



Danish Phraseography

Farø, Ken

Published in:
Phraseologie - Phraseology

Publication date:
2007

Document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Farø, K. (2007). Danish Phraseography. In H. Burger, D. Dobrovolskij, P. Kühn, & N. Norrick (Eds.), *Phraseologie - Phraseology: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung* (1. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 949-958). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Schottelius, J.G. (1663): Ausführliche Arbeit Von der Teutschen HauptSprache. Braunschweig. [Neudruck hrsg. von W. Hecht. Teil I u. II. Tübingen²1995].

Stantcheva, D. (1999): Zum Stellenwert der Phraseologie im einsprachigen deutschen Bedeutungswörterbuch des 20. Jahrhunderts. In: Linguistik online 3, 2/99 (= http://www.linguistik-online.de/2_99/stantcheva.html [10.10.2006]).

Stantcheva, D. (2003): Phraseologismen in deutschen Wörterbüchern. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte

der lexikographischen Behandlung von Phraseologismen im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch von Adelung bis zur Gegenwart. Hamburg.

Wiegand, H.E. (1998): Historische Lexikographie. In: Besch, W./Betten, A./Reichmann, O./Sonderegger, S. (Hrsg.), 643–715.

Peter O. Müller, Erlangen
Kathrin Kunkel-Razum, Mannheim
(Deutschland)

79. Danish phraseography

1. On Danish phraseography and metaphraseography
2. Danish phraseological terminology
3. Danish phraseological dictionaries
4. Danish dictionaries with phraseological components
5. Summary and perspectives
6. Select bibliography

1. On Danish phraseography and metaphraseography

Phraseography is not a novelty in Denmark, as phraseology has been an integral part of Danish lexicography for centuries. The novelty is, however, the following three issues: 1) the emergence of specialized dictionaries of phraseology, 2) a theoretical discussion of how this part of lexis should be treated in the dictionary, and 3) an overall systematic discussion of and research in the field of phraseology, which can of course hardly avoid influencing how multi word expressions (MWE) are dealt with by the dictionaries. Especially during the last couple of years, an emerging interest in phraseology has become evident in Denmark. And several scientific activities such as a new Danish Society for Phraseology may lead to a breakthrough for systematic phraseological research and phraseography, although this is still in its take off phase (cf. Naumann 2002). A few attempts towards describing individual problems can be found, viz. related to translation (e.g. Gottlieb 1995; Farø 2001; Farø 2006), corpora (Gottlieb 1998), lexicography (Boje/Braasch 1992; Thomsen 1998; Farø 2000a; 2004a), and diachrony (Farø 2004b). But apart from a few more or less introductory works (Ander-

sen 1987; 2001, 317–414; Farø 2003a), no theoretical, systematic and comprehensive studies on Danish phraseology exist. This part of language seems to be mainly of interest to lexicographers, although their lexicographical description would probably be much better off if lexicological studies in phraseology were promoted. A large share of the problems in Danish phraseography is associated less with the lack of “common sense” than with the lack of theoretical and empirical knowledge about this specific part of language.

Below, a number of the most important Danish phraseographic publications will be critically analyzed. As a starting point, a few significant Danish phraseological terms need to be introduced.

2. Danish phraseological terminology

Although the term “fraseologi” has been used in a number of recent works (e.g. Farø 2003a; b), it is definitely not (yet) a widespread term in Danish. This, however, is due to the already mentioned fact that research in the field of phraseology has been scarce and on the whole unsystematic. Unlike the situation in for instance the German speaking area, a common Danish terminology is therefore nonexistent. For this reason, a short introduction and discussion of some of the most common terms is highly relevant. Particularly the terms *talemåde*, *ordsprog*, *idiom*, *vending*, *udtryk*, *bevinget ord* and *fyndord* should be mentioned.

The first one, *talemåde* (cf. German *Redensart*), seems to be both the most widespread Danish phraseological term and at the same time the most problematic of all. Not

only is it a polysemous word from ordinary language, meaning both ‘way of speaking’ and ‘unserious statement’, but it is also used in lexicography in a paradoxical way: By Røder (1998) and Andersen (2001) as a term for non-textemic and non-compositional MWE, but in the DDO and the ODS, by contrast, as meaning exactly the opposite, namely textual (sentential) units generally associated with proverbs (at least in the DDO, 45). But proverbs in Danish are rather known as *ord-sprog* (“word-language”, see Karker 1982), an unambiguous term suitable for both scientific and general purposes and therefore preferable to “*talemåde*” (cf. Farø 2003b). *Idiom* is a quite well-known term in Denmark although it is mostly defined too broadly (i.e. negatively) in order to be able to cover exactly the category intended – mostly iconographic phrasemes that allow for both phraseological and literal decoding: Normally, it is not meant to include *phraseonyms* like *The White House*, (semi-) *phraseoterms* like *grüner/ grauer/schwarzer Star* or *xenophrasemes* like *do ut des*. Indeed, these are not compositional phrases, but that does not make them *idioms* in the eyes of most scholars, and not in the eyes of this writer either (cf. Farø 2004a). *Vending* is a vague term meaning more or less the same as *talemåde*, namely a MWE of any kind (cf. German *Wendung*). Even more vague is *udtryk* which can be both poly- and monolexical, denoting any significant part of the lexicon and even compositional sentences (cf. German *Ausdruck*). *Bevinget ord* (“catchphrase”), then, at least when used scientifically (cf. Farø 2003b), means ‘lexicalized quotation’ or ‘phrase or word historically connected to a specific person, context etc’, i.e. an *intertextual lexeme* (cf. German *geflügeltes Wort*). Curiously, the most prominent Danish dictionary on *bevingede ord* (Vogel-Jørgensen/Zerlang 1998) contains phrases and words with an interesting history rather than synchronically intertextual lexemes – not unlike Röhrich (1973) (cf. 4.2.).

Finally, the term *fyndord* seems to be a Danish speciality, not very widespread in ordinary language (cf. the apparently but not at all equivalent German term *brisantes Wort*, Strauß et al. 1989). In his doctoral dissertation (1992), Skyum-Nielsen has investigated the rhetoric functions of the Danish “fyndord”, which he himself describes as “short forms”. They are “independent word combinations”, “short texts” (op.cit., 11–12), and they “show

a high degree of intentional significance in the communication act” (716). But although “idiom” and “vending” are a part of his interesting “periodic system” of short forms (210–211), “idioms” are in most cases not texts, but rather lexemes that happen to be polylexical (cf. 291). So “fyndord” is not a genuine phraseological notion but nevertheless an interesting neighbouring phenomenon (cf. Gülich 1997).

3. Danish phraseological dictionaries

In the following two sections, a number of important Danish dictionaries and other publications with significant phraseographical components are analyzed. First, a distinction is made between dictionaries which define themselves as idiom dictionaries (3.) and those containing phraseology without being specialized in MWE (4.).

3.1. Monolingual

One of the first Danish mainly phraseological dictionaries has a title that only at a second glance reveals its true character, namely “Dansk Sprogbrug” (“Danish Language Use”) (Bruun 1999). This dictionary aims at “examining the *use of the words*, i.e. their capability to interrelate meaningfully with other words” (*Preface*). This somewhat vague announcement of the dictionary’s focus is only partly improved by its subtitle: “Dictionary of style and construction”. None of these terms really reveal what it is about, namely an attempt at a collection of Danish collocations and idioms. Particularly collocations – in terms of cooccurrence of words with other words, like for instance adverbs and prepositions – are given a thorough description. Idioms in the strict sense (cf. 2.), then, are somewhat more peripheral in this dictionary. Although the subtitle is vague, too – “interrelate” could in fact be conceived as syntax, “constructions” might be understood as grammatical and ad hoc, and “style” is an extremely wide notion – it may be justified by the fact that the dictionary actually contains more than lexicalized MWE. For instance, information about which objects or subjects are taken by certain words (*hyre: et mandskab, en taxa* [“hire: a crew, a taxi”]; *hælde: muren, tårnet, væggen -r* [“lean: the (outside) wall, the tower, the (inside) wall -s”]) is a description of “lexical solidarities” (Cosieriu 1967) of singular words and therefore semantic rather than colloca-

tional phenomena in a strict, modern sense. Today, “constructional” information is an integral part of any major monolingual dictionary, but this does not imply that a special dictionary on this aspect cannot be a valuable tool.

Michelsen (1993) is the first “real” Danish idiom dictionary. It contains 1’000 idioms (in the strict sense: they are “billedlige”: ‘figurative’ [ibid: 5]), plus definitions, examples of the idioms in use, and, typical for this genre, illustrations. Peculiarly, though, it is not quite clear whether these are meant to illustrate the literal or the idiomatic reading or maybe a combination of both. In the case of *tabe hovedet* (“lose the head”: ‘become confused/irrational’), only the literal decoding can be illustrated, and this in fact seems to be the general principle – possibly because the semantic-pragmatic content of the idiom is too abstract to illustrate. Sometimes, an integration of the two readings seems to be intended (*stjæle billedet* [“steal the picture”: ‘attract all attention’], *gå bort* [“walk away”: ‘die’]), whereas some illustrations do not really cover any of the two readings but rather an abstract contamination of the two, cf. *være kasterbold* (“be a throwing ball”: ‘be manipulated by strong powers without any influence of ones own’). This demonstrates quite well the sometimes complex relationship between the phraseological and literal “level” of an idiom. Furthermore, like most other dictionaries this dictionary does not completely respect its own idiom definition: *gå i gang, give sig, ngt kommer ud på ét* cannot be considered as “billedlige”.

Carrying a title which is a Danish idiom expressing surprise, emotional sympathy etc, “Av min arm” (Munk/Bæk 1998) contains 1’000 somatic phrasemes (cf. Farø 2002). The dictionary was published by *Special-pædagogisk Forlag* which specializes in material for special pedagogical purposes like learning handicaps and Danish as a foreign language. The motivation for this dictionary, though, is somewhat unclear: One can question the idea that foreign learners should learn idioms – as these do not belong to the core part of lexis and are mostly pragmatically restricted. Furthermore, picking out *somatic* idioms based on the argument that “body idioms form the biggest and oldest part of the idioms” is not comprehensible in an explicitly communicational context. Of more interest to foreign learners would be a dictionary of Danish *collocations* which they desperately

need every day (cf. Bruun 1999). But nobody “needs” idioms, and somatic idioms are communicationally no more important than any other type of idioms. In that respect, this publication remains to some extent a puzzle.

In 1998, Danish phraseography was enriched with another two phraseological dictionaries, viz. Røder (1998) and Andersen (1998/2001). Although both quite extensive (616 and 419 pages respectively), they are indeed two very different dictionaries (cf. the reviews of Karker 1999 and Andersson 1999). Whereas Røder is a collection of authentic material, i.e. idioms from novels, papers, comics, ads etc in their context – often with good illustrations from the latter, Andersen is a more traditional non-empirical dictionary. Røder’s “more than 5’000 examples” should not lead to the conclusion that it is more comprehensive than Andersen’s “3’500” as the type-token relation in Røder sometimes reaches 1:10 because of his many empirical examples of idioms in use. Their idiom concept is not completely identical, either: Røder explicitly looks for “billedlige” (figurative) phrasemes (cf. Michelsen 1993), whereas Andersen’s definition is broader (i.e. negative: the main criterion being non-compositionality) and at the same time more precise as *talemåder* “denote abstract phenomena” (Andersen 2001, 13) (which means that phraseonyms, for instance, are not idioms). Therefore, Andersen covers a wider phraseological field than Røder, e.g. *et nødvendigt onde* (“a necessary evil”: ‘an unpleasant but necessary measure’), *i ét væk* (“in one away”: ‘without a break’) and *det smukke køn* (“the fair sex”) – which hardly create any communicational misunderstanding (as claimed by Andersen 2001, 13). Andersen has some difficulty in meeting his own criterion of “principal ambiguity” of “talemåder”, although it would make a lot of sense in a definition of idioms (in a strict, positive interpretation). Another difference is the semantic and pragmatic information delivered by the two dictionaries. Røder’s short and clear definitions are met by Andersen’s more “impressionistic” ones which sometimes leave it unclear whether the “beatings around the bush” are a description of one or more meanings. Andersen also contains synonymous Danish and “equivalent” English, German and French idioms under each lemma. To what extent they are really synonymous and equivalent,

however, is not quite clear. But this is a typical lexicographical problem.

In 2003, the Centre for Lexicography in Aarhus launched the first Danish idiom dictionary on the Internet (Vrang et al. 2003). According to its own declaration, the base contains 7'500 Danish idioms which would make it the most comprehensive Danish idiom dictionary. This number, however, may be modified by the fact that some variants are lemmatized separately, as are different meanings of the same idiom. Apart from being the first Internet based idiom dictionary, this tool presents a number of new idioms not contained in the existing dictionaries. An onomasiological feature is planned to be provided, namely the possibility of searching for idioms with a specific meaning (cf. Schemann 1991) which would be a much needed functionality. A weakness of Vrang et al., however, is the quite slippery handling of their own (negative) idiom definition: Both collocations, catchphrases, phraseonyms and phraseotermes have found their way into the dictionary although this material is obviously not the main interest of it (cf. also Cowie et al. 2000). But only the compositional collocations are actually excluded by the broad definition. Also, a much more profound description of pragmatic and diachronic restrictions is needed if Vrang et al. is supposed to meet the dictionary functions it – with some exaggeration – claims to cover. Nevertheless, this is an interesting novelty in Danish phraseography (for a comprehensive review of this dictionary, see Farø 2004a).

A special type of idiom dictionary is Katlev/Spliedt (2001) which mainly focusses on etymology, i.e. the interesting nomination history of the idioms included. In fact such information seems to be in great demand, illustrated by the fact that questions of this kind are among the most frequent in Danish newspaper language columns. In sum, the history behind 400 idioms is explained in Katlev/Spliedt.

3.2. Bilingual

Although Danish with its 5,2 million speakers does not belong to the largest of languages and bilingual phraseological dictionaries will probably never be a particularly lucrative business, a few within this genre can be mentioned: An explicit spin-off product of the “Collins Cobuild Dictionary” is the idiom dictionary from English to Danish, explicitly

made for Danes, the “Engelsk-Dansk Idiomordbog” (Grue/Steen 2001). It is quite heterogeneous as it contains 3'000 “idioms” in a very wide sense, including proverbs and expressions like *domino effect* which in Danish normally correspond to single words (i.e. compounds: *dominoeffekt*). Generally, the article structure is as follows: 1. English lemma; 2. Danish equivalent idiom(s); 3. English (!) definition; 4. Authentic context example from *The Bank of English*; 5. pragmatic information; 6. etymological information (in Danish). The both quite systematic and useful publication seems to be marred only by the fact that the user is not able to make out whether a Danish equivalent is actually an idiom or merely an editor's construction. And also at times by the lack of syntactical equivalence of lemma and “translation” (cf. *happy as Larry, in seventh heaven* and *high as a kite*).

Brink (1993) is a German-Danish idiom dictionary carrying in its title the German routine formula *Hals- und Beinbruch*. It contains around 2'000 German phrasemes and a number of Danish equivalents. According to the foreword (ibid: 7), the expressions included are all “billedlige”. But this is not completely true: *ab und zu, Anspruch auf etwas erheben, in Bälde, ohne Belang* are only a few examples of many possible lemmata that are not “billedlige”. Apart from this, the principle for choosing equivalents is not comprehensible, as these are sometimes idioms themselves, sometimes just ordinary lexemes. More problematic is the lack of precision in presenting the equivalents: *Fracksausen haben* is not equivalent to *være bange* ‘be afraid’ as the latter is neutral, whereas the German idiom is extremely informal. The dictionary does not provide any pragmatic information at all which is a problem when the intended user group is learners – who then may use these phrases, unaware of their many restrictions. But being the first Danish-German dictionary of its kind, it nevertheless represents an advance in itself in Danish phraseography.

A dictionary which to most Danes is quite exotic is the Japanese-Danish phraseological dictionary published by Suzuki/Shintani (2002). It contains 1'000 Danish idioms with both a Japanese phraseological and literal translation, and it provides good empirical examples in context. For other than Japanese readers, however, the dictionary may be less valuable, as metatext and preface are in Japanese.

In 2001, a Danish-English proverb dictionary was published (Barlach 2001), a commendable initiative as the existing bilingual dictionaries in general contain only few proverbs (op.cit., 8). The dictionary is bidirectional, and also provides – apart from proverbial equivalents – to some extent synonyms and meaning definitions. It is “definitely aimed at Danish users” (ibid.). Although it is, according to the author (5), to some extent corpus based, the Danish part is paradoxically often not contemporary. In fact, many of the Danish proverbs are not used today at all which undoubtedly makes the covered 1’200 Danish proverbs too high a number – especially when one does not get any information on the (lacking) frequency-in-use of the proverbs. Just a few examples of hardly ever used proverbs: *man skal ikke hælde det skidne vand ud, før man har det rene* (“one should not throw out the murky water before one has the clean”); *jo bedre vin, desto stærkere ed-dike* (“the better the wine, the stronger the vinegar”); *sjældent får liggende ulv lam i munde* (“lying wolf seldom gets a lamb into its mouth”) (cf. 4.5.).

4. Danish dictionaries with phraseological components

4.1. Monolingual ordinary dictionaries

In the official Danish orthographic dictionary (RO) edited by the Danish Language Council (“Dansk Sprognævn”: <http://www.dsn.dk>), no strong tradition for including phraseology exists, apart from a few examples such as preposition + substantive (*om bord* [‘aboard’] and *til dels* [‘partially’]), or adverb + preposition like *hen over* and *hen ad* – as well as Danish xenophrasemes like *charge d’affaires* and *in casu*, the latter most unconventionally found in the dictionary under its “lightest” component. In the recent editions such phrasemes have become more frequent. In general, though, the orthography of phraseology does not seem to be of primary interest of the RO, although the writing of phrasemes in many cases causes trouble too.

Two very important modern general Danish definition dictionaries exist: Between 1953 and 2003, “Nudansk Ordbog” (NUO) was the only larger general dictionary on contemporary Danish, and therefore to many people *the* Danish dictionary. This work is in fact a dictionary of extraordinarily good quality. In the last editions phraseology has become more

and more prominent, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and it is today more accessible, as the phrasemes are now printed in bold. Under the lemma *ben* (‘leg’, ‘bone’), for instance, one finds around 30 lexicalized phrases, such as *få ben at gå på* (“get legs to walk on”: ‘be quickly spent’). Apart from short meaning definitions, the dictionary often provides good examples too. But it is not a *scientific* dictionary, unlike “Den Danske Ordbog” (DDO). This dictionary is the first corpus based dictionary on the Danish language. Phraseology is in many respects in extremely good hands here, as the methodological principle of profound corpus analysis is carried out consequently. This ensures the most thorough empirical description of contemporary Danish phraseology in the broad sense at the time of writing. A few problems should be mentioned, though: One can observe in the dictionary a slightly “anti-phraseological” tendency. This means that when in doubt, metaphorical (etc) meanings are preferred to phrasemes. For instance, the lemma *abe* (‘monkey’), apart from its normal meaning, apparently has a second one (described as “slang”, which is in itself controversial, cf. 4.3.), namely ‘fault’, ‘responsibility’. This description might be sufficient if the purpose of the dictionary were merely to help with reception of Danish language. But of course this is not the case: The dictionary is aimed at *producing* Danish text too. Exactly this aspect is somewhat ignored when a special *abe*-meaning is claimed: Because a user with little or no knowledge of this lexeme may on the basis of this description create a large number of non-acceptable sentences containing *abe*, e.g.:

*Har du ikke forstået aben i det her? (“*haven’t you understood the monkey in this?”)

*Hun kunne ikke komme pga. familiære aber (“*she couldn’t come because of family monkeys”)

The problem is that not only is the use of *abe* in this meaning extremely restricted, but it also seems to be limited to two or three *phrases*, viz. *sende aben videre* “pass the monkey” and *sidde tilbage med aben* “have the monkey in the end” which of course would take up more space in the dictionary. On the other hand, the user would then get an instrument enabling him to create genuine and acceptable sentences. And that is currently not the case. Concludingly, *abe* does not mean ‘problem’ in Danish. Rather, it is

just a component in a few idioms that form a small and definite paradigm.

The same principle is in the DDO sometimes used to isolate what is conceived of as the core of a phraseme, like for instance in the case of *bål og brand* (“bonfire and fire”) which is described as “violence, force, threat-enings” etc. Like *abe*, this could be used as a starting point of sentences like:

*Jeg er så vant til hans bål og brand (“I’m so used to his bonfire and fire”)

*Bålet og branden mod borgmesteren blev stadig værre (“The bonfire and fire against the mayor got ever worse”)

In this case, the NUO is actually more adequate as it treats this phenomenon as a lexicalized phrase and not as a meaning. Also *bundt* is in the DDO described synthetically instead of phraseologically as ‘a group of persons’ although it is hardly ever used without the co-text *hele* (“hele bundtet”: ‘the whole bunch’: ‘all of them, it’). In this case, however, the DDO is followed by the NUO. These examples show that the aspect of text production seems to have been given a lower priority than the reception aspect and may also have been restricted due to space considerations. On the other hand this principle has been handled somewhat arbitrarily: In many cases phrases in the dictionary could have been described in the same way but the lexicographer has nevertheless chosen the “phraseological principle”.

The *Danskordbogen* (Bergenholtz et al. 1999), then, could serve as a model when it comes to declaration of the phraseological content of an ordinary dictionary: It contains “5’000 idioms, 8’500 example sentences and 2’000 proverbs, catchphrases and other quotations”.

4.2. Dictionaries of “bevingede ord”

A hitherto unsolved problem in phraseological research is the question whether catchphrases (CP) (“geflügelte Worte”, e.g. *something is rotten in the state of Denmark*) are phraseological units or not. In some works they are seen as a part of phraseology, although not a core part of it. But this is too vague, mainly because CP should not be defined on the criterion polylexicality but rather on the two elements *intertextuality* and *lexicalizedness*. That is why Holmgård (1996), a Danish dictionary of quotations, cannot be called a dictionary of “bevingede ord”, as it contains solely non-lexicalized quotations.

Furthermore, CP can be both mono- and polylexical units. Therefore, when CP are dealt with in a phraseological context, this is merely for pragmatic and not for theoretical reasons.

In Denmark, especially one dictionary of “bevingede ord” is very well-known: Vogel-Jørgensen/Zerlang (V/Z) (1998), which was first published in 1940 and now contains around 15’000 “catchphrases”. The reason for the quotation marks here is the extremely heterogeneous nature of this dictionary. While being a very important and useful source for both scholarly users and lay people, the work contains not only catchphrases, but in fact also idioms, proverbs and single words. Which is of course mostly a problem for genre conscious readers – but also for those actually expecting a dictionary of 15’000 *catchphrases*. Phrasemes like (*ngt er*) *hip som hap* (‘the method doesn’t matter’), *holde stik* (‘become true’) and (*ngt er*) *knald eller fald* (‘sth. may have both a happy and a sad ending’) are not catchphrases – and this is not changed by the fact that famous Danish writers have used them (as documented by the dictionary): This is pure coincidence and not a manifestation of intertextuality.

In 2001, this dictionary was followed by another one, Bramsen (2001). The *raison d’être* of this work seems to be its chronological form as opposed to V/Z’s alphabetical. Whether this is a great advantage is open to discussion. But it is beyond dispute that the methodology of this dictionary is completely unacceptable when it comes to the categorizing and dating of CP. This becomes all too clear when studying the chapter covering Danish “CP” from the post-war era. Although the author documents a number of CP from this period, especially from music albums, book and song titles (“Mærk verden”, “Hvad gør vi nu, lille du”, “Det er hammer, hammer fedt”), many of these lemmata are not post war CP or “expressions from the end of the 20th century”, but merely phrasemes which have incidentally been used by contemporary well-known Danes. In many cases the expressions are actually old, but that is not the impression conveyed in this very problematic dictionary. Just a few examples: *i dyre domme* (‘for much money’), *have en kniv i ærmet* (‘have a knife in one’s sleeve’), *trække på skuldrene* (‘shrug’), *ngt er lige til øllet* (‘sth. is for the beer’: ‘sth. is only barely enough’), *træde i spinaten* (‘waddle in the spinach”:

‘make a clumsy mistake’) and *være ude med snøren* (“be out with the line”: ‘try to catch sth./sb.’) were never CP, nor were they from the second half of the 20th century. Similarly, monolexemes like *house* and *table* do not become interesting just because they are used by well-known persons. So unfortunately, the new dictionary has not seized the opportunity to make a more homogenous and methodologically satisfying product than V/Z. Rather, it has in some respects made things worse. Danish catchphrase lexicography is in dire need of a scientific approach.

4.3. Slang dictionaries

To many lay people, idioms are mistakenly conceived of as “slang”. But there is no direct interrelation between these two spheres, the first being MWE with special semantic relations whereas the second is a genuine *pragmatic* category. Anker-Møller/Jørgensen (A/J) (1997) mention “language creativity” and “low style” as two important criteria among others for “slang”. The first criterion, though, seems to collide with another one pointed out by the authors, namely that slang expressions are “somewhat widespread”. But if slang is widespread, one could argue, it is not slang anymore. Rather, slang is used by special groups in society and in special situations. After some time, slang material can become adopted by larger groups or it may disappear again – and then appear only in slang dictionaries as “ghost slang”.

In the DDO some idioms are characterized as slang, cf. *halv abe* (“half a monkey”: ‘0,35 liter of schnapps’), *barn på gule plader* (“child on yellow license plates”: ‘a child to whom somebody is not a biological parent’) and *få noget på den dumme* (“get something on the stupid”: ‘[of a man] have sex’). But these expressions are so widespread, that they are a part of the main lexicon – otherwise one would not find them in this corpus based dictionary. Therefore, they are not slang although they are of course quite informal. Slang in the strict sense is difficult to find because it is used in special surroundings, it is mainly oral and has a short life span (as slang).

A/J (1997) is a good example of a slang dictionary which contains real slang that would never be included in an ordinary dictionary because of its poor frequency. It also includes many words and expressions which can hardly (anymore) be conceived of as

slang, such as many well-known idioms. A few examples: *have julelys i øjnene* (“have christmas candles in one’s eyes”: ‘look very enthusiastic or expectant’), *ikke have opfundet den dybe tallerken* (“not have invented the soup plate”: ‘be unintelligent’) and *ikke være tør bag ørerne* (“not be dry behind one’s ears”: ‘be [too] young and inexperienced’). These expressions are not instances of “creativity” but rather lexicalized idioms. Around 10 percent of the dictionary consists of such lexicalized phrases which in fact makes it partially an idiom dictionary.

4.4. Dictionaries of “lumske ord og vendinger”

The notion “lumske ord og vendinger” which could be translated “tricky words and phrases” has nothing to do with the English “hard words” which in Danish are covered by the term *fremmedord* (“foreign words”). What seems to come closest are “false friends”, but in a phraseological context the Danish use of this category is in fact – tricky. When one examines the content of Buhl (1977a, b and c) which cover “lumske ord og vendinger” in the language pairs Danish-English, Danish-German and Danish-French, quite a clear picture can be observed: The L2 phrasemes given are not false friends compared to Danish at all: They are just phrasemes with no literal equivalent in Danish (cf. Farø 2004c). Regrettably, no dictionary of phraseological false friends between Danish and other languages seems to exist.

4.5. Proverb dictionaries

Methodologically satisfying dictionaries of contemporary proverbs in Danish cannot be found, even though proverbs have not disappeared from modern Danish. Their number has probably decreased, though: Apparently around 500 are still in use, including loans and new creations, and their functions have to some extent changed (Farø 2003b). Currently on the market are the more or less historical dictionaries like Kjær/Holbek (1972) and Kristiansen (1991) as well as often heterogeneous dictionaries of the more popular kind, e.g. Kragh (2003), Madsen (1983) and Holbek/Piø (1985). Bregenhøj/Pått (1994) is a large dictionary of Nordic proverbs of which at least most of the Danish are not at all contemporary. Apart from the mix up of categories (e.g. Kragh 2003 contains both proverbs and syntactically actualized idioms),

these dictionaries generally do not reveal whether an idiom is used today or not. What is worse, the idea here seems to be that proverbs are “self explanatory” which would make semantic and pragmatic information superfluous. But this is a completely erroneous premise: In fact no single current Danish proverb seems to be iconic to such an extent that one can predict how it is actually used (Farø 2003b), so both types of information should be considered.

Farø (2003b) is not a proverb dictionary but a comprehensive discussion of the problem of proverbs in modern Danish. It is nevertheless also of phraseographic value as it treats a large number of contemporary Danish proverbs with and without their empirical context. The DDO (using the term *talemåde*, cf. 2.) contains around 200 proverbs used in modern Danish, including this dictionary’s good definitions and authentic quotations. The NUO is more sparing in this respect: It includes only few proverbs, often without quotations. In the ODS, many proverbs can be found (also under the term *talemåde*), but this dictionary was published between 1918 and 1956, a fact that calls for a cautious reading of the information given.

Generally, the NUO, and especially the DDO are the best sources for the use of modern Danish proverbs. But a comprehensive, linguistically orientated and scientific modern proverb dictionary is much needed.

5. Summary and perspectives

Danish phraseography has collected and documented quite a large number of phrasemes, both contemporary and historical. Interestingly, the general dictionaries in some cases both quantitatively and qualitatively represent the highest level of phraseography – a somewhat paradoxical fact that could be changed in future. Hence, the situation today is not too disheartening, boasting both quite a few special phraseological dictionaries as well as a couple of phraseologically relatively progressive general dictionaries. However, some principal tasks are in store for Danish meta- and practical phraseography. Three of them are emphasized here: A much better description of *pragmatic restrictions* should be aimed at, as the current situation almost exclusively describes the semantic content of the phraseological units and therefore mainly solves problems of text *reception*, whereas

production of phraseology in (adequate) contexts is a problem with which the user is generally left without guidance. This is particularly true in those general dictionaries whose policy is to some extent “anti-phraseological”, in the sense that they (somewhat inconsistently) insist on a “synthetic form”: They let one metaphorical or metonymical word represent a number of lexicalized phrases which – and that is the problem – on one or more levels are restricted and therefore unpredictable for the user. But also the specialized phraseological dictionaries are too laconic in this regard; this will be a main task in the next decade of Danish phraseography. Also the *formal representation* of the phrasemes is to some extent still unsatisfactory. Finally, the “*idiom*” problem needs to be solved. This concerns mainly the specialized phraseolexica, but on the other hand it is a very crucial point for this genre: How should the term “idiom” be understood in Danish? Is it just another synonym for “frasem” (phraseme) in the strict sense or should it be a special type of “frasem”? I certainly advocate the latter interpretation as it is a necessary category in research, and a vague tendency towards this understanding can actually be found in international research literature, first and foremost in the German speaking world whereas the English notion “idiom” seems to be broader. A clear consciousness about a special, positively defined category “idiom” has not yet emerged in Denmark. Until it does, compiling a Danish “idiom” dictionary remains a problematic task.

6. Select bibliography

6.1. Dictionaries

6.1.1. Danish (mainly) phraseological dictionaries

Andersen, S.T. (1998): *Talemåder i dansk. Ordbog over idiomer*. Copenhagen.

Andersen, S.T. (2001): *Talemåder i dansk. Ordbog over idiomer* (2. edition). Copenhagen.

Barlach, E. (2001): *Ordsprogsordbog, dansk-engelsk/engelsk-dansk*. Copenhagen.

Bramsen, J.B. (2001): *Bevingede ord og aforismer. Citatordbog*. Copenhagen.

Bregenhøj, C./Pått, S. (1994): *Politikens ordsprogsleksikon*. Copenhagen.

Brink, K.-E. (1993): *Hals- und Beinbruch og 2017 andre tyske udtryk og talemåder*. Copenhagen.

Bruun, E. (1999): Dansk sprogbrug. En stil- og konstruktionsordbog. Copenhagen.

Grue, M./Steen, H.H. (main eds.) (2001): Politikens Engelsk-Dansk Idiomordbog. Copenhagen.

Holbek, B./Piø, I. (1985): Alverdens ordsprog. Copenhagen.

Katlev, J./Spliedt, H.S. (2001): Hvorfor siger vi sådan? Copenhagen.

Kjær, I./Holbek, B. (1972): Ordsprog i Danmark. 4000 ordsprog fra skrift og tale gennem 600 år. Copenhagen.

Kragh, O. (2003): Aschehougs store bog med ordsprog. Ordsprog og talemåder fra hele verden. Copenhagen.

Kragh, O. (1973): 700 ordsprog fra alverdens lande. Copenhagen.

Madsen, E. (1983): Muntre ordsprog. Randerup (Denmark).

Michelsen, C. (1993): Idiomordbog. 1000 talemåder. Copenhagen.

Munk, I./Bæk, P. (1998): Av min arm. Herning (Denmark).

Røder, A. (1998): Danske talemåder. Copenhagen.

Suzuki, M./Shintano, T. (2002): 1000 Danske talemåder. Japan.

Vogel-Jørgensen, T./Zerlang, P. (1998): Bevingede Ord. Copenhagen.

Vrang, V. (main ed.)/Lund, L./Bergenholtz, H./Pedersen, J./Almind, R. (2003): Den Danske Idiomordbog. Aarhus. (<http://www.idiomordbogen.dk>, 10.6.2006).

6.1.2. Danish dictionaries with phraseological components

Anker-Møller, S./Jørgensen, P.S. (2001): Politikens Slangordbog. Copenhagen.

Becker-Christensen, C. (main ed.) (2001): Nudansk Ordbog. Copenhagen.

Bergenholtz, H./Pedersen, J./Vrang, V./Almind, R. (1999): Danskordbogen. Aarhus.

Buhl, I. (1977a): Lumske ord og vendinger – engelsk. Copenhagen.

Buhl, I. (1977b): Lumske ord og vendinger – tysk. Copenhagen.

Buhl, I. (1977c): Lumske ord og vendinger – fransk. Copenhagen.

Dahlerup, V. et al. (1918–1956): Ordbog over det Danske Sprog. Copenhagen.

Dansk Sprognævn (2001): Retskrivningsordbogen. Copenhagen.

DDO = Hjorth et al. (2003f).

Hjorth, E./Kristensen, K. (main eds.) (2003f): Den Danske Ordbog. Copenhagen.

Holmgård, J.B. (1996): Den store citatbog. Copenhagen.

ODS = Dahlerup et al. (1918–1956).

RO = Dansk Sprognævn (2001).

Skyum-Nielsen, P. (1992): Fyndord. Copenhagen.

6.2. Others

Andersen, S.T. (1987): Idiomatik. In: Selskab for Nordisk Filologi, Årsberetning 1985–1986, 23–31.

Andersson, H. (1999): To nye danske idiomordbøger. In: LexicoNordica 6, 133–150.

Boje, F./Braasch, A. (1992): Hvad får man skudt i skoene? Flerordsenheder i aktive ordbøger for mennesker og maskiner. In: Fjeld, R.V. (ed.): Nordiske Studier i Leksikografi. Rapport fra Konferanse om leksikografi i Norden 28–31. mai 1991, 483–500. Oslo.

Burger, H. (1983): Phraseologie in den Wörterbüchern des heutigen Deutsch. In: Germanistische Linguistik 1/83, 13–66.

Burger, H. (1989): Phraseologismen im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch. In: Hausmann et al., 593–606.

Burger, H. (2003): Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen. 2. edition. Berlin.

Coseriu, E. (1967): Lexikalische Solidaritäten. In: Poetica 1, 293–303.

Cowie, A.P./Mackin, R./McCaig, I.R. (2000): Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms. Oxford.

Farø, K. (2000): Idiomatik i moderne dansk-tysk leksikografi. In: Hermes 25, 176–202.

Farø, K. (2001): Äquivalenz kann man mit der Laterne suchen. Om dansk-tysk idiomatik og oversættelse. In: MDT-Nyt 3/2001, 10–30.

Farø, K. (2002): Somatismen als Problem der dänischen und deutschen Lexikographie. In: Gottlieb, H./Mogensen, J.E./Zettersten, A. (eds.): Symposium on Lexicography X. Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Lexicography in Copenhagen, 107–124. Tübingen.

Farø, K. (2003a): Det ligger lige på tungen: Den danske fraseologi. In: Mål og Mæle 3/2003, 19–27.

Farø, K. (2003b): Ordsprog i nutidisdansk. Problemer og funktioner. In: Danske Studier 98, 39–64.

Farø, K. (2004a): Idiomer på nettet. Den Danske Idiomordbog og fraseografien. In: Hermes 32, 201–235.

Farø, K. (2004b): Omkring det grønne bord. Dansk-tysk idiomatik og sproglig forandring. In: Studier i Nordisk 2002/2003, 51–75.

Farø, K. (2004c): Vom geschossenen Papagei und anderen Schwierigkeiten. Phraseologische falsche Freunde des Deutschen und Dänischen. In: Deutsch als Fremdsprache 3, 152–157.

Farø, K. (2006): Dogmatismus, Skeptizismus, Nihilismus und Pragmatismus bei der Idiomübersetzung: Grundfragen zu einer idiomtranslatorischen Theorie. In: Häcki Buhofer, A./Burger, H. (eds.):

Phraseology in Motion I, 188–202. Baltmannsweiler.

Gottlieb, H. (1995): Oversætteres fornemmelse for idiomer. Et punktnedslag i oversættelsen af litterære tekster. In: Florentsen, P. (ed.): Oversættelse af litteratur, 105–125. Danske Afhandlinger om oversættelse nr. 6. Copenhagen.

Gottlieb, H. (1998): A Nose for Lexicography. On Idioms, Corpora and Intuition. In: Garde, A./Jarvad, P./Thomsen, K.T. (eds.): *Elefant – se også myg*. Festskrift til Jens Axelsen, 142–152. Copenhagen.

Gülich, E. (1997): Routineformeln und Formulierungsroutinen. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung 'formelhafter Texte'. In: Wimmer, R./Berens, F.J. (eds.): *Wortbildung und Phraseologie. Studien zur deutschen Sprache*, 131–175. Tübingen.

Hausmann, F.-J./Reichmann, O./Wiegand, H.E./Zgusta, L. (eds.) (1989–1991): *Wörterbücher. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*. Berlin.

Karker, A. (1982): Om ordet ordsprog i dansk. In: *Danske Studier* 79, 112f.

Karker, A. (1999): Christian Michelsen: *Idiomordbog. 1000 talemåder*. Allan Røder: Danske talemå-

der. Stig Toftgaard Andersen: *Talemåder i dansk. Ordbog over idiomer*. In: *Danske Studier* 94, 198–203.

Naumann, H.-P. (2002): Nordic language history and phraseology/idiomatics. In: Bandle, O. (main ed.)/Braunmüller, K./Jahr, E.H./Karker, A./Naumann, H.-P./Telemann, U. (eds.): *The Nordic Languages. An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*. Berlin, 241–248.

Röhrich, L. (1991) [1973]: *Das große deutsche Lexikon der sprichwörtlichen Redensarten*. Freiburg i.B.

Strauß, G./Haß, U./Harras, G. (1989): *Brisante Wörter. Von Agitation bis Zeitgeist. Ein Lexikon zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch*. Berlin.

Thomsen, K.T. (1998): At gå ombord i et stykke flæsk er også en slags arbejde. In: Garde, A./Jarvad, P./Thomsen, K.T. (eds.): *Elefant – se også myg*. Festskrift til Jens Axelsen. Copenhagen.

Ken Farø, Copenhagen (Denmark)

80. Phraseographie des Französischen

1. Vorläufer (Mittelalter–16. Jh.) und Anfänge (17.–18. Jh.) der französischen Phraseographie
2. Die französische Phraseo- und Parömiographie des 19. Jhs.
3. Die französische Phraseographie des 20. Jhs.
4. Phraseographie älterer Sprachstufen und Phraseographie der Varietäten
5. Kollokationswörterbücher
6. Zweisprachige Phraseographie Französisch-Deutsch, Deutsch-Französisch
7. Zusammenfassung und Ausblick
8. Literatur (in Auswahl)

1. Vorläufer (Mittelalter–16. Jh.) und Anfänge (17.–18. Jh.) der französischen Phraseographie

Von einer eigenständigen Phraseographie des Frz. kann seit dem 17. Jh. gesprochen werden. Vorläufer ist die parömiographische Tradition, deren älteste volkssprachliche Zeugnisse die "Proverbia magistri Serlonis" (ca. 1150–1170) des Serlo von Wilton sowie die anonymen "Proverbes au Vilain" (ca. 1180) sind. In der Folge ist eine Vielzahl teils un-

kommentierter, teils ins Lateinische übersetzter oder auf Latein kommentierter Sprichwortsammlungen überliefert, die durchschnittlich mehrere hundert Einheiten registrieren, aber auch umfangreicher ausfallen (vgl. Morawski 1922, 481ff.). Nach einer ersten Blüte im 13.–14. Jh. bewirkt die humanistische, durch die "Adagia" des Erasmus von Rotterdam beförderte Hinwendung zu den Sprichwörtern einen weiteren Höhepunkt der frz. Parömiographie im 16. Jh., in dem vielfältige, teils nur inventarisierende, teils didaktisch-moralisierend kommentierende Sammlungen oder auch Übersetzungen vornehmlich antiker Sprichwörter ins Frz. entstehen. Angesichts nur partiell realisierter alphabetischer oder inexisterender makrostruktureller Gliederung und aufgrund fehlender oder rudimentärer mikrostruktureller Beschreibung sind sie nur bedingt als Wörterbücher im modernen Sinne anzusehen (vgl. Lindemann 1994, 500ff.).

Erste, noch unselbständige Ansätze einer phraseographischen Analyse sind seit der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jhs. zu verzeichnen