

Book reviews

Carmen Mellado, Patricia Buján, Claudia Herrero, Nely Iglesias and Ana Mansilla (eds.): *La fraseografía del S.XXI. Nuevas propuestas para el español y el alemán* [Phraseography of the 21st century. New proposals for Spanish and German]. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2010. 297 pp. ISBN 978-3-86596-291-1.

The relatively new academic discipline of phraseography draws as much on linguistics as it does on the idiomatic use of language. As we all know, lexicography goes far beyond mechanically putting together a dictionary, but rather calls for intricate compilation and description procedures. Thus, linguists in general and phraseologists in particular will welcome this book as it contains invaluable information about some highly promising work in progress. Many of the projects that are described in the volume are being carried out independently in different parts of Spain and directly relate to similar initiatives all over Europe. The present collection of fifteen articles, three of which are written entirely in German, responds to the challenge of making known to a broader public a number of current or already finished research projects, whose ultimate goal is to produce online and/or printed phraseological dictionaries in Spanish and German. Several of these projects aim at bilingual versions, and some are even conceived as interactive platforms.

The five editors of this book are also members of FRASESPAL, the research group headed by Carmen Mellado at the University of Santiago de Compostela. The first part of the present volume is dedicated to a detailed explanation of the aims and the scope of this group's phraseographic enterprise. Note that the research group, together with their member Juan Larreta, has also joined efforts with Hans Schemann for the German part of a printed Spanish-German phraseological dictionary, which has recently become available on the market (Schemann et al. 2012). The group's own bilingual online dictionary categorizes phraseological units according to onomasiological criteria. For the time being, it is restricted to about 3000 German and Spanish phrasemes. These entries collected for both languages are centred about the semantic fields of "speech/silence", "life/death", and "health/illness". Whereas Patricia Buján (Vigo University) presents a general outlook on present-day Spanish and German phraseography, the contributions by various other project members, including Carmen Mellado and Claudia Herrero (University of Santiago), Ana Mansilla (University of Murcia), and Nely Iglesias (University of Salamanca), directly deal with single aspects concerning the dictionary's macro- and microstructure, as well as the cognitive model underlying its selective approach. As Mansilla points out, a dictionary with these

characteristics should be useful, not only for decoding and interpreting a text, but also for encoding and producing texts in a foreign language.

Three further articles contained in the present volume (written by Margarita Alonso, Pedro Mogorrón, and Annelies Häcki Buhofer) elaborate on their authors' current projects (two in Spain, one in Switzerland), which focus on the ample and debatable typology of collocations, i.e. multi-word sequences. At the University of A Coruña, Alonso heads the DiCE project, a database of collocations for students of Spanish as a foreign language. At Alicante University, Pedro Mogorrón coordinates a multilingual online dictionary on fixed verbal sequences. This dictionary is also designed according to onomasiological criteria, which are organized in macro- and microstructures and present a number of synonyms and variations. Häcki Buhofer's proposal can be considered the German language counterpart to the above Spanish projects. Note that Prof. Häcki Buhofer has also been entrusted with the revision of Rudolf Suter's *Baseldeutsch Wörterbuch* as head of a research group at the University of Basel. This most recent edition is now available in printed version (Häcki Buhofer et al. 2010). For its last actualization an online questionnaire was filled in by over 3500 informants, who provided more than 10,000 authentic samples of present-day Swiss German. In line with this focus on dialectal variation, she also insists on the importance of defining and presenting regional phraseological variation. This aspect has been generally neglected by Spanish phraseographers for rather obvious reasons. Not only do we have four official languages on the peninsular territory of Spain (Castilian Spanish, Catalan, Galician and Basque), but there also exists a great variety in regional dialects with their own specific idiomatic phrases. In addition, the huge variability found throughout the Spanish-speaking parts of the American continent turns an adequate description of idioms and their meaning in each country or region into a real challenge. Although there have been sporadic and partial attempts at collecting phraseological regionalisms, a global inventory is still needed. Thereby, the number of native speakers of a given variety could be a decisive factor for considering a specific variety separately and conducting detailed phraseographic research. Be that as it may, all the endeavours mentioned above are excellent proof of current tendencies in linguistics. The authors offer various solutions to the lexicographical problem of documenting collocations as they appear in available online corpora. They also stress the importance of finding adequate descriptions and/or definitions for these collocations. In addition, they attempt to solve the problem of polysemic forms by providing an exact contextualization for each. The advantage of such collocation dictionaries, as opposed to dictionaries restricted to special types of phrasemes, is that they cover a great variety of idiomatic categories along with many possible borderline cases that make a typological classification precarious. In this respect, the truly meticulous, not to say painstaking,

classification presented by Mario García-Page (2008) must be pointed out. Although his approach may appear somewhat formalistic, the examples and reasons he gives for his selection are fully convincing for the Spanish language.

The contributions by Inmaculada Penadés and Leonor Ruiz Gurillo explain two monolingual projects in Spanish phraseography in depth. The first endeavour is a *Dictionary of Idioms in Present Spanish* (DILEA), for which the national research project *Phraseography in Theory and Practice* at the University of Alcalá de Henares is responsible. The second initiative is a *Dictionary of Discourse Particles in Spanish* undertaken by the research groups Val.Es.Co (Valencia, Español Coloquial) and GRIALE (on pragmatics and irony) at the Universities of Valencia and Alicante. This dictionary is already available in its online version (DEPD.es). Both projects undoubtedly fill a gap in this area and will be highly useful tools for future users.

Vida Jesenšek (University of Maribor) and Julia Sevilla (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) report on their past and ongoing work on multilingual dictionaries of proverbs, putting special emphasis on the relevance of proverbs in language teaching. The former describes her European research project *Sprich-Wort*, which consists in a paremiological multilingual database that takes German as a starting point. The latter presents the different phases and results of *The Paremiological Minimum* project, repeatedly financed by Spanish public funds. The structure of each entry as well as the strategy employed for compiling data are made perfectly explicit by Sevilla.

Antonio Luque Durán from Granada University centres the focus on the relation between metaphor, phraseology, and text structure. His investigations have been developed within the project framework of a multilingual and intercultural dictionary. He explains in detail the method for a systematic elaboration of cultural connotations for each language. The treatise written by two other members of this project, Antonio Pàmies and Kamilla Tutaeva, singles out the olive-tree and the birch-tree according to the traces that these 'donors of metaphors' have left in Spanish and Russian phrasemes and proverbs. Thus, the cross-cultural aspect gains special importance, elaborating on differences and similarities which can bridge many gulfs between nations and people. It is furthermore essential in language acquisition and teaching.

Kathrin Steyer at the IDS Mannheim presents her *UWV (Usuelle Wortverbindungen)* project. She pleads for the corpus analysis of multi-word expressions, arguing that any phraseological glossary should nowadays rely on authentic linguistic data for its empirical underpinning. She also distinguishes between 'corpus-driven' and 'corpus-based' analyses. This is certainly to be taken into account by all present and future phraseologists since the access to more varied corpora, especially in spoken language, seems to be an urgent need for every researcher.

Therefore, renewed efforts should be made toward obtaining transcriptions and audio samples of everyday speech and of certain discursive strategies in action.

Finally, Aina Torrent-Lenzen comments on a voluminous undertaking carried out at the Fachhochschule Köln. The project consists in putting together a comprehensive Spanish-German phraseological dictionary. Through passive decoding, such a dictionary enables its users to understand Spanish texts more precisely and will thus be an essential tool for translators. The examples furnished by Torrent-Lenzen prove that normally there is no single phraseological German equivalent that is valid for all co- and contexts, but that usually there are several, depending on their contextual proximity. This is why she proposes the concept of ‘contextual phraseological equivalent’.

All authors in the present collection of articles give detailed descriptions of their methods for compiling data and of the exact structure of their dictionary entries. They also explain and defend their selection procedures. Some of them comment on the feasibility and necessity of providing hyperonyms or key ideas for easier cross-reference. The exchange of frequently raised questions between these groups, as well as of the solutions and results that they have obtained, should offer new stimuli to many lexicographers and linguists. It is to be expected that the successful conclusion of all the described projects will constitute landmarks and essential steps ahead into the future of phraseography. The dictionaries will be indispensable reference instruments for linguists, translators, language teachers and researchers.

In summary, the activities that the present volume reports on should be taken into account by all specialists on the idiomatic use of language, since, independently of the type of idioms or the target public we deal with, we all seem to share similar problems in our attempt to deliver adequate descriptions, definitions, contextualizations, prototypical uses, indications of frequencies, and underlying cognitive models for phraseological units.

Berit Balzer

Correspondence address: balzerbe@filol.ucm.es

References

- García-Page, Mario. 2008. *Introducción a la fraseología española*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Häcki Buhofer, Annelies, Markus Gasser & Lorenz Hofer. 2010. *Das Neue Baseldeutsche Wörterbuch*. Hrsg. von der Christoph Merian Stiftung. Basel: Christoph Merian Verlag.
- Schemann, Hans, Carmen Mellado, Patricia Buján, Nely Iglesias, Juan P. Larreta & Ana Mansilla. 2012. *Idiomatik Deutsch-Spanisch*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Jarmo Korhonen: *Phraseologie und Lexikographie: Phraseologismen in ein- und zweisprachigen Wörterbüchern mit Deutsch* [Phraseology and Lexicography. Phraseological Expressions in Monolingual and Bilingual Dictionaries with German as One of Their Languages] (Supplement Series of Proverbium: Yearbook of International Proverb Scholarship 32). Burlington, Vermont: University of Vermont, 2011. 297 pp. ISBN 978-0-9817122-4.

This volume can be seen as part of the tradition of critical analysis in phraseography as it has been practised in German linguistics for some decades. In recent times, it has been refreshed by quite a few studies, such as Burger (2009), Stantcheva (2002) and Filatkina (2009) for historical aspects, Mieder (1999) and Martín (2001) with respect to bilingual dictionaries, and Wotjak (2001) and Heine (2005) with respect to monolingual learners' dictionaries. Korhonen's fine collection of papers is evidence of his strong contribution to this tradition. These papers were written within the context of a project on German-Finnish contrastive phraseology 1998–2010. The primary sources comprise various categories of dictionaries that are meticulously analysed by focusing on their representation of phraseological expressions: historical dictionaries of German, general monolingual dictionaries of contemporary German, general bilingual dictionaries with German as the source language, monolingual phraseological dictionaries of German, bilingual phraseological dictionaries with German as the source language, and dictionaries of German as a foreign language. These dictionaries are systematically analysed considering the following criteria: classification and labelling of the phraseological expressions, lemma selection, infinitive forms, and information on the syntactical structure of the expressions.

The first paper evaluates a historical dictionary: Josua Maaler's *Die Teütsch spraach. Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum* (1561). This dictionary is perhaps the most prominent 16th century example of German-Latin lexicography with German as the source language. Latin is used as an explanatory language, not as the target language. This work is very much based on the *Dictionarium Latinogermanicum* by Joannes Frisius, which appeared five years before Maaler's dictionary. The phraseological status of a group of words is mostly marked by abbreviations of the Latin noun *proverbium*, e.g. PRO or PROV. In his review, Korhonen focuses on the way verbal phraseological expressions are represented in Maaler's dictionary. The infinitive forms of these expressions prove to be heterogeneous. Infinitive constructions are found side by side with complete sentences, e.g. *Mit dem Halß bezalen* (literally 'to pay with one's throat', i.e. 'to pay with one's life') and *Das Haar gadt zeberg* (literally 'the hair is rising'). Apart from lexical semantic explanations, Korhonen provides comments on the contextual use of the phraseological expressions, e.g. *Eim die Oren versperren*

explained as *Wenn man einem weder hoeren noch reden lassen will* (literally ‘to close somebody’s ears’ explained as ‘If you do not want somebody to listen or to talk’).

The second paper shows how the lexis and morphosyntax of 80 selected idioms have changed since the period of Early New High German. The idioms were collected from synchronic and diachronic phraseological dictionaries as well as from samples of Martin Luther’s language use. Korhonen discovers a stabilisation of the phraseological units in the form of a reduction of variants. For instance, the variants in the expression *über die Schnur fahren/treten/hauen* (literally ‘to ride/step/beat over the string’, i.e. ‘to carry something too far’) are reduced to *über die Schnur hauen*. Korhonen sees this reduction of verbal variants as a general development from Early New High German to contemporary German. However, it is important to emphasise here that we are dealing with the process of language standardisation as reflected in lexicography, not with standardisation in actual language use. Recent studies on the pragmatics of phraseological units have shown that despite the process of standardisation, phraseological units still vary considerably (cf. Schmidlin 2007).

The third paper focuses on the representation of proverbs in monolingual German dictionaries. These dictionaries are criticised for their lack of systematicity in the choice of first lemmata for the dictionary entries. Moreover, Korhonen states that the dictionaries do not differentiate between proverbs and other phraseological expressions. For instance, Wahrig (2000) and (2006) classify *ein Esel in Löwenhaut* (literally ‘a donkey in lion’s skin’), which is actually an idiomatic noun phrase, as a proverb.

The representation of synonymous phraseological expressions in relevant dictionaries constitutes the topic of the fourth paper. Here Korhonen criticises the mention of the same phraseological expressions in various entries without synchronisation of the semantic explanations. According to Korhonen, the most adequate representation of phraseological synonyms can be found in Schemann (1993), which contains more cross references than the other dictionaries considered in this paper. Korhonen certainly has a point in saying that inconsistent semantic explanations of synonymous phraseological units make non-native speakers of German feel insecure. As a consequence of this insecurity, Korhonen suggests that users might turn to other dictionaries, or that they conduct extensive internet corpus research. It is to be replied here that corpus research by language learners is not inappropriate. After all, in some cases only corpus research could reveal whether different infinitive forms are due to lexicographic inaccuracy or whether they are just variants.

The fifth paper focuses on *Duden. Das grosse Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache in zehn Bänden* (Duden. The Comprehensive Dictionary of German in

Ten Volumes; GWDS). Back in the 1970s, the Duden dictionaries established an important tradition with regard to the lexicographic labelling of phraseological expressions. Nevertheless, Korhonen criticises the GWDS for placing phraseological expressions at the end of individual semantic explanations in polysemic entries. He prefers the positioning of such expressions at the end of the whole entry. According to Korhonen, phraseological expressions are independent linguistic signs that should be treated as sub-lemmata of their own in dictionaries. Furthermore, Korhonen shows that the infinitive forms of phraseological expressions are treated inconsistently. For instance, *einen Korb bekommen* (literally ‘to get a basket’, i.e. ‘to be turned down’) is represented as an example of the use of the word *Korb*, while it should actually be represented in terms of the infinitive forms *einen Korb bekommen*; similarly, *sich einen Korb holen* and *jmdm. einen Korb geben* (literally ‘to give somebody a basket’). Korhonen reveals a series of examples of such unrecognised phraseological expressions or idioms. However, there is also the reverse case, where certain non-phraseological constructions are classified as idioms, such as *zur Entfaltung kommen* (literally ‘to reach its development’, i.e. ‘to develop’). Moreover, Korhonen shows that valency complements are often insufficiently explained. For example, it is difficult to understand why the infinitive form *etw. steht jmdm. im/ins Gesicht geschrieben* (literally ‘something is written in somebody’s face’, i.e. ‘something is written all over one’s face’) is used side by side with the infinitive form *ein anderes Gesicht bekommen* (literally ‘to get a different face’) instead of *etw./jmd. bekommt ein anderes Gesicht* (literally ‘something/ somebody gets a different face’).

Inconsistent information on the syntactic subject is a point of criticism in the sixth paper too, which deals with *Duden Redewendungen* (2002) (cf. also Pilz’ harsh criticism (1995) on the first edition of this widely used dictionary). Korhonen finds inconsistencies even within the same entry, such as *etw. brennt jmdm. auf der Zunge* (literally ‘something burns on somebody’s tongue’, i.e. ‘to have a very strong impulse to tell something’) in contrast to *jmdm. auf der Zunge liegen* (literally ‘to lie on somebody’s tongue’, i.e. ‘to be on the tip of one’s tongue’).

In the seventh paper, Korhonen states that the third edition of *Duden Redewendungen* (2008) has been successfully revised in some respects such as the updating of phraseological expressions, the inclusion of usage examples and cross-references. For instance, dead cross-references have been eliminated. However, the use of the term *Redewendung* (idiomatic phrase) is considered inadequate by Korhonen. He points out that the same is true for other semantically imprecise terms like *bildlicher Ausdruck* (metaphorical expression), *idiomatischer Ausdruck* (idiomatic expression) und *Fügung* (construction), which are all used in a parallel way. Furthermore, Korhonen is often dissatisfied with the choice of the lemma for a given entry. The rule of taking the first noun, adjective,

or adverb as the first lemma is not followed by the authors of *Duden Redewendungen* although this rule is widely accepted in phraseography and by learners of German as a foreign language. Instead, the authors follow a procedure according to which the phraseological expressions are attributed to a keyword that is either the first word of the expression “oder eines der wichtigsten sinntragenden Wörter der jeweiligen Wendung [or one of the most important meaningful words of the expression in question, translated by RS]” (Duden 2008: 11). Korhonen reasonably supposes that this makes it difficult for non-native speakers of German to find the key lemma of phraseological expressions. *Attisches Salz* (attic salt, i.e. ‘refined, incisive wit’) is lemmatised with *Salz*, whereas *dick auftragen* (to lay it on thick) is lemmatised with *auftragen*. The phrase *aufrechter Gang* (upright gait) is lemmatised with *aufrecht* and *alt aussehen* (literally ‘to look old’, i.e. ‘to be in the cart’) is lemmatised with *alt*. In many cases the decision as to which word is the most meaningful proves to be arbitrary.

The eighth paper is on the representation of the valency of verbal phraseological expressions in contemporary dictionaries of German as a foreign language. Korhonen argues that Kempcke (2000) and the *Langenscheidt Grosswörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (the Langenscheidt Comprehensive Dictionary of German as a Foreign Language) (2008) are more reliable than the *Pons Grosswörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Pons Comprehensive Dictionary of German as a Foreign Language) (2006) and the *Duden Standardwörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Duden Standard Dictionary of German as a Foreign Language) (2002). One of the more frequent faults is the incomplete representation of cases in which the subject position is lexically variable, but where the position is often taken by the pronoun *das* (this), e.g. in *etw./das steht auf einem anderen Blatt* (literally ‘something/this is written on a different sheet of paper’, i.e. ‘this is quite another matter’). Phraseological expressions such as these can be interpreted as verbal idioms or sentential idioms. Only Kempcke (2000) seems to be aware of this problem: *etw.* <bes. *das*> *steht auf einem anderen Blatt* (something <especially this> is written on a different sheet of paper). Moreover, infinitive forms of verbal phraseological expressions are often incomplete. In *Pons* (2006), Korhonen finds *in Anspruch nehmen* instead of *jmdn./etw. in Anspruch nehmen* (literally ‘to take somebody/something into claim’, i.e. ‘to make demands on somebody/something’). In *Langenscheidt* (2008), he finds *etw. fällt/springt/sticht ins Auge* (literally ‘something falls/springs/pricks in one’s eye’, i.e. ‘something hits somebody in the eye’). In such cases, according to Korhonen, the dative object *jmdm.* (to somebody) is missing. However, Korhonen’s point has to be contextualised, for *etwas sticht ins Auge* is indeed very frequently used without the dative object. Nevertheless, he rightly claims that inflectional cases should be carefully indicated, especially for non-native speakers of German. A positive example would

be *sich (Dativ) den Kopf [über etwas (Akk.)] zerbrechen* (Duden 2002) (literally ‘to break one’s head over something’, i.e. ‘to rack one’s brains’). In Pons (2006), information on inflectional cases (dative, accusative, genitive) is often missing.

Papers nine to twelve discuss the representation of phraseological expressions in bilingual dictionaries: German-Finnish (papers nine and ten), German-Swedish (paper eleven), and German-Swedish and German-Finnish both together (paper twelve). Korhonen claims that in bilingual dictionaries it should be particularly important to consider those phraseological expressions that have equivalents in both languages. On the whole, Korhonen’s own German-Finnish phraseological dictionary (2001) and German-Finnish general dictionary (2008), the structures of which are illustrated in the tenth paper, can serve as examples for an economical microstructure in bilingual phraseography.

In several papers, Korhonen gives concrete advice on how to correct the phraseographical inconsistencies being criticised (see, e.g., p. 74 and p. 174). For example, he suggests that verbal idioms with an animate subject should be in the infinitive form without explicitly marking the subject, whereas verbal idioms with an inanimate subject should be completed with the slot *etw.* (something), e.g. *in der Luft liegen* (to be in the air)—*etw.*, or *ins Wasser fallen* (literally ‘to fall into the water’, i.e. ‘to fall through’)—*etw.* By contrast, idioms that can take either animate or inanimate subjects should be completed with *jmd.* (somebody), *etw.* (something), e.g. *ins Zwielicht geraten* (literally ‘to come into twilight’, i.e. ‘become suspect’)—*jmd.*, *etw.* This recommendation shows that Korhonen would prefer to see explanations as to valency complements under the grammatical form of the phraseological unit rather than in the semantic explanations. Undoubtedly, this makes sense in most cases. However, in cases like *ins Wasser fallen*, the semantic explanation *nicht stattfinden* (not take place), *nicht durchgeführt werden können* (not able to be carried out) (GWDS) makes it clear enough that only inanimate subjects can occur with this phraseological expression. There are other passages in Korhonen’s paper which make it evident that, in contrast to Korhonen’s idealised view, information as to how an idiom is correctly used cannot (or need not) only be given by the abstract completion of its infinitive grammatical form. For instance, Korhonen criticises in *Duden Redewendungen* that *sein* (to be) in comparative phraseological expressions with adjective + noun is often missing. For example, the dictionary lists *alt wie Methusalem* (as old as Methusalem) or *frech wie Oskar* (literally ‘as cheeky as Oscar’, i.e. ‘cheeky as a cheeky devil’) instead of *alt sein wie Methusalem*, *frech sein wie Oskar*. Korhonen claims that on the basis of *alt wie Methusalem* or *frech wie Oskar* the learner of German as a foreign language could be misled regarding the attributive use of the phraseological expression. However, this shortcoming has to be considered in context. The fact that structures with an adjective

+ *wie* (as) do not allow an attributive use (e.g. **das wie Oskar freche Kind*, **the cheeky as a devil child*) is a question of grammatical competence rather than phraseological-lexicographical information.

On the whole, this volume is highly recommended to all lexicographers and linguists working in the area of phraseography and phraseology. In particular, the authors and publishing houses of the meticulously analysed phraseological dictionaries would profit very much from Korhonen's well-argued critique. With regard to Korhonen's own book it may be highlighted that an alphabetical list of all phraseological expressions whose lexicographic representations are discussed in this volume would be helpful. Moreover, some redundancies could have been avoided by synthesising papers six and seven, papers nine and ten, and papers eleven and twelve.

Regula Schmidlin

Correspondence address: regula.schmidlin@unifr.ch

References

- Burger, Harald. 2009. Semantische Aspekte der deutschen Phraseografie: die aktuelle Praxis— allgemeine und phraseologische Wörterbücher im Vergleich. In Carmen Mellado Blanco (ed.), *Theorie und Praxis der idiomatischen Wörterbücher*, 23–44. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Duden: *Standardwörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. 2002. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Duden *Redewendungen: Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik*. 2002. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Duden *Redewendungen: Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik*. 2008. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Duden: *Das grosse Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache in zehn Bänden*. 1999/ CD-ROM 2000. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Filatkina, Natalia. 2009. Historical phraseology of German: Regional and global. In Jarmo Korhonen, Wolfgang Mieder, Elisabeth Piirainen & Rosa Piñel (eds.), *Phraseologie global— areal—regional. Akten der Konferenz EUROPHRAS 2008 vom 13. –16.8.2008 in Helsinki*, 143–151. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Heine, Antje. 2005. *Funktionsverbgefüge in System, Text und korpusbasierter (Lerner-) Lexikografie*. Dissertation, Leipzig.
- Kempcke, Günter. 2000. *Wörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Korhonen, Jarmo. 2001. *Alles im Griff. Homma hanskassa: Saksa-suomi-idiomisanakirja. Idiomwörterbuch Deutsch-Finnisch*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Korhonen, Jarmo. 2008. *Saksa-suomi-suursanakirja Grosswörterbuch Deutsch-Finnisch*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Langenscheidt *Grosswörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. 2008. Berlin: Langenscheidt Verlag.
- Martin, Luis. 2001. *Phraseologie im zweisprachigen Wörterbuch Deutsch-Spanisch*. Frankfurt a.M. et al.: Peter Lang.

- Mieder, Wolfgang. 1999. Sprichwörter in den größeren allgemeinen und phraseologischen Wörterbüchern Deutsch-Englisch/Englisch-Deutsch. In Herbert Ernst Wiegand (ed.), *Studien zur zweisprachigen Lexikographie mit Deutsch*, 1–41 Hildesheim et al.: Olms.
- Pilz, Klaus D. 1995. Duden 11. Redewendungen: Das anhaltende Elend mit den phraseologischen Wörterbüchern. In Rupprecht S. Baur & Christoph Chlosta (eds.), *Von der Einwortmetapher zur Satzmetapher*, 305–320. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Pons: Grosswörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. 2006. Stuttgart: Klett Sprachen.
- Schemann, Hans. 1993. *Deutsche Idiomatik: Die deutschen Redewendungen im Kontext*. Stuttgart & Dresden: Klett.
- Schmidlin, Regula. 2007. Phraseme in standardsprachlichen Varietäten des Deutschen / Phraseological expressions in German standard varieties. In Harald Burger, Dmitrij Dobrovol'ski, Peter Kühn & Neal Norrick (eds.), *Phraseologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung / Phraseology: An international handbook of contemporary research*, 551–562. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stancheva, Diana. 2003. *Phraseologismen in deutschen Wörterbüchern: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der lexikographischen Behandlung von Phraseologismen im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch von Adelung bis zur Gegenwart*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- Wahrig: Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 2000. Gütersloh & München: Wahrig.
- Wahrig: Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 2006. Gütersloh & München: Wahrig.
- Wotjak, Barbara. 2001. Phraseologismen im neuen Lernerwörterbuch: Aspekte der Phraseologiedarstellung im ‚de Gruyter Wörterbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache‘. In Annelies Häcki Buhofer, Harald Burger, Laurent Gautier (eds.), *Phraseologiae Amor: Aspekte europäischer Phraseologie. Festschrift für Gertrud Gréciano zum 60. Geburtstag*, 263–279. Hohengehren: Schneider Verlag.

Wolfgang Mieder: *“Sein oder Nichtsein”: Das Hamlet-Zitat in Literatur, Übersetzungen, Medien und Karikaturen* [“To Be or Not to Be”: The Hamlet-Quote in Literature, Translation, Media, and Caricatures] (Kulturelle Motivstudien 8). Wien: Praesens Verlag, 2008. 287 pp. ISBN 978-3-7069-0501-5.

This fascinating collection includes translations and parodies of Hamlet’s most famous speech (18th to 20th-century) as well as hundreds of short extracts in English and German which illustrate modern re-uses of the phrase *to be or not to be* in various genres and media. What is not offered, although the series title implies as much, is the ‘study of a cultural motif’. The 250-page volume is essentially an anthology. The introductions to the various sections simply describe some salient items without mentioning any of the historical, syntactic, or semantic categories that are available for the analysis of quotation and parody. Instead the process of locating material is foregrounded: “It was no easy task to trace the German translations and then find copies through interlibrary loans” (p. 37, my translation).

Wolfgang Mieder’s emphasis on hard-to-obtain manuscript sources sounds rather quaint in an age of electronically searchable text corpora, but it is also symptomatic of a kind of scholarly passion and long-term dedication which is

not always evident in critically more sophisticated studies. In fact, his patient research has brought to light many items that would have slipped through electronic nets, particularly with the German items. The twenty translations of Hamlet's soliloquy in act 3, scene 1 date from 1758 to 1978 and begin with items by Moses Mendelssohn (from his *Reflections on the Sublime and the Naïve in the Arts*) and Christoph Wieland. The 32 parodies in German and English range very widely, from samples of the 18th-century rage for 'soliloquies' modelled on Hamlet's through the absurd havoc wreaked on the speech by two tramps in *Huckleberry Finn* to a 1986 version in German street language where "that is the question" becomes "Da biste voll am Rotieren, wenn Du das checken willst" (p. 105).

Of course there have to be also some less exclusive items; Hamlet's soliloquy has been parodied so often and *to be or not to be* quoted so frequently that any anthology of such instances needs an inclusion policy. This is not made explicit here—even the balance between English and German texts seems to result from putting together what was available, which results in some regrettable omissions as well as irrelevancies. On the first count, three of the parodies of *to be or not to be* are quoted from Walter Hamilton's (1885) *Parodies of the Works of English and American Authors*. This anthology offers dozens of rewrites of 'To be or not to be', some of which could easily have been added and would have been more useful contributions than the 20-page digression on later quotations of *There is something rotten in the state of Denmark* or the three 'original' versions of Hamlet's soliloquy from the First and Second Quarto and First Folio editions.

The following section lists poems that quote just the line *to be or not to be*. Here the width of the range becomes a slight problem; parodies, however diverse, have what could be described as a common angle on their originals, but it is difficult to imagine enlightening connections between an extract from Lord Byron's epic *Don Juan* ("To be or not to be! That is the question," / Says Shakespeare, who just now is much in fashion"), a poem by the German revolutionary poet Georg Herwegh and a facetious four-liner ("Schwein oder Nichtschwein") from the diaries of the German émigré Victor Klemperer. With the 80-plus items in "Aphorismen, Sprüche und Graffiti", things become even more random, especially considering the handful of versions that are merely referenced as "original contributions" from a friend. A similar number of titles of books, magazine articles, lectures, and other publications are bibliographically more 'reputable' and cover an interesting chronological range from 1913 to after 2000.

After titles come cartoons, a collection which includes a fascinating range of images from *Simplicissimus*, the German equivalent of *Punch*. Whether dating from the First World War or the late 1930s (i.e. reflecting the Fascist point of view), they all figure a variety of political or allegorical figures assuming a Hamlet persona to exemplify a current issue. More recent versions tend to be

more banal, such as a strip with ‘Garfield’ the cat or the barkeeper from the New Yorker who says, superciliously: “To be or not to be, that is the question. Next question?” (p. 222). Advertising, another section (1946–2008), could be expected to provide a lot of wit, but most of the examples turn out to work the formula “to x or not to x”, with x representing the activity which the advertisement is trying to promote. What is welcome is the fact that both cartoons and ads come with the original images in black and white; the 50 magazine pages which illustrate *Hamlet*-quoting headlines, on the other hand, are rather more expendable.

The space made available by this and other desirable cuts could have accommodated a bibliography to pull together the numerous interesting pointers scattered in bibliographical footnotes and references. This would make working with the materials on offer much easier, as would more careful editing. It is not pointed out, for example, that the 1840 soliloquy parody “Monolog eines Hagestolzen” is in fact a translation of the 1824 “Bachelor’s soliloquy” which is reprinted four pages earlier. Similarly, the German poem “Wien im Herbstmond”, a particularly interesting find, is not revealed as the translation of a 1758 English “Bachelors’ soliloquy” because the earliest parody given in *Sein oder Nichtsein* is from 1780. Such poems started to appear in print at least from 1744. Mindless copy-pasting “aus dem Internet” is indeed a curse, but information which is available from quality fulltext collections such as *Literature Online* or from databases such as *HyperHamlet* (at www.hyperhamlet.unibas.ch) would certainly have enhanced the usefulness of this volume.

Sein oder Nichtsein provides welcome and unusual basic materials for a ‘cultural motif’ study on the English or German afterlife of the famous soliloquy or its opening line. The fact that only one single specimen has been “aus dem Internet kopiert” (p. 7) describes both a strength and a weakness—there are valuable things to be found in this book, but it makes the reader do rather more work than it should.

Regula Hohl Trillini

Correspondence address: r.hohl@unibas.ch

References

- Hamilton, Walter. 1885. *Parodies of the works of English and American authors*. London: Reeves and Turner.
- HyperHamlet*. <http://www.hyperhamlet.unibas.ch>.
- Literature Online*. <http://lion.chadwyck.com>.

Dmitrij Dobrovol'skij and Elisabeth Piirainen: *Zur Theorie der Phraseologie: Kognitive und kulturelle Aspekte* [On Phraseological Theory: Cognitive and Cultural Aspects] (Stauffenburg Linguistik 49). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2009. 211 pp. ISBN 978-3-86057-179-8 (Pb.).

Dmitrij Dobrovol'skij and Elisabeth Piirainen can certainly be regarded as two of the most influential figures in the European tradition of phraseology and its international association EUROPHRAS. They have written landmark publications in the general domain of idiom semantics and have opened new routes for investigating the cognitive and cultural dimensions of phraseological units (e.g., Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen 2005). On a more personal note, their work also provided one of the core sources of inspiration for my own research on idiom representation and variability (Langlotz 2006). In this book they present the state-of-the-art as well as several new insights in their core areas of interest by putting a special focus on both the nature and impact of idiomatic figurativity and idiom motivation. On the one hand, this publication can therefore be read as a synthesis of their central research strands. On the other, and more importantly, it also offers several new and original theoretical ideas that are substantiated by detailed analyses and should thus constitute sources of inspiration for further research along the trails blazed by the authors.

The overarching aim of the book is to make a phraseological contribution to a “*Conventional Figurative Language Theory*” (CFLT), which scrutinizes the complex internal semantics of lexicalized figurative expressions and attempts to model their particular status in the language system (p. 12, italics in the original). The authors’ main argument is that the “*image component*” is central for the mental representation as well as the grammatical and discursive behaviour of idioms (p. 12). It is important to emphasise that this image component must neither be equated with the idioms’ lexical structure nor with its lexicalised figurative meaning. Rather, it denotes the rich conceptualisation—the mental image—that mediates between the lexical structure and the idiomatic meaning. It thus anchors an idiom’s complex semantic structure relative to complex cognitive representations of world knowledge (p. 14). Moreover, since most of this knowledge is culturally bound, an idiom’s image component also has the potential of evoking and conveying culture-specific chunks of knowledge. In this sense, idioms are seen to function as important linguistic vehicles of culture (p. 15). On the basis of the assumption that idioms are fundamentally intertwined with cognition and culture, the authors thus propose to approach idioms from a cognitive-linguistic perspective as this theory regards language as being rooted within general cognitive processes and as being embodied in cultural worlds of experience.

To discuss and analyse the impact of the image component for the characteristic nature and behaviour of idiomatic expressions within a CFLT and to demonstrate the challenges that the cognitive and cultural dimensions of idioms raise for applied areas such as lexicography and translation, the book is organised into four parts that comprise eight different chapters.

Part I “*Semantik und Motivation*” contains Chapter 1, which develops a systematic typology for alternative forms of idiom motivation. As the quality of the internal semantic structure of idioms is primarily guided by the image component, this chapter can be considered the theoretical foundation for the theoretical discussions and analyses in the subsequent parts and chapters. The authors first engage with metaphorical types of motivation from the perspective of cognitive linguistics (p. 20–24). They concentrate on motivation by conceptual metaphors—probably one of the most extensively researched areas in idiom semantics (see, e.g., Gibbs 1994, Lakoff 1987, Langlotz 2006)—and they also scrutinize frame-based metaphors. Following their own research (Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen 1997), the authors then sketch the impact of cultural symbols on idiom transparency (*symbolische Motivation*). Most interestingly, however, they also point to more marginal and less-known patterns that channel associations between the lexical structure and the figurative meaning. For instance, they include habituated word plays (*usualisiertes Wortspiel*) as in *Kotzebues Werke studieren* (to study the works by Kotzebue), which means ‘to vomit’. So this expression is based on an obvious pun on the German verb *kotzen* and its quasi-homophonous relation to the author’s name *Kotzebue* (p. 29). Another interesting motivation type is reflected by what the authors term *indexale Motivation* (indexical motivation). For instance, with expressions like *ist der Papst katholisch* (is the Pope a catholic) the absurdity of the literal question breaks the pragmatic principle of relevance and thus works as an indexical pointer to the idiomatic meaning ‘this is so obvious’ (p. 37). Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen conclude their overview of idiom motivation with reference to Fauconnier and Turner’s (2002) notion of ‘blending’ in order to illustrate that many of the motivation types addressed above can be cognitively conflated (p. 39). In short, while not being as original as some of the subsequent chapters, this first part of the book thus provides an illuminating starting point for pulling the reader into the more intriguing effects of idiom motivation.

The second part of the book is devoted to scrutinising the impact of the image component on idioms’ regular syntactic behaviour. The authors thus take up a discussion that goes back to early generativist discussions on the transformational deficiency of idiomatic expressions (e.g., Chafe 1968). As the notion of ‘decomposition’ (*semantische Teilbarkeit der Idiomstruktur*) is central to this debate, Chapter 2 ventures to operationalise this concept. In accord with the general line of argumentation pursued in the book, the idiom’s image component is conceived as the

central factor in rendering its semantic structure decomposable. Along these lines, *die Katze aus dem Sack lassen* (let the cat out of the bag) is a decomposable idiom because the conceptualisation of an AGENT letting a CAT out of a CONTAINER (the bag), can be directly correlated with the conceptualisation of the idiomatic meaning of an AGENT revealing a SECRET (p. 55–58). On the basis of this theoretical account, the authors then engage with a highly meticulous and state-of-the-art discussion of the semantic foundations of idiom passivisation in Chapter 3. The theoretical argumentation is based on both German and Russian idioms and supported by corpus data. It results in a set of seven conditions that are claimed to determine the idiomatic potential for passivisation in a rule-based rather than arbitrary way (p. 91–93). Moreover, the conditions are shown to be in line with the cognitive-linguistic tradition of idiom analysis (Gibbs 1994). In my opinion, the seven conditions for idiom passivisation should provide a very solid theoretical basis for more extensive hypothesis-driven and corpus-based empirical studies. Such future studies are to show whether the postulated regularity of idiom passivisation can also be defended quantitatively in terms of significant statistical results.

In Part III the book turns towards specific semantic and pragmatic aspects of idiom structure and idiom behaviour. In Chapter 4—my personal favourite—idioms that contain wordplays as part of their lexicalised structure (*usualisiertes Wortspiel in der Phraseologie*), rather than being the result of ad hoc modifications in discourse, are analysed in detail. This chapter is particularly interesting as it focuses on a phenomenon that has not been satisfactorily classified in traditional approaches to phraseology because they have tended to draw a rather neat and clinical boundary between lexicalised, ‘normal’ phraseological units and ‘deviant’ idiom modifications, which only occur in actual discourse. However, idioms such as *sämtliche Hühneraugen zudrücken*, which is virtually impossible to translate, or *gespannt wie ein Regenschirm sein* (to be as tense as an umbrella) indeed contain wordplays as part of their (often hilarious) semantic structure (p. 104, 107). This nicely reveals the inherent creativity that is conveyed by many idioms. The authors distinguish two basic subtypes of lexicalised wordplays: independent wordplays (*eigenständige wortspielerische Phraseme*) and modifications of existing inconspicuous idioms (*Modifikationen bereits bestehender Phraseme*). Moreover, they discuss three central processes that seem to underlie the quaint semantic structure of these phrases. While this chapter must be praised for its object of analysis, I would have appreciated a broader discussion of the theoretical significance of these lexicalised word plays for phraseological as well as linguistic theory. In my opinion, they nicely reflect the central tenets of usage-based models of language (Barlow and Kemmer 2000), which highlight the origin of linguistic knowledge in actual use and thus neglect a neat distinction between competence and performance. Lexicalised wordplays provide perfect evidence in favour of such a theoretical conception.

Chapter 5 explores the interface between phraseology and gender linguistics. More specifically, it scrutinises to what extent the image component plays a role in restricting the reference of some idioms to either men or women. For instance, *jmdn. auf Händen tragen* (to carry sb. on one's hands, 'to look after someone with a lot of love and care') is used for men, whereas *sich jmdm. an den Hals werfen* (to embrace sb. round the neck, 'to force oneself on sb.') is rather employed with female referents (p. 116). The authors enter this topic by pointing to lexicographic deficits, which reflect the considerable lacuna in gender-linguistic phraseological investigations. Therefore, to pave the way for further empirical research, Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen present a very differentiated and methodologically subtle empirical case study. They employ the COSMAS II corpus from the IDS Mannheim to analyse potential gender-restrictions for 10 German idioms that contain gender-specific terms such as *Kamm*, *Bart*, or *Hosentasche* in their lexical structure. The corpus study reveals that the gendered image components of these idioms indeed constrain their actual use to refer either male or female agents (p. 130). Although the number of idioms that were subject to analysis is small, and even though the results are not subjected to statistical testing, this case study constitutes a road map for future investigations. It should therefore inspire and motivate other researchers to engage with this topic along the lines sketched in this chapter.

The final Part IV is dedicated to the subfield of contrastive phraseology and its practical implications for the translation of idioms. Based on English, German, and Russian idioms, Chapter 6 offers a detailed and differentiated typology of idiomatic equivalence relations. However, it is illustrated—again by relying on some corpus examples—that full equivalence between seemingly congruent idioms from different languages hardly exists. Relative to this insight, the authors criticise the fact that bilingual idiom dictionaries often suggest such idiomatic equivalence with insufficient care (p. 161). Even if idioms may reflect close formal and semantic correspondences, their actual use shows subtle differences in most cases. In my opinion, this offers further evidence for a usage-based conception of phraseology, which regards idioms as being embedded in the linguistic practices that are shared by specific speech or language communities. In Chapter 7, the consequences of the different extensions and uses of idiomatic expressions in different languages are discussed from the perspective of translation. The concrete challenges for translation are discussed on the basis of one Russian idiom that has a much broader extension than its German near-equivalents. As a result, translating this expression by any of the German alternatives will never result in full correspondence. Moreover, the different image components of these expressions are also highly likely to activate rather diverse conceptual associations. The authors therefore propose that in many cases non-idiomatic translations of idioms are preferable to looking for a near phraseological match in the target language (p. 181).

In the final Chapter 8, Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen conclude their tour through well-known and novel phraseological territory. Again, they highlight their ambition of establishing an idiom-specific module within the overarching Conventional Figurative Language Theory and relative to the central characteristic of idiomatic expressions—the image component (p. 184). In other words, in the conclusion as well as throughout the theoretical discussions and case studies the authors highlight the specificities of idiomatic expressions and their consequential behaviours instead of presenting a more comprehensive, global phraseological theory. By choosing the image component as a leitmotif for their elaborations, they manage to integrate rather diverse and fairly particularised analyses along a coherent red thread. Indeed, the intricate case studies, which nicely link the state-of-the-art in phraseological research with the development of several new and original ideas certainly constitute the strength of this book. I have thoroughly enjoyed reading it and can warmly recommend it to anybody interested in idiom semantics. However, the focus on the particular also prevents the authors from placing into a wider theoretical framework the minute facets of idiomaticity being scrutinised. While they seem to prefer a componential or modular conception of linguistic and phraseological theory, I believe that it would have been interesting to step back at strategically appropriate points in order to discuss the wider implications of their very interesting insights from a broader theoretical perspective. For instance, many of the results and conclusions are fully compatible with recent usage-based conceptions of language such as Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 2008) or Construction Grammar (Goldberg 2006). By reading the implications of their research results against these (or alternative) theories of language, Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen could have opened their unquestionable expertise in phraseology to wider theoretical debates that are being fought out outside the domain of phraseology. In my opinion, making phraseological insights accessible to more global controversies within linguistics would help greatly to change the image of phraseology as being an 'idiosyncratic' field of linguistic analysis that studies 'idiosyncratic' language and to make phraseology relevant to a wider linguistic audience. The present book certainly deserves to find a highly interested readership both inside and outside phraseology.

Andreas Langlotz

Correspondence address: andreas.langlotz@unil.ch

References

- Barlow, Michael & Suzanne Kemmer (eds.). 2000. *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Chafe, Wallace L. 1968. Idiomaticity as an anomaly in the Chomskyan paradigm. *Foundations of Language* 4. 109–27.
- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij & Elisabeth Piirainen. 1997. *Symbole in Sprache und Kultur: Studien zur Phraseologie aus kultursemiotischer Perspektive*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij & Elisabeth Piirainen. 2005. *Figurative language: Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives* (Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface 13). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Fauconnier, Gilles & Mark Turner. 2002. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. 1994. *The poetics of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Langlotz, Andreas. 2006. *Idiomatic creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English* (Human Cognitive Processing 17). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Xesús Ferro Ruibal (ed.): *Cadernos de Fraseoloxía Galega* [Journal of Galician Phraseology] 12. Santiago de Compostela: Galigraf, 2010. 473 pp. ISBN: 1698-7861.

Cadernos de Fraseoloxía Galega (Journal of Galician Phraseology) is an annual review of phraseological research edited in Galician, a language spoken in northwestern Spain. The volume encompasses sixteen different studies on Galician, Basque, Spanish, German, Hungarian, and Esperanto phraseology and is structured into five sections: articles, compilations, book reviews, news, and outcomes. For the purpose of this review, however, only articles and compilations are discussed, comprising thirteen and three papers, respectively. I went into more detail when describing the articles on Galician phraseology since many readers do not usually have the opportunity to read Galician.

The first article by Balázs offers a synthesis of the different areas of Hungarian phraseology. The author presents a detailed description of the different existing classifications of Hungarian phrasemes by some of the most distinguished Hungarian scholars such as Nagy (1976), Handrovics (1995) and Bárdosi et al. (2003). The article also touches on Hungarian proverbs, idioms, loan words, and some other phraseological units claimed to be situated between folklore and linguistics: greetings, curses, superstitions, short proverbs used as quotes during speech, and graffiti. The article concludes by giving an approximate number of Hungarian phrasemes: 38,000 found in regional

compilations, 8,000 found in national Hungarian collections and almost half a million regional words, generally proverbs, found in the *New Hungarian Regional Dictionary*. These numbers prove the extreme richness and diversity of Hungarian phraseology.

The aim of the second article is to highlight the impact of Michel Bréal on phraseology. Bárdosi argues that many phraseological experts excessively stress the importance of Charles Bally in the field. But even though Bally's contribution to the domain is undeniable, Michel Bréal should also be considered one of the precursors of modern phraseology. Bréal's *Essai de sémantique*, and other essays such as *Les commencements du verbe* are introduced. It is shown that they contain very fresh and new ideas that are close to modern phraseology, in particular, the relationship between synchrony and diachrony in proverbs. It is also suggested that his research had actually set the stage for Bally's own work. Bárdosi argues that Bally elaborated on Bréal's work by highlighting and detailing the synchronic focus on phraseology, while he criticizes that Bally never gave importance to the classification of phraseological units.

Next, Cajaraville explores the presence of wordplay in the headlines of the free Galician newspaper *De Luns a Venres* (from Monday to Friday). This free newspaper was created with the main intention of being close to the reader, which explains the use of more quotidian language not generally found in regular newspapers. Cajaraville uses a corpus to classify wordplay into four different categories. *Recontextualización* (re-contextualisation) refers to a common proverb or sentence that is borrowed and used in some other context. Cajaraville gives the example of *Crónica dunha morte anunciada* (Chronicle of a death foretold, the title of a novel by Gabriel García Márquez) to refer to a sore defeat in a soccer match. *Diloxía* (dilogy) is reflected by an expression that has a literal and a figurative interpretation, such as *Un deporte de peso* (literally, 'a sport of weight', figuratively, 'an important sport'). *Ruptura* (breaching) refers to a fixed expression that is modified to fulfil its purpose as in *Á segunda vai a vencida* (second try is the charm vs. third try is the charm). Finally, Cajaraville groups the remaining headlines in *outros recursos* (other strategies), i.e. headlines that are not based on fixed expressions but reflect some sort of morphological derivation or unusual use of language. The article ends with an analysis of the corpus according to the aforementioned four categories, *diloxía* being the most common by far.

In the fourth article, Ferro Ruibal offers an analysis of Galician phraseological expressions involving teeth and molars. Ferro Ruibal first describes what he calls 'passive dental phraseology'. He begins with the physiology of teeth by listing Galician phrasemes of teething such as *nacer os dentes* (birth of the teeth). Next, he cites the typology of teeth in terms of age, position, shape, and purpose.

Examples include *dentes da mama* (mom's teeth) to refer to the first teeth, *dentes da frente* (front or incisor teeth), *dentes de cabalo* (horse teeth) or *dentes de mentireiro* (liar's teeth), which refers to the common belief that people with a gap between their incisors let lies out through them. The author also cites several examples of passive dental phraseology involving biting (*a dentadas*, i.e. 'biting with teeth'), eating (*meterlle o dente*, i.e. 'put the teeth' or *ferrarlle os dentes*, literally, 'to shoe one's teeth'), or having a big appetite and being hungry (*te-los dentes afiado*, literally, 'having sharp teeth' or *ter dentes de frade*, i.e. 'having monk's teeth'). Ferro Ruibal also describes what he calls 'active teeth phraseology' to classify those units in which the teeth work as a metaphor for something else. Some of these are *armado ata os dentes* (armed to the teeth) or *custa-los dentes da boca* (something costs one's mount teeth), which is used to point to something very expensive.

Sabine Fiedler reviews Esperanto phraseology in the fifth article. She begins by introducing Esperanto, the only constructed language that successfully evolved from a project to a genuinely spoken language. Fiedler claims that Esperanto is an invaluable source for studying phraseological units because of its agglutinative nature, free pragmatic word order, and flexibility. She divides Esperanto phraseology into three main groups: planned or consciously constructed, loan translation, and socio-cultural phraseology. The first category comprises nominal compounds such as *acida pluvo* (acid rain), sayings such as *balai ion sub la tapison* (sweep something under the carpet), proverbs such as *peko kaj eraro estas ecoj de l'homaro* (Sin and failure are characteristics of human beings), bimembrations like *paso post paso* (step by step), or communicative formulas such as *jam temp' estâ* (it is a matter of time). All these phraseological units were introduced by Zamenhof (1910), who published a collection of proverbs in Esperanto. The second group belongs to those phraseological units that entered Esperanto from other languages. Those units were mainly borrowed from Greek mythology or the Bible. According to Fiedler this is the largest group. The third group consists of expressions that are socio-cultural at core and thus reflect the communicative history of Esperanto, for example *Ne krokodilu!* (Don't be a crocodile!), which means 'speak Esperanto when you are around Esperanto speakers'. Finally, the use of phraseological units in journalistic articles, literary texts as well as verbal communication is described, which reflects the richness of Esperanto phraseology. This may prove phraseology to be an important factor for the development of a language project into a full-fledged language.

In the first of the two articles with pedagogical implications, Iñesta Mena writes on teaching lexical and phraseological units such as idioms or metaphors in the foreign language classroom. Teaching phraseological units is argued to

be essential for the development of communicative competence and the promotion of social integration. The article is based on the author's previous work on metaphors as a convergence zone between phraseology, cognitive semantics, and lexico-semantic typology (Pamies and Iñesta 2000, Iñesta and Pamies 2001). Making use of the cognitive framework, the author argues that presenting phraseological units organised according to topic or resorting to a word's etymology can serve as good teaching strategies. Moreover, the use of diverse activities that emphasise both linguistic and cultural diversity and involve the learner emotionally is promoted.

Similar to Ferro Ruibal's study above, Martínez Blanco and Veiga Alonso brilliantly analyse Galician phraseological units related to fish and other marine animals. The authors argue that many Galician phrasemes make reference to fish due to Galicia's strong maritime culture. The authors provide a semantic catalogue of phrases in the first and of proverbs in the second part of their article. The first part is divided into several subgroups. For instance, the first subgroup comprises phrasemes that characterise individuals such as *estar feito un bacalau* (literally, 'be made a cod') to refer to someone who is very thin or *estar coma unha balea* (be like a whale) for someone who is overweight. The second involves units that describe a situation or a state, e.g. *coma o peixe/troita na auga* (like a fish/trout in water, i.e. 'be competent') or *coma sardiñas en lata* (like sardines in a can, i.e. 'to be in a crowded place'). Other subgroups involve actions (*apegar(se) coma unha lapa*, i.e. 'to cling to people') or meteorology (*haber arroaces de mar*, literally, 'there are sea dolphins' to refer to sea water with swells similar to the movement of dolphins). In the second part of the article, the authors create a semantic catalogue of proverbs, which are also divided into several groups. The first group comprises proverbs with a referential meaning such as *ollomol de xaneiro sabe a carneiro* (Red bream fished in January tastes like mutton), proverbs describing times when someone should not consume fish such as *sardiñas de maio*, *sardiñas do diaño* (May sardines are sardines of the devil), or proverbs describing the social preferences/dispreferences of fish like *se qués ver á túa muller morta, dale de comer samborca* (If you want your wife to die, give her streaked prochilod to eat). The second group refers to proverbs with a metaphoric meaning such as *o que troitas quer percar, as calzas ten que molar* (If you want to fish trout, you have to get your hose wet) or *sardine quó gato leva, tarde ou nunca volve o prato* (The sardine that the cat gets, either never returns or does so late). The authors conclude the article by stressing the recursiveness of fish and other marine species in Galician phraseology, sardines and trouts being the most popular ones. They also highlight the fact that many of these expressions have fallen into disuse due to new fishing techniques and the different connotations and metaphorical images that are associated with

some species. They connect these changes to the evolution of the language within society.

In the next article, Odriozola Pereira and Ondarra Artieda analyse the use of the Basque connector *ere* (too/also) and its way of organising information within the clause. First, the pragmatic, prosodic, and syntactic levels of this prototypically additive Basque connector as well as its topical nature are described. Basque does not have an internal negative particle such as the Spanish *tampoco* (neither). Therefore, *ere* appears isolated in affirmative clauses and with the particle *ez* (no) in negative clauses. The authors then present phraseological units containing *ere* when it functions exclusively as a negative polarity unit. They conclude the article describing the changes that the connector has been subject to recently.

Pastor Lara investigates specialised phraseological units. It is claimed that many phraseologists are reluctant to study phraseological units in specialised texts because their comprehension is entirely dependent on their meaning and function within the discourse, which demands a deep knowledge of the specialised domain itself. The purpose of this article is two-fold. On the one hand, it surveys the theoretical aspects of specialised phraseological units while highlighting the role of context, on the other, it exposes the necessity to expand the current concept of specialised phraseology to go beyond verbo-nominal constructions and to also include recurrent suprasentential constructions. The author analyses two Spanish and German corpora of legal texts related to criminal law with each corpus providing 100 sentences. The results show that there are several recurrent suprasentential constructions such as *publicar una sentencia* (literally, ‘publish a verdict’), which reflects the commonness of suprasentential constructions in these texts. Pastor Lara admits that these findings are limited to her corpus, but implicitly invites readers to further investigate specialised phraseological units in other juridical texts. In doing so, the current lexicographical and terminological needs of translation professionals could be addressed.

Penadés Martínez then investigates how some of the definitions of Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese idioms found in dictionaries include information that does not correspond with the actual uses of these idioms. The author uses several examples to underline her claim. For example, the Spanish idiom *echarse los años encima* (literally, ‘pounced on years on someone’) is scrutinised. Penadés Martínez finds the dictionary definition ‘to age suddenly’ and then points to uses like *si veo que se me echan los años encima, no me importaría tener un hijo sin estar casada* (If I see that I get old, I would not mind having a child without being married) or *te averguenzas de que se te hayan echado los años encima, así de pronto* (You are embarrassed that you suddenly aged). The second example

actually includes the modal *suddenly*, which leads the author to conclude that the modal information in the dictionary definition for this idiom is redundant and should therefore be simplified to ‘to age’ only.

Recio Ariza’s article explores how and to what extent phraseology is used in advertisements and their translation. She stresses that the study of translation in publicity has become more important but also points to the difficulties of translating corresponding phraseological units and metaphors due to their creative and dynamic nature. Moreover, since phraseological units are a reflection of a particular language and culture, it is significantly harder for a translator to interpret them. Recio Ariza therefore claims that professional translators have to be provided with the necessary tools to be able to successfully translate the phraseological expressions used in advertisements.

Next, Sanromán Vilas investigates phraseological units for expressing gratitude. The study is based on a compilation of 50 acknowledgement sections from Spanish Ph.D. dissertations. The author reveals the relatively small inventory of formulas that are actually used and shows that the expressions have a similar structure. Some of the most frequently used phrasemes are *dar las gracias* (give thanks), *llegar a buen puerto* (literally, ‘to arrive in a good harbor’, i.e. ‘to reach a satisfactory conclusion’) or *esta tesis fue posible gracias a* (This thesis was possible thanks to). Sanromán Vilas proposes that her description of phraseological units expressing gratitude could provide a model for prospective Ph.D. graduates to write acknowledgements. She also suggests that it may have pedagogical applications for learners of Spanish as a second language.

The last article in the ‘studies’ section involves contrastive animal phraseology in German and Spanish. The paper compares the symbolism embodied by animals in German and Spanish to determine the possible similarities and differences between them. Silva López’s corpus shows that animal phraseology is frequent in both languages. Moreover, it reveals that their symbolic meaning is often antithetical as in German *jemand ist voller Freude wie ein Hund voll Flöhe* or in Spanish *alguien está lleno de alegría como un perro lleno de pulgas* (someone is full of joy like a dog is full of fleas). Finally, the author discusses how the symbolic meaning of animals is associated with specific concepts. For example, in Spanish and in German ‘stupidity/clumsiness’ is represented by the hen and the bear, ‘danger’ by the snake, and ‘obesity’ by the elephant.

The first article of the ‘compilation’ section is a sociological case study, which provides a collection of the phraseological units used by Pilar Guerra, a 75 year old rural woman from Carballido, Lugo, Spain. Ms. Guerra’s dialectal variety consists of morphemes, words, phrases, and even phonemes that are not commonly used by other speakers of Galician. She also makes use of several hispanicisms, such as

deuda (debt) instead of *débeda*, *libreta* (notebook) instead of *caderno* or *Dios* (God) for *Deus*. The author claims that although Ms. Guerra uses some phraseological units that are structurally and stylistically Galician, they are not commonly heard since they are prototypical for her hometown, Carballedo. The article lists Guerra's phraseological expressions and divides them into several grammatical categories: locutions such as *comer coma un cura* (eat like a priest, i.e. 'to eat a lot'), sayings such as *cousas claras e o chocolate espeso* (things are clear and chocolate thick, i.e. 'to ask for someone to speak straightforwardly'), proverbs like *desconfiarás e acertarás* (Distrust and you will be right), dialectalisms such as *pra donde vas, muller ben casada? Pra donde non teñas sogra nin cuñada* (Where are you going, well-married woman? Wherever there is not a mother-in-law or a sister-in-law, i.e. 'for a recently married woman, it is better to live in a house without the women from her husband's family'), and wellerisms like *di a curuxa: "Anda de día, que la noite es mía"* (The owl says: walk during the day because the night is mine).

The second article is a compilation of equine Galician phrasemes. Galician has a wide variety of phraseological units that involve horses, mules, or donkeys due to Galicia's large equine population that is often presented at fairs and town parties as well as championships and horse shows. The importance of these animals in Galicia is reflected in its phraseology, with almost 2000 phrases and proverbs containing one or more equine referents. Again, this article is heavily centred on listing exemplars. A list and classification of Galician equine phraseology is presented and divided into several groups. Examples include *baixar da burra* (get off the donkey, i.e. 'to realize something that was clear all along'), formulas such as *anda, burro animal, que non estamos no tempo do Carnaval* (Go, donkey animal, it's not Carnival time), and proverbs like *os the Lugo, nin boa besta nin bon burro, montadores, os millores* (People from Lugo are neither good beasts of burden nor good donkeys, but the best horse jockeys).

The third and final compilation article is an examination of 120 Galician verbal phrasemes currently used in different parts of this region. The article almost exclusively provides a list of examples such as *escapar/fuxir como o demo á auga bendita* (escape/run away like a demon would run away from holy water) or *non dar o santo para a vela* (not give a Saint for the candle, i.e. 'there are more losses than benefits').

This edited volume of papers sheds light on phraseology in Galician and other languages by focusing on a variety of topics and pursuing different approaches. One of the main disadvantages of this diversity of subjects and methodologies is the volume's lack of straightforward structure, cohesiveness, and a unifying theme beyond the common denominator 'phraseology'. At the same time, and perhaps contradictorily, the wide array of issues addressed and the

different perspectives proposed can also be seen as one strength of the volume. In particular, the articles on Galician phraseology offer fascinating and intriguing insights into the interrelationship between culture and language. Hence, the reviewer hopes that these articles will inspire phraseologists and corpus linguists to pursue further research along these lines.

The title *Cadernos de Fraxeoloxia Galega* (Journal of Galician Phraseology) is rather misleading. Potential readers might pick this volume while expecting to find research on Galician phraseology only. They will be surprised to see that only six out of the sixteen articles actually focus on Galician. Thus, this annual review of phraseological research is edited in Galician both as a project of promoting its linguistic ecology as well as for promoting research on Galician. Whereas the purpose of supporting the Galician language is certainly accomplished, the greatest shortcoming is its limited accessibility to a non-Galician audience. This makes the volume hard to distribute and read, which seems detrimental to making the vital research on Galician phraseology better known. An additional problem of the volume is the fact that the English translations of the abstracts are generally very poorly written. Actually, on several occasions it was easier for me to read them in Galician (a language I can read but not speak) rather than in English. Ideally, the reader will therefore be fluent in Galician or use a skilled combination of Spanish and Portuguese (or Spanish and Catalan as in my case) to read the text. Despite these problems, the book is a valuable contribution to the study of phraseology, and I particularly recommend it for reference to Galician phraseology.

Alexandra Mateu Martin

Correspondence address: mateumar@ualberta.ca

References

- Bárdosi, Vilmos, Géza Balázs, Péter Balogh, Regina Hessky & Gábor Kiss (eds.). 2003. *Magyar szólások*. Budapest: Tinta.
- Handrovics, László. 1995. *Magyar frazeológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai.
- Iñesta Mena, Eva María & Antonio Pamies Bertrán. 2001. La conceptualización de la ira a través de las unidades fraseológicas. Paper given at *IV Internationale Arbeitstagung zum romanisch-deutschen und interromanischen Sprachvergleich* (Leipzig 7–9 Okt. 1999).
- Nagy, Gábor. 1976. *Magyar szólások és kozmondások*. Budapest: Gondolat.
- Pamies Bertrán, Antonio & Eva María Iñesta Mena. 2000. El miedo en las unidades fraseológicas: Enfoque interlingüístico. *Language Design* 3. 41–75.
- Zamenhof, Ludoviko Lazaro. 1910. *Proverbare Esperanta*. La Laguna: J. Régulo Eldonisto.

František Čermák (ed.): *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky I-IV* [Dictionary of Czech Phraseology and Idiomatics I-IV]. Prague: Leda, 2009. Part I: 512 pp., Part II: 552 pp., Part III: 1248 pp., Part IV: 1272 pp. ISBN 978-80-7335-215-8.

The *Dictionary of Czech Phraseology and Idiomatics* is a unique and original work in phraseography without parallels elsewhere in the world. Its innovation and originality applies to all aspects and every step of the dictionary compilation process. This long-term academic project, which was based at Charles University and was run by its university teachers (only its second volume has been helped by lexicographers from the Czech Academy of Sciences), was completed in the first decade of this century. It is divided into four volumes. More specifically, the four volumes represent Czech idioms in terms of functionally homogeneous classes that are defined on a structural basis: I. Comparisons (1983), II. Nominal, adverbial, and grammatical idioms (1988), III. Verbal idioms (two books) (1994), and IV. Propositional idioms (2009). Overall, the dictionary records some 17,000 contemporary Czech idioms and many idiom variants and transformations. Thus, it is one of the largest and most comprehensive dictionaries of its kind.

The first quality that speaks for the originality of this dictionary is related to the dimensions of data collection and corpus building, i.e. the fundamental empirical and material bases for the dictionary. The central research question tackled by the researchers reads: What should the dictionary be based on and how can one draw much more attention to a chronically weak point in dictionaries, i.e. the registration of the typical, colloquial, lexicalised, and idiomatic compatibility and collocability of lexical items? The primary solution to this problem was to collect new and fresh language data. This was an absolute desideratum after the period of the old-fashioned and monopolistic academic lexicographical situation in former Czechoslovakia. Back then, traditional and partially out-dated archives with excerpts not covering the current state of the contemporary Czech language were used.

The solution to fill this general lacuna in dictionary compilation (e.g., for the *New Dictionary of Czech*) was met by a number of academic institutions. In 1994, they established The Institute of the Czech National Corpus (CNC) at Charles University in Prague. First, the corpus only included written language from after 1989. With regard to the *Dictionary of Czech Phraseology and Idiomatics*, the CNC was only partially used for the second edition of the first three volumes. However, it was exhaustively employed for the preparation of the last, i.e. the fourth volume, which contains propositional idioms. Propositional idioms constitute the second largest group of idioms. The CNC was used to especially explore the usage and frequencies of proverbs in texts.

But the project of designing a dictionary of contemporary Czech phraseology itself had been conceived and started much earlier in the days before computers

and linguistic corpora, namely sometimes in the late seventies. It was based on a rich pool of excerpts and citation slips obtained not only from all available published sources but also from manual records of spontaneous spoken language. Doubtful cases concerning the usage of form or meaning were verified by further inquiring native speakers. Along these lines, Čermák therefore states that “the dictionary aims to be both a reliable academic source and also a multi-purpose reference-book for the general public, students, translators, etc. . . . and it aims at a reasonably exhaustive description of the idioms of all kinds in Czech” (Čermák 2001, reprinted 2007: 657).

The selection of items for inclusion into the dictionary was based on Čermák’s theory of idioms (Čermák 1982, Filipec and Čermák 1985, Čermák 1988). The following simple rules were applied: “(1) *any collocation (combination)* of at least *two lexemes (word forms)* has been included which has been found (2) *stable, recurrent in use* and for which (3) *at least one component (lexeme, word) collocates, in the same function or sense, with the other components in a unique or severely limited manner*” (Čermák 2007: 658, italics used by Čermák). Thus, the collocational restriction and anomaly of components, which can be tested by a commutation test, are the basic criteria to select and isolate idioms (cf. Čermák 1994).

The dictionary’s second unique characteristic consists in the lexicographical design of the dictionary entries. The crucial problem of listing of idioms alphabetically was solved by using word class distinctions, which are very strong in Czech. Following this approach, a given idiom is listed under its first noun. In the case of nouns being absent, the idiom appears under its first adjective. If there are no adjectives, it is the verb, then adverb and finally any other word. A secondary subclassification for large idiom families, such as somatic idioms with the same noun, is based on the same alphabetic and grammatical criteria.

The dictionary has two types of entries: one with the full lexicographic description and another other with reduced information. Only familiar and highly frequent idioms are provided with the full dictionary entry. Rare and old idioms, many idiom transformations and variants are represented by the reduced entry. This strategy has substantially reduced the volume of the printed books.

The microstructure of each full entry contains 10 sections. (1) comprises the lemma, which is the standard form of the idiom that also includes its paradigmatic (substitution of components) and syntagmatic (linear, extended, or reduced form) variants. (2) involves stylistic information on its textual usage and expressivity with added information about its frequency. The next section (3) contains grammatical information with the explicit enumeration of restricted or not realised grammatical categories for the idiom’s components. (4) lists formal transformations including both so-called ‘functional (quasi)transformations’ which have the same function as the basic forms and so-called ‘heterofunctional transformations’

whose function differs from the base form (e.g. nominalizations, verbalizations, comparisons). Then (5) specifies information on context, valency, and function, including the idiom's typical usage contexts and situations with corresponding general or specific subject or object participants. This account is further completed by adding important information on the relations, attitudes, and motivations of the participants. In (6) the meaning is described on the basis of a restricted and formalised meta-language. Note that this meaning description is distinguished from the background information on the situational frame provided in (5). However, special attention is given to pragmatic features and evaluative aspects of idioms. (7) provides typical examples of the idiom's usage. (8) comprises notes with additional comments on variants, usage, function, speech acts, etymology, etc. In (9) references to semantic relations such as synonyms, antonyms, and other related expressions are established. These semantic relations are the basis for an independent semantic dictionary, an original onomasiological counterpart to the alphabetical, semasiological dictionary. This semantic dictionary groups all idioms into semantic classes with the same meaning. Finally, (10) lists equivalents in English, German, French, and Russian. The lexicographic information in the semasiological (alphabetical) and onomasiological (semantic) dictionaries are closely linked. This allows a user friendly and easy search for idioms from opposite semantic perspectives.

The first volume, led by J. Hronek, J. Machač and J. Čermák, which includes comparisons and similes, was published in 1983. The primary intention was to make the linguistic description as exhaustive and comprehensive as possible. Hence, already in this first volume some rather unique and atypical features were added. These features include phraseological synonyms and antonyms, equivalents in four languages (English, German, French, and Russian) and a supplementary semantic dictionary (onomasiological thesaurus) for looking up idioms according to their meaning. All of these characteristics make it easier and more attractive to use the dictionary.

The second volume contains more than 4000 entries with nominal or non-verbal idioms of two types: binary structures with autosemantic components (e.g. adjective+noun, noun+adjective, noun+noun, adjective+adjective, etc.) and multiple structures with two autosemantic words and their subtypes (e.g. noun+preposition+noun, noun+preposition+adverb, etc.) or subtypes with autosemantic and synsemantic word combinations (e.g. pronoun+noun, pronoun+adjective, numeral+noun, etc.). This volume also includes an appendix with 750 grammatical idioms, i.e. relational (prepositional, conjunctive), deictic (mostly pronominal) and commentator (particle) idioms.

The third volume includes nearly 10,000 idioms that are represented in 3600 full entries, 5900 reduced entries, and approximately 500 transformations. The volume is extended with approximately 10,000 quasi-idioms that contain

abstract nouns and verbs. These expressions feature a conspicuous anomaly in the selection of the verbs used as primarily inchoative, durative, and terminative functions are realised. This volume contains idioms that function as predicates or as multi-word verbs and also all combinations of a verb and a noun, adjective, adverb or any of the synsemantic words.

The fourth volume led by František Čermák contains approximately 10,000 propositional idioms of Czech, i.e. idioms that have both the form and function of a full sentence or a combination of sentences (simple sentences with a single subject, complex sentences with a single subject, and dialogic polypropositional intersubjective idioms). For the first time in the history of phraseography (paremiography, in particular) a system of standard intonation for propositional idioms was developed for this volume. The system contains 7 distinct types and many subtypes.

The *Dictionary of Czech Phraseology and Idiomatics* is a unique work in the history of lexicography. Its theoretical as well as its empirical approach can serve as a prototypical design for the compilation of idiom dictionaries in other languages. Moreover, the dictionary should be a very strong source of inspiration for contrastive phraseography. The announced electronic version of this impressive and monumental work will constitute another big step in phraseography and general lexicography not only for Czech but on an international scale.

Peter Durčo

Correspondence address: durco@vronk.net

References

- Čermák, František. 1988. On the substance of idioms. *Folia Linguistica* 22(3–4), 413–438.
- Čermák, František. 1994. Czech Idiom Dictionary. In Willy Martin, Willem Meijs, Margrikt Moerland, Elsemiek ten Pas, Piet van Sterkenburg & Piek Vossen (eds.), *Euralex 94. Proceedings*, 426–431. Amsterdam: Euralex.
- Čermák, František. 2001. A dictionary of Czech phraseology and idiomatics. *Bolletino dell'Opera del Vocabolario Italiano. Supplemento* 1, 77–86, reprint in Čermák 2007, 655–665.
- Čermák, František. 2007. *Frazeologie a idiomatika česká a obecná/Czech and general phraseology*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Čermák, František & Jirí Hronek. 1982. Heslo frazeologického slovníku a systémové souvislosti. *Slavica Pragensia* 25(4–5), 231–237.
- Čermák, František, Jirí Hronek & Jaroslav Machač (eds.) 2009. *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky, Vol. I.—IV*. Praha: Leda.
- Filipec, Josef & František Čermák. 1985. *Česká lexikologie*. Praha: Academia.