Fischer, E. (1992). A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Romantic Love. *Ethnology* vol. 31 no. 2, 149–155.

Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, C. S. (1960). *The Four Loves*. London: Geoffrey Bless.

Magon, N., Kalra, S. (2011). The orgasmic history of oxytocin: Love, lust, and labor. *Indian journal of endocrinology and metabolism 15 Suppl 3*, 156–61.

Nielsen, N. Å. (1969). *Dansk etymologisk ordbog*. København: Gyldendal.

Nielsen, Th. (2011). *Kærlighed og parforhold under forskernes lup*. Risskov: Plurafutura.

Nowakowska-Kępna, I. (2000). Język ciała czy ciało w umyśle, czyli o metaforyce uczuć. *Język a Kultura 14*, 25–58.

Skautrup, P. (1944). *Det danske sprogs historie. Første bind*. København: Gyldendal.

Underhill, J. (2012). *Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts. Truth, Love, Hate and War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1971). *Kocha, lubi, szanuje. Medytacje semantyczne*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Wierzbicka, A. (1986). *Metaphors Linguists Live By. Papers in Linguistics 19*, 287–313.

Zaron, Z. (1985). *Wybrane pojęcia etyczne w analizie semantycznej (Kochaj bliźniego swego)*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo.

INTERNET SOURCES

Den Danske Ordbog (DDO): https://ordnet.dk/ddo [accessed: 07.2019]
Gammeldansk Ordbog: https://gammeldanskordbog.dk/ [accessed: 05.2019]

Gammeldansk Seddelsamling: https://gammeldanskseddelsamling.dk/ [accessed: 05.2019]
Korpus.dk: https://ordnet.dk/korpusdk [accessed: 12.2019]

SOURCES OF INDIVIDUAL NOTES REFERENCED IN THE TEXT[9]

2Mos. .. (GldBib.) = *Den gammeldanske Bibeloversættelse 2. Mosebog*, 1475-1500, Molbech, C. (red.): Den ældste danske Bibel-Oversættelse eller det gamle Testamentes otte første Bøger, fordanskede efter Vulgata, s. 112–213. København 1828.

BønneB.I.076-151 = *Johanne Nielsdatters Tidebog*, 1475-1500, Nielsen, K.M. (red.): Middelalderens danske Bønnebøger 1, s. 76–151. København 1945-1946

BønneB.II.021-283 = *Anna Brades Bønnebog*, 1497, Nielsen, K.M. (red.): Middelalderens danske Bønnebøger 2, s. 21–283. København 1949.

BønneB.II.287-330 = *Bønnebog i AM418,12*, ca. 1500, Nielsen, K.M. (red.): Middelalderens danske Bønnebøger 2, s. 287–330. København 1949.

BønneB.III.003-175 = *Bønnebog i AM75,8*, ca. 1500, Nielsen, K.M. (red.): Middelalderens danske Bønnebøger 3, s. 3–175. København 1957.

DiplChrI, 1448-1555 = Knudsen, Hans & C. F. Wegener (red.): Diplomatarium Christierni Primi. Samling af Aktstykker, Diplomer og Breve, henhörende til Kong Christiern den Förstes Historie. København 1856.

Gregor.Tract = *Tractatus Sancti Gregorii skreffwæn til nogræ clostær iomffrvær*, ca. 1500.

HarpS = *Harpestreng Urtebog. Hs. S*, ca.1300, Kristensen, M. (red.): Harpestræng. Gamle danske Urtebøger, Stenbøger og Kogebøger, s. 3–99. København 1908–1920.

HarpStenbK = *Harpestreng Stenbog. Hs. K*, ca. 1300, Kristensen, M. (red.): Harpestræng. Gamle danske Urtebøger, Stenbøger og Kogebøger, s. 174–193. København 1908–1920.

HellKv = *De hellige kvinder*, 1480–1485, Brandt, C.J. (red.): De hellige Kvinder, en Legende-Samling. København 1859 (2. del af Dansk Klosterlæsning fra Middelalderen 1. København 1865).

Hofregnsk.001-002,13 = *Dronning Christines Hofholdningsregnskaber*, 1496, Christensen, W. (red.): Dronning Christines Hofholdningsregnskaber. Udgivne for det kongelige danske Selskab for Fædrelandets Historie og Sprog, s. 1–2,13. København 1904.

JyTingsv, 1438–1515 = Nielsen, O. (red.): Gamle jydske Tingsvidner. København 1882.

Kempis, ca. 1500 = Tekstfordærvelser, fundne eller formodede, er indført på sedlerne, men ikke i arbejds-eksemplaret. Thomas a Kempis 1380–1471.

KlosterB = *En Klosterbog fra Middelalderens Slutning*, 1470, Kroon, S. et al. (red.): A Danish Teacher's Manual of the Mid-Fifteenth Century. Codex AM76,8. Volume 1. Transcription and facsimile. Addendum: The Gotfred of Ghemen Print of The Danish Lucidarius (1510). Lund 1993.

KærlSt, ca. 1500 = Det danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab (red.): *Bonaventura. Tre skrifter i gammeldansk oversættelse*. Duplikeret til brug for Ordbog over det ældre danske Sprog. København 1968.

Mandev = *Mandevilles Rejse*, 1459, Lorenzen, M. (red.): Mandevilles Rejse i gammeldansk Oversættelse tillige med En Vejleder for Pilgrimme, s. 1–206. København 1882.

MariagerL = *Mariager Legende-Håndskrift*, 1488, Knudsen, G. (red.): Mariager Legende-Haandskrift. København 1917–30.

Post = *Den skånske Postil fra Bekkaskogh*, ca. 1450, Klemming, G.E. (red.): Svenska Medeltids-Postillor 3. SSFS 23. Udgave af Cod.Upps.C56,4

---

[9] The format of the listed items is as follows: abbreviation = *name of the source* (if given), estimated time of origin, source from which the note was originally excerpted.

Sydr = *Sydrak*, ca. 1450–1500, Knudsen, G. (red.): Sydrak. Efter Haandskriftet Ny kgl. Saml. 236 4to. København 1921–1932.

SøndEv.001-169 = *Søndags-Evangelier*, ca. 1450, Ejder, Bertil (red.): Svenska Medeltidspostillor Del 8. Lund 1983.

Aleksander Kacprzak

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
Wydział Neofilologii
al. Niepodległości 4
61-874 Poznań
Poland

aleksander.kacprzak@amu.edu.pl