

Svar til Uwe Kaufmanns “... ergo er Morlille en Steen” (*Hermes* 11 - 1993)

Vi er naturligvis kede af, at Uwe Kaufmann ikke forstår vores anmeldelse, for det tyder på, at vi ikke har været i stand til at formulere os klart nok. Men vi vil dog gøre et forsøg på at svare på indlæggets to kritikpunkter:

- stikprøvens forsvarlighed
- den forkerte sammenhæng i vores skema

Som vi gør opmærksom på i anmeldelsen, har vores afprøvning af ordbogen inden for et delemne klart karakter af stikprøve. Stikprøver kan jo udvælges på mange måder. Vi valgte at se på det afsnit, der hedder “Introduktion til molekylærbiologi” og udvalgte et tilfældigt emne, idet vi måtte gå ud fra, at titlerne på de 30 paragraffer, der udgør denne introduktion, afspejler - i hvert fald nogle af - emnets centrale områder. Uwe Kaufmanns udtalelse “Ærlig talt, man må da vælge enten flere ting (forsvarlig stikprøve) eller et centralt emne inden for det fagområde, som bogen vil informere om” strider således imod ordbogens egen formulering om “den faglige indledning” (p.26), idet der på s. 9 står skrevet “For der første bringer den et overblik over den faglige systematik, som er baggrunden for genteknologien. Dette elementære overblik, som afsluttes med et stikordsregister, kunne læses helt uafhængigt af ordbogen som et eget lille værk med det formål at skaffe sig **grundlæggende oplysninger om molekylærbiologi og genteknologiens faglige grundlag**. I ordbogssammenhængen er det ment som en hjælp til de læsere, der har behov for en kort fremstilling. **De med fed skrift fremhævede faglige udtryk angiver nogle af de vigtigste termer**, som også findes som opslagsord. En mindst lige så væsentlig funktion har den faglige indledning som fagsystematisk henvisningsgrundlag fra de enkelte ordbogsartikler, hvor **de givne enkeltinformationer i en række tilfælde bedre vil kunne forstås, hvis de ses i en større sammenhæng**.” (vores fremhævninger!)

Hvis vi vender tilbage til termen “lipider”, så er der i den faglige indledning, som på side 26 kaldes “Introduktion til molekylærbiologi”, en paragraf, nemlig § 14, med titlen **Lipider** (pp 40-41). På side 27 § 2 står “lipider” fremhævet med fed skrift - den hører altså til “nogle af de vigtigste termer”, og termen er igen nævnt i stikordsregistret (p. 63) under bogstavet L. Men Uwe Kaufmann hævder, at delemnet lipider er inferiørt i forhold til ordbogens overordnede tema. Vores udgangspunkt har været ikke-fagmandens, og det kan for denne type bruger være vanskeligt at gennemskue, at det ikke er et centralt emne, idet han/hun netop ikke ved, at lipider i første række tilhører det biokemiske område eller den organiske kemi.

Som ikke-fagmænd har vi, som forfatterne har stillet os i udsigt, ønsket at få “et overblik over den faglige systematik, som er baggrunden for genteknologien”. Vores ærinde har alene været at undersøge, om en ikke-fagkyndig bruger har mulighed for at få dette overblik inden for et snævert afgrænset område.

Vi mener fortsat, at vi har påvist en manglende konsekvens i de faglige forklaringer - en manglende konsekvens, som let kunne afhjælpes ved en mere stringent formulering af de faglige forklaringer og af de enkelte paragraffer i afsnittet "Introduktion til molekylærbiologi".

Uwe Kaufmann påpeger i sit indlæg, at informationerne - vi går ud fra, at det er definitionerne, der menes - er rigtige. Det må nødvendigvis give den systematik, der er illustreret gennem begrebssystemet. Denne systematik kommer ikke til udtryk i afsnittet om lipider, hvori det hedder "Af særlig interesse er fedtsyrer, triglycerider, fosfolipider og steroider", idet der for den første terms vedkommende er tale om en komponent, der indgår i lipider, og for de øvrige tre terms vedkommende er tale om underbegreber. I anmeldelsen har vi derfor ønsket at vise, hvordan systematisk opbyggede definitioner kan støtte brugeren. Vi savner iøvrigt dokumentation for påstanden om, at vores "skema om tingenes sammenhæng" er forkert, når definitionerne er korrekte.

Hvis Uwe Kaufmann vil pege på et for molekylærbiologien/genteknologien centralt område, som bogen omfatter, vil vi gerne foretage endnu en analyse.

Annelise Grinsted og Bertha Toft

Erik Andersson: *Grammatik från grunden. En koncentrerad svensk satslära*. Uppsala: Hallgren och Fallgren, 1993.

Erik Anderssons *Grammatik från grunden* er et forsøg på at gøre to ting på en gang: Den er en introduktion i svensk syntaks for studenter, der vil studere fremmede sprog ved Finlands svensksprogede universitet Åbo Akademi (hvor Erik Andersson er professor i svensk), og samtidig er den en introduktion i almen grammatik, dvs. at forfatteren har foretaget et udvalgt af de almindeligste grammatiske termini og forklarer dem i forbindelse med gennemgang af den svenske syntaks. Bogen er for så vidt anvendelig som opslagsbog, fordi man let via registret finder den terminus, man søger og i teksten får en forklaring i jævne ord. Men den vil mere end det, den vil vise "hur det grammatiska systemet hänger samman och ge en förståelse för vilka kriterier de grammatiska analyserna grunder sig på". Det er jo ikke så lidt. Men faktisk forekommer det mig, at Erik Andersson ved at tage læseren med i sine ræsonnementer mange steder får formidlet en indsigt i sprogets mekanik, som må være nyttig for studenter i fremmedsprog.

Nu er det en vanskelig opgave, Erik Andersson har sat sig for. Den der vil skrive om grammatik for en bredere kreds er i hvert fald i Skandinavien i disse tider oppe mod en irrationel skræk og et indgroet had til disciplinen. Man behøver blot at tænke på, hvorledes tysk i vide kredse opfattes som indbegrebet af al komplicerethed, skønt dets formlære i international sammenligning må

siges at være ret enkel; man opererer fx blot med 5 forskellige bøjningsformer i kasus og tal hos adjektivet og hos substantivet 4 eller færre.

Men Erik Andersson lader sig ikke gå på af den almindelige holdning, han skriver ufortrødent løs, hans redegørelser er klare og letforståelige, så bekendtskabet med den svenske syntaks og de mange termini bliver til en stimulerende oplevelse. Formodentlig vil ikke blot fagets vel ret få aficionados, men også andre kunne stræklæse fremstillingen, i hvert fald stykkevis.

Eksempelmaterialet er rigt varieret med mange udtryk fra dagligsproget. Imellem kapitlerne er som oplivende element indføjet digte, de fleste om sproget, af E.A. og enkelte andre bl.a. den uforlignelige Povel Ramel (der opfinder de nye kategorier presens pimpelativ og suputum!)

Terminologien, der anvendes, er bortset fra enkelte udtryk (underordning, bisats etc.) naturligvis den latinske. I svensk har man ikke den tradition som bla. i dansk og tysk, at man først lærer eleverne en national terminologi og dernæst en international. Vi noterer et enkelt udtryk, der er mindre brugt i dansk: utrum (> < neutrum) for fælleskøn (> < intetkøn).

Detaljeringsgraden er stor på en del områder. Der er syv sider om adverbialer. Tidsadverbialerne inddeles således i "tidfæstningsadverbial, durationsadverbial, iterationsadverbial, frekvensadverbial och kanske sekvensadverbial". Der er kapitler om aktionsart, en grundig gennemgang af ledstilling, men også et kapitel om konstruktionsväxling, som skal skærpe elevernes sans for brugen af sprogets forskellige udtryksmuligheder.

Løst og fast prædikatv optræder under betegnelserne nödvändigt/icke nödvändigt predikatv. Afgrænsningen mellem løst prædikatv og adverbial er på svensk tydelig: Kalle gick bedrövat mot udgången (adverbial), Kalle gick bedrövad mod utgången (predikatv).

Fremstillingen er båret af en mærkbar fascination af og kærlighed til sproget samt en velgørende mangel på skråsikkerhed. Man kan vel ikke altid være enig i de mere vovede ideer, at participierne bør være en ordklasse for sig, at vi ikke bare har et adverbium i "nyckeln sitter i", men at præposition plus styrelse måske skal betragtes som et transitivt adverbium med rektion, eller at man skal tale om ikke bare "delad objekt", men "två objekt" i sætninger som "Mittfältare har dom bara Kenta och Lasse (Som midtbanespillere har de kun Kenta og Lasse)".

Men alt i alt er bogen en stor pædagogisk præstation og en forfriskende oplevelse.

Jørgen Christensen

Carl Bache, Mike Davenport, John Dienhart, Frits Larsen, *An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis*. Second revised edition. København: Munksgaards Sprogserie, 1993.

The first edition of *An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis* appeared in 1991. Based on “materials used over the past fifteen years in our teaching of English (surface) syntax at Odense University” (Introduction, 1991 edition), it was the result of mature reflection and considerable experience. The authors deserve praise, therefore, that they have taken the trouble to go over their work again so soon after it first saw print; the provision of an index is what strikes the reader as the main difference between the two editions.

As the title makes clear, the book is not a grammar of English in the traditional sense. The position of adverbials, simple versus progressive verbal forms, types of relative clauses, etc., are not the concern of *An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis*: its aim is to provide students of English with a theoretical tool for their study of English syntax, to teach them to “think grammatically”. Fundamental to the authors’ approach is the form versus function distinction, which is maintained throughout the book. Typographically, the two labels are kept clearly apart, function being placed first and written with capital letters, form being written with small letters after a colon. Thus, A:g is easily decoded as “function adverbial, form group”; component labels placed under the relevant items are supplemented by tree diagrams.

An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis falls into three main sections. Part I (chapters 1-4, pp. 13-64) concentrates on the basics of sentence analysis with regard to function and form, the titles of the four chapters being ‘Sentence Functions’, ‘Forms’, ‘The Internal Structure of Complex Forms’, ‘The Full System’. Part II (chapters 5-9, pp. 67-177), which goes into more detail with complex grammatical structures and investigates possible alternative analyses, has the chapter headings ‘Group Structure’, ‘Missing Forms’, ‘Comparative Constructions’, ‘Complex Predicators’, ‘Special Types of Clausal Constructions’. In Part III (chapters 10 and 11, pp. 179-214), which has the chapter headings ‘Clauses and Utterances’ and ‘The Top of the Tree: Utterance Types’, the authors transcend the declared scope of their book and introduce the reader to speech act theory, to Austin’s question of “what sort of act do we perform in uttering a sentence”. After the three-page Index the one-page Appendix concludes the book with a list of the labels used to indicate function and form.

There is no doubt that the book serves its purpose. The careful and considered account it gives of the way (or ways, for the authors invite discussion and encourage possible alternative analysis) the English sentence can be viewed and where we move from word to utterance level cannot help but equip students with the skills needed for grammatical analysis, and the exercises provided at regular intervals reinforce the learning process. Accordingly the reservations

made in what follows are not meant to detract seriously from my positive evaluation of *An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis*.

My first reservation is the fact that the authors have chosen to allow not only groups and clauses but individual words to function as first-level constituents in the sentence, that is as S (subject), P (predicator), O (object), A (adverbial) or C (complement). Thus the subject of *'John left'* (p. 29) is described as 'S:n', the subject of *'The victims were too young to die'* (p. 33) as 'S:g'; the subjects of two examples on p. 131, *'Bob walked out on Friday'* and *'Robinson Crusoe walked out on Friday'* are characterized as 'S:n' and 'S:g', respectively; the complement of *'Mary is taller'* (p. 105) appears as 'C:adj', that of *'Alice is the tallest'* (p. 108) as 'C:g'.

The authors' decision to allow words to function as sentence constituents was, I believe, wrong; a forceful refutation appears in Quirk and Stein, *English in Use*, Longman 1990, p. 191. What seems odd (though not all wrong) is the analysis of preposition groups as consisting of a preposition as head followed by a dependent (p. 48), where the conventional analysis is noun group preceded by preposition. The authors must have had reactions to this analysis since one of the differences between the first and second editions is that now they defend their analysis, admitting that "both the preposition and the other constituent are obligatorily present" but still commenting that "One argument for treating the preposition as head is that it "governs" the form of the other constituent, as can be seen when the constituent is a personal pronoun: we say 'from **him**, not 'from **he**'. The force of this argument is weakened, however, when the reader considers the implications for the argument of what is said in connection with the "accusative with infinitive" construction (p. 149), where we read about the "nominative" case being "the "marked" case for English pronouns", which "appears in the **position** reserved for subjects of finite verbs". It seems to me that the only argument that can be adduced in favour of the authors' choice is the one implicitly put forward on p. 48: if there is no preposition, there is no preposition group, ergo the preposition is the "obligatory characterizing head".

A marked feature of the book is that it has its origins in the classroom, where what is written can be supplemented, commented on, elucidated. Thus Part I begins with a listing of the basic sentence functions SPOAC and illustrates them by means of five examples; definitions have to be supplied by the teacher. Chapter 8: Complex Predicators begins by stating (p. 121) that "The Examples discussed in Chapters 1 to 7 all have predicators described as consisting of a main verb as H plus from 0 to 4 (emphasis added) auxiliary verbs as DEP's"; the student will remember that she had only encountered a maximum of three auxiliaries as dependents in the chapters referred to, and the teacher has to explain about four auxiliaries being possible in rare passive examples like "*The fields were still under water when they should have been being sown*".

In fact, the book is geared to the interaction provided by the classroom, and especially in the early chapters this makes it less suitable for self-study. The term ‘sentence’, for instance, is not defined, which probably does not matter much to begin with; but then we get to Chapter 2.C: The Clause (p. 36), where the reader may begin to find things difficult: “A clause contains a predicator (P) plus one or more of the other functions described in Chapter I (S, O, A, C). You have already had numerous examples of clauses in sections 1.A-2.B, since most sentences are clauses (though clauses are not necessarily sentences):

John left.
This situation he liked immensely.
The old lady likes flowers.

These are all examples of main clauses. In the following examples, we have subordinate clauses (these are not sentences):

because he was bored
if he wants it
when he was here last
that she could come
having heard the story before
to do it at once”

Here I’m afraid the student reader will feel baffled and out of her depth; she may even coin her own erroneous definitions. At least the above certainly serves as a powerful injunction for students not to skip lectures, but too many fundamental distinctions appear to have been left to the teacher, who will have to explain and define sentence, main clause, subordinate clause, finite clause, non-finite clause before work can safely progress.

In marked contrast to the very condensed treatment sometimes found in the early chapters, the later chapters are comfortably relaxed, cf. for instance the excellent analysis provided (pp. 155-157) of “*It would be awkward for me to go now*”. (After reading pp. 155-157 the student will want to correct her analysis of 4b) in Exercise 3.C, p. 52, and possibly also 8) in Exercise 4.A, p. 57.)

Though *An Introduction to English Sentence Analysis* is a finely honed effort, the seams occasionally show. In a few places the book strains to provide students with a link with more traditional accounts, for example in its use of the terms “accusative/nominative with infinitive”; also, the analysis of “*His giving me tickets*” (p. 63) harks back to the days of the gerund as verbal noun rather than as predicator in a nominal -ing clause.

The exhaustive index is a great boon. The authors have taken the trouble to include terms they have themselves chosen not to use in their own text, but which students may come upon in other descriptions, e.g. verbless clause, dependent clause, ellipsis. I spotted only one misprint (p. 200: funtions) - further evidence of the authors’ care.

Though the book is generally written in British English, the reader is aware that the author of Part III is American (we now find the spelling ‘analyzed’ and

‘in Chapters 1 through 9’). This is an added charm of the book and only serves to bring it home to the reader what a feat it is for four scholars representing three nationalities to come up with a coherent and cohesive introduction to English syntax that fuses elements of Chomsky’s revolution, speech act theory and traditional grammar. I look forward to the third edition.

Niels Hald

**Francisco Matte Bon: *Gramática Comunicativa del Español*.
Tomo I: *De la lengua a la idea*. Tomo II: *De la idea a la lengua*.
Madrid: Difusión, 1992.**

For 12 years the author has been investigating the function of Spanish as a communication system in the teaching of foreigners. The grammar by Francisco Matte Bon is intended to be a reference grammar where a student can look up a problem without having read the other parts of the two books. The grammar is also intended to be an “obra de estudio”, including the analysis of the language as a coherent system (Introducción V). The author wants to start the analysis from a communicative perspective (Introducción VI). The book therefore gives main emphasis to the interpretation of the utterances, focussing on the interlocutors and the interaction between them (Introducción VI-VII). A communicative grammar would not limit itself to describing the categories of words that exhibit similar behaviour, e.g. adverbs of time, adverbs of space, and adverbs of manner. This grammar claims to emphasize the specificity of every grammatical operator (e.g. the conjunctions: como, si, en caso de que, etc. What are the differences? In which context do they appear) (Introducción VIII)? The author intends to explain why the speaker chooses only one among various possibilities and this is why he finds it fundamental to examine the role and the attitude of the speaker. This grammar is communicative especially because of the organisation of its contents (Introducción IX). The second volume is organized by notional-functional criteria: it describes how people express different ideas (notions and functions). The purpose is to give the reader the opportunity of becoming aware of the function of the system (Introducción X). According to the author a communicative grammar must be a grammar that describes and explains the expressive effects, analysing every operator and studying all the different expressive effects produced by the operator (Introducción XI).

The author has excellent intentions, but too many, and that may be the source of some of the problems in this grammar.

Volume I contains chapters on the microsystems (the verbal system, the nominal system, operators or abstract microsystems, prepositions and orthographic and pronunciation rules and, finally, accentuation rules). Most chapters are divided into two parts: forms and uses.

The reader will recognize several things from traditional grammars: morphology and syntax. In this volume the author presents the morphology and gives a general idea of the function of the parts of speech. E.g. a substantive: Substantives are the words used for naming persons, objects or concrete or abstract entities (Se llaman sustantivos aquellas palabras que sirven para nombrar seres, objetos o entidades concretas o abstractas) (Vol I, p. 173).

Another definition: The essential characteristic that distinguishes the subjunctive from all the other Spanish verbal forms is that the subjunctive does not present new information. The speaker puts the verb in the subjunctive when he only wants to refer to the relation between a subject and a predicate, without giving information on the subject of the verb. (La característica esencial que distingue al subjuntivo de todos los demás tiempos del español es que no presenta informaciones nuevas. El enunciador pone los verbos en subjuntivo cuando sólo se quiere referir a la relación entre un sujeto y un predicado, sin dar informaciones sobre el sujeto del verbo. (Vol. I, p. 49).

Such notional definitions may be useful in language-general descriptions. But in a language-particular description the focus must shift to formal criteria, if grammatical categories are to be defined in such a way that they permit the successful identification of instances of those categories. Unfortunately, there are few definitions of grammatical terms in this grammar, e.g. I have not found a definition of subject, nor of many other functions. This leads to errors like the one on page 44 in volume II: *Este libro* in *Este libro se vende mucho* (This book sells well) is apparently analyzed as a direct object (complemento directo), which may be the intuitive analysis of Spaniards, but if we put the sentence in the plural, should *estos libros* also be analysed as a direct object?: *Estos libros se venden mucho* where the verb agrees with *estos libros*, which usually is taken to be a criterion of the subject. In his analysis the author has to formulate a new rule which says that in such cases the direct object is not repeated by a pronoun (an unnecessary complication compared to the traditional analysis). This example reveals that in order to avoid inconsistency and obscurity, even a communicative grammar should not depart too radically from a traditional approach, but draw on the principles of the structural approach that is typical of modern linguistics in general. At least the author's analysis requires some comment on approaches involving several layers of structure (e.g. deep and surface structure).

The author's interests and concerns show in his choice of the few terms that he does define: contexto, temático, remático, informar, presuponer, extralingüístico, lingüístico and metalingüístico.

Volume II describes different notional-functional areas and demonstrates how the operators function.

The table of contents of volume II (only the headlines are indicated):

Individuals and quantities (*Individuos y cantidades*)
 Numerals (*Los numerales*)
 Impersonal sentences (*Las oraciones impersonales*)
 Essence and existence (*Esencia y existencia*)
 Possession (*La posesion*)
 Necessity (*La necesidad*)
 Exclamations and intensity (*Las exclamaciones y la intensidad*)
 Compare (*Comparar*)
 Coordinate and introduce new elements (*Coordinar e introducir nuevos elementos*)
 Correct, oppose, contrast information (*Corregir, oponer, contrastar informaciones*)
 Time (*El tiempo*)
 Talk about the present (*Hablar del presente*)
 To talk about the past (*Para hablar del pasado*)
 Talk about a moment posterior to another: the future perspectives (*Hablar de un momento posterior a otro: Las perspectivas de futuro*)
 Space (*El espacio*)
 Establish relations from a temporal point of view (*Establecer relaciones desde un punto de vista temporal*)
 Express conditions (*Expresar condiciones*)
 Concession and adversative sentences (*La concesión y las frases adversativas*)
 Explain the cause, the consequence, the finality and the way in which (*Explicar la causa, la consecuencia, la finalidad y el modo*)
 Knowledge, ideas and control of the information (*Conocimientos, ideas, disponibilidad de la información*)
 Ask and answer (*Preguntar y responder*)
 Talk about things: before knowing (*Expresarse sobre las cosas: antes de saber*)
 Talk about things: after knowing (*Expresarse sobre las cosas: después de saber*)
 About speech-acts and the information (*Sobre los actos del habla y la información*)
 To influence others (*Influir sobre los demás*)
 Referred discourse (*El discurso referido*)

The author does not comment on the conception of this volume, whether there is a system or a hierarchy or if the chapters can be continued ad infinitum. Apparently, there are elements from philosophy, linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics. This is perhaps something that suits the author's purpose, but in his search for specific answers the student will invariably run into serious problems while using this 400 page book; it is by no means certain that he has the same cognitive approach as the author, especially not if he is a non-native. He will probably have to consult the index which seems to be a good help.

What we really need is a detailed explication of the author's theory and his method. That would also avoid a lot of repetitions in this grammar (probably due to the author's wish to write a referential grammar). It certainly is difficult to

make pragmatics, discourse analysis and syntax cooperate, but it should be possible in a more systematical way.

Concerning theory and scientific tradition, we notice that in the short bibliography the author mentions the studies of H. Adamczewski, J.C. Chevalier, B. Pottier, Leech, Svartvik, Quirk and Greenbaum as having had a strong influence on this grammar.

It is undoubtedly sure that this grammar is different from other kinds of Spanish grammars and it is likely that several ideas in its conception will find a place in future learner-oriented grammars. And there are many good ideas realized in this grammar. The author seems to be an experienced teacher of Spanish; he knows many of the problems and false friends that foreigners find in Spanish. Probably many teachers of Spanish will find inspiration especially in volume II, where they will find new ways of presenting grammatical problems, and some students will like to read these chapters, written in an uncomplicated Spanish, and not charged with grammatical terms and formulas. A special merit is found in the examples that transcend the sentence-boundedness of more traditional learner-grammars by venturing into questions of textual cohesion. The examples reflect everyday conversation and the reader easily discovers the communicative situation of the example. The author does not mention the representative quality of the examples, but one could wish that a second edition of this grammar would take the new corpus-linguistics in consideration.

In conclusion: An interesting, refreshing new Spanish grammar with some theoretical and methodological lacks.

Kjær Jensen

Forretningsprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk. København: Grafisk Forlag, 1993.

Forretningsprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk er baseret på en svensk udgivelse fra 1991 oversat og bearbejdet til dansk af Hanne Blaaberg.

Bogen består af tre identisk opbyggede dele, nemlig en engelsk, en tysk og en fransk del. Hver del omfatter følgende kapitler: *Sprogfunktioner, Information om Danmark, Forretningsudtryk, Værdiangivelser, Forkortelser, symboler og tegn* samt en afsluttende alfabetisk ordliste med fremmedsproget som kilde-sprog. Hertil kommer en kort vejledning i bogens brug samt en indholdsfortegnelse.

Målgruppen er personer, der "kender lidt til" hhv. engelsk, tysk og fransk, og som "har brug for at kommunikere skriftligt og/eller mundtligt på et eller flere af sprogene". For denne målgruppe er bogen ifølge teksten på bagsiden "et uundværligt værktøj (...) i (det) daglige arbejde".

Bogen har således et helt praktisk sigte, og det er naturligvis med dette in mente, det må bedømmes, om den formår at leve op til påstanden om uundværlighed. Det skal dog stærkt understreges, at de følgende betragtninger udelukkende er baseret på bogens *franske del*.

Kapitlet om *Sprogfunktioner*, opdelt i to underafsnit: *Skrive korte breve og meddelelser* og *Telefonsamtale* er opbygget således, at man under en række forskellige funktioner som *Henvisning*, *Bekræftelser*, *Indvendinger og klager*, *Tilbyde hjælp* osv. finder eksempler på dansk udtryksmåde med forslag til tilsvarende formuleringer på fransk. Dette kan i sig selv være en udmærket idé, selv om jeg personligt finder denne struktur lidt besværlig at arbejde med. Når jeg alligevel er betænkelig ved denne del af bogen, skyldes det nogle generelle overvejelser i forhold til målgruppen.

Som nævnt henvender bogen sig til brugere, der “kender lidt til” i dette tilfælde fransk. Ikke desto mindre gøres det intetsteds klart, hvori dette (begrænsede) kendskab forudsættes at bestå. Mit indtryk er da også, at der fra forfatternes side ikke er foretaget grundige overvejelser desangående. Blot et par eksempler:

I mange af eksemplerne er det ved markeringen “...” angivet, at brugeren skal supplere eksemplet med sin egen formulering. Spørgsmålet er imidlertid, om en bruger, der har behov for hjælp til at oversætte enkle sætninger som: “Hvis De kigger i vort katalog ...” (“Si vous regardez dans notre catalogue ...”) eller “Vi ønsker ...” (“Nous désirons ...”), selv er i stand til at formulere en korrekt fortsættelse. Eller om vedkommende vil kunne gennemskue det problematiske i f.eks. følgende oversættelsesforslag: “I Deres sted ville vi ...” - “A votre place, nous ferions ...”!

Heller ikke med hensyn til problemstillinger som stilniveau/høflighed yder bogen den nødvendige støtte. I afsnittet *Indbydelser* er eksempelvis foretaget en opdeling af eksempel materialet mellem “formelt” og “mindre formelt”. Forskellen kommer i de danske eksempler til udtryk ved brug af hhv. “De” (= formelt) og “du” (= uformelt). Og i de franske eksempler ved helt tilsvarende skift mellem “vous” og “tu”!!

Min konklusion vedrørende kapitlet *Sprogfunktioner* er, at det placerer sig mellem de berømte to stole. Tilhører brugeren gruppen med “lidt kendskab” til fransk, har han/hun formentlig brug for betydelig mere hjælp og støtte, end bogen yder. For den mere erfarne sprogbruger vil der til gengæld ikke være meget at hente, som ikke lige så godt - og nemmere - kunne søges oplyst andetsteds.

De øvrige kapitler (stadig i bogens franske del), der består af ordlister, dansk-franske og fransk-danske, rejser et tilsvarende spørgsmål: Hvad kan denne bog tilbyde sin bruger? Svaret er ikke ganske indlysende.

En “ordbog” af den type, man finder i *Forretningssprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk*, bør på en eller anden måde profilere sig i forhold til andre opslagsvær-

ker, der henvender sig til samme målgruppe. En sådan profilering kan typisk bestå i lemmaselektionen, enten ved at listen indeholder netop de lemma, der er specifikke for det pågældende område, og som man ikke finder i "almindelige" opslagsværker, eller ved at der i ordlisten er samlet de for området relevante lemma, hvorved opslagsarbejdet lettes for brugeren.

Noget tyder på, at man her har forsøgt sig med begge former for profilering - uden at nogen af dem er konsekvent gennemført.

Indledningsvis må det konstateres, at *Forretningssprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk* indeholder en del lemma, der ikke findes i f.eks. *Gyldendals røde ord-bøger dansk-fransk og fransk-dansk*; det drejer sig imidlertid i mange tilfælde om lemma, hvis tilstedeværelse i en bog om forretningssprog virker noget søgt (se eksempler nedenfor). Til gengæld er mange af de specifikke fagudtryk, man leder forgæves efter i "de røde", heller ikke medtaget i *Forretningssprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk*.

Som antydnet giver lemmaselektionen anledning til nogen undren. Hvilken særlig interesse har lemma som *børnehaveklasse*, *forældreforening*, *husbesøg*, *lejerforening*, *fastelavnsris* og *kåldolmer* for brugere af en bog om forretningssprog? Spørgsmålet bør stilles i betragtning af, at man må gå forgæves efter en lang række lemma, der er åbenbart relevante for det område, bogen prætenderer at dække. Eksempelvis søger man i afsnittet *Betaling og forsikring* forgæves efter betalingsformer som "bekræftet remburs" og "dokumentinkasso". Under *Virksomhedsstruktur, virksomhedstyper* finder man "aktieselskab" og "interesseselskab", men ikke "anpartsselskab" og heller ikke f.eks. "konsortium". I den afsluttende fransk-danske ordliste ses "marketing" og "marchéage", mens f.eks. "mercatique" ikke optræder i listen. "Impôt sur le revenu" er med i listen, men ikke "impôt sur les sociétés".

Dertil kommer, at specielt kapitel 15 (*Forretningsudtryk*), der er underopdelt i syv sagområder, er ganske upraktisk at arbejde med - hvem vil f.eks. søge efter opslagsord som "håndbog", "klage" eller "forespørgsel" under overskriften *Forretningsdokumenter* eller forvente at skulle slå op under *Bogføring* for at finde "aktie" og "aktionær". Uanset at bogen ikke gør krav på at kunne løse mere sofistikerede terminologiske problemer, er ækvivalensangivelserne i nogle tilfælde for unøjagtige, for eksempel angives "établissement financier" som eneste ækvivalent for "pengeinstitut".

Jeg skrev i starten, at et værk som *Forretningssprog. Engelsk - tysk - fransk* bør bedømmes på sin praktiske anvendelighed. Dvs. på, om den potentielle bruger kan anskaffe sig den i tryk forvisning om derved at komme i besiddelse af et brugervenligt og pålideligt arbejdsredskab. Og dermed naturligvis på, om den kan bidrage til, at brugeren kan tilføre sin fremmedsproglige kommunikation et kvalitetsmæssigt løft. I sin nuværende form virker bogen for ugennemarbejdet til at opfylde disse krav, og man kan kun håbe på, at forlag og forfatter(e) inden en

eventuel ny udgave vil ofre tid og kræfter på en klarere styring af indholdet i forhold til såvel formål som målgruppe.

Aase Møller

Lars G. Frosterud: *Franske forkortelser*. København: Grafisk Forlag, 1993.

For alle, der beskæftiger sig med fransk på blot lidt mere end det mest elementære niveau, er forkortelser et evigt tilbagevendende problem. Franske aviser og tidsskrifter indeholder på stort set hver eneste side forkortelser af den ene eller anden art, ofte i stort tal og for det meste uden nærmere forklaring, ligesom mange forkortelser også anvendes i det talte sprog, som det forekommer for eksempel i fransk TV. Der eksisterer derfor et helt indlysende behov for hjælp til at finde rundt i denne jungle af forkortelser, der i øvrigt er karakteriseret ved en yderst frodig vækst.

Franske forkortelser henvender sig til en bred kreds af brugere og omfatter ca. 3.000 forkortelser. Målgruppen er "alle, der læser fransksproget presse, og alle, der ser TV fra Frankrig eller et andet fransktalende land". Indsamlingen af forkortelser er dog ifølge det oplyste udelukkende baseret på *fransk* presse og faglitteratur og *fransk* radio og TV, uden nærmere specifikation i øvrigt. Der er ingen oplysninger om oprindelsesland for de enkelte forkortelser, men indsamlingsgrundlaget taget i betragtning må man gå ud fra, at eksempelvis de mange private og offentlige institutioner, der forekommer i bogen, og hvor nationaliteten ikke fremgår af navnet, er *franske*.

Bogen indeholder en alfabetisk liste over som nævnt ca. 3.000 forkortelser, hovedsageligt sigler. Listen er ikke baseret på nogen frekvensundersøgelse, men repræsenterer "et bredt udsnit af forkortelser" og gør "ikke krav på at være udtømmende" - fornuftigt nok!

Dette taget i betragtning kan man vanskeligt stille sig meget kritisk over for listens valg hhv. fravalg af forkortelser (for så vidt som der overhovedet er tale om et bevidst (fra)valg). Et par kommentarer giver listens indhold dog anledning til.

Når det drejer sig om de i listen forekommende initialord eller sigler (der for de flestes vedkommende dækker over navne på offentlige og private organisationer, institutioner mv.), forekommer listen bredt dækkende. De fleste af de i medierne hyppigt anvendte forkortelser er naturligvis med, men derudover findes en lang række sjældnere (sjældent!) anvendte. Nyere forkortelser som *MSF* (*Médecins sans frontières*) er med - til gengæld kunne man have overvejet at rense listen for ikke længere eksisterende institutioner som *ORTF* og *OECE*.

Listens udvalg virker mere tilfældigt og mindre gennearbejdet, når det drejer sig om andre typer forkortelser end de ovennævnte. Dette *kanne* naturligvis

skyldes, at man fra forfatterens side har ment, at disse andre typer i højere grad taler for sig selv og altså normalt volder færre problemer. Men i så fald undrer det lidt, at man i listen finder f.eks. *ct* (*courant*), *ets* (*établissement*) og *ste* (*société*), men ikke *arr* (*arrondissement*), *bd* (*boulevard*), *no* (*numéro*). Listens præg af tilfældighed i selektionen er indimellem iøjnefaldende, f.eks. indeholder listen forkortelsen *MF* for *million de francs*, men ikke den ellers almindeligt anvendte *MdF* for *milliard de francs*; man finder såvel *K* (*kilo*) som *KG* (*kilogramme*) og *L* (*litre*), men ikke *KM* (*kilomètre*) eller *M* (*mètre*) - og i øvrigt heller ikke forkortelsen *M* i dens anden anvendelse (*Monsieur*).

Listen anfører alle forkortelser med samme typografi, nemlig versaler uden punktum mellem bogstaverne. Derfor har en række forkortelser ikke fundet plads i listen i deres hyppigst forekomne form; f.eks. findes *L/C* (*lettre de change*) i listen som *LC*, der ikke er almindelig, ligesom *S.E. & O.* (= *sauf erreurs et omissions*) er blevet til *SEO*.

Konkluderende kan man sige, at *Franske forkortelser* er, hvad den giver sig ud for - en liste over mere eller mindre tilfældigt indsamlede og udvalgte forkortelser. Bogen ville vinde ved en mere bevidst/systematisk selektion, ligesom uddybende kommentarer f.eks. i form af oprindelse/nationalitet ville øge bogens brugsværdi.

Der er dog ingen tvivl om, at *Franske forkortelser* også i sin nuværende form vil finde plads på hylden hos mange franskinsinteresserede.

Aase Møller

Erik Hansen: *Rigtigt dansk*. 2. rev. udg. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag, 1993.

De fleste husker vel endnu det postyr, som opstod da den nye udgave af *Ret-skrivningsordbogen* skulle udgives i 1986. Hændelsen er gået over i historien under navnet *majonæse-krigen* efter "hovedpersonen". Dansk Sprognævn havde taget konsekvensen af, at de færreste danskere behersker den franske stavemåde mayonnaise og ofte staver fejl (nemlig med *ét n*), og derfor indførte man en alternativ stavemåde, som modsvarer den almindelige danske udtale. Det offentlige røre, der opstod som følge heraf, viste endnu engang for den undrende omverden, at den danske nationalkarakter åbenbart består af lige dele konservatisme og anarkisme. Der blev råbt vagt i gevær fra (især selvudnævnte) "sproglige livvagter": dette var begyndelsen til enden for det danske sprog, det var endnu et tidstypisk tegn på sædernes forfald, osv. Kernen i forslaget var, at når folk bevisligt har svært ved at stave ordet korrekt (fordi der er stor afstand mellem den franske stavemåde og den danske udtale), så var det bedre at indføre en stavemåde, som svarer til udtalen, end det var at kriminalisere 90 % af befolkningen. Kunne man fransk, var der stadig mulighed for at vise det gennem at stave

mayonnaise; ellers kunne man stave på dansk. Heftigheden i debatten var helt ude af proportioner i forhold til anledningen, og som Sprognævnets formand Erik Hansen nogle år senere tørt konstaterede i et interview, så var det åbenbart bedre at skrive forkert fransk end rigtigt dansk.

Professor Erik Hansen har været formand for Dansk Sprognævn siden 1985, og har i den tid (men også inden) gjort et stort arbejde for at højne den sproglige bevidsthed gennem oplysning, og især har han arbejdet hårdt for en *fornuftig* holdning til det danske sprog (hvad der menes med dette, skal jeg straks vende tilbage til) gennem talrige bøger om sprogbrug og normer. Nu foreligger en 2. revideret og udvidet udgave af hans bog fra 1988 *Rigtigt dansk*, som i 50 korte artikler behandler problematiske forhold i det danske sprog. Og lad det være sagt straks: dette er ikke kun en bog for dansklærere, men for alle som interesserer sig for sprog i det hele taget. Dette er den på to måder: for det første giver den svar på problemer, som alle, der skriver på dansk, har stået overfor. For det andet er den med sin konsekvens i det sprogpoltiske et glimrende diskussionsgrundlag for alle sproglærere.

Bogen indledes med et 20 sider langt essay om "Rigtigt og forkert dansk", hvor Erik Hansen diskuterer sprognormers funktion og berettigelse: normen udpeger en af flere adfærdsformer som den "normale" i et bestemt samfund, og når man følger normen bliver ens adfærd derfor til en vis grad forudsigelig. I forhold til den sproglige adfærd betyder dette, at man undgår en mængde muligheder for misforståelse; en norm er helt enkelt praktisk hvis man ønsker en så gnidningsfri kommunikation som mulig. Samtidig har normen en signal-funktion: man signalerer sit tilhørsforhold til en bestemt gruppe (bl.a.) gennem de sproglige udgydelser.

Dette betyder, at der findes en mangfoldighed af "dansk'er", specifikke for geografiske områder, sociale klasser, faggrupper osv. Det meste er fælles for disse forskellige slags dansk, men der er, som vi alle ved, forskelle. Og et af disse særsprog er rigsmålet, som indtager en særstilling ved at gøre krav på at være fællesnorm. Og at vi har en sådan fællesnorm er praktisk, fordi uklarheder giver gnidninger i kommunikationen. Derfor bør man have en norm, og man bør holde denne norm fri for usystematiske og ulogiske ord og udtryk. Men begreberne "smukt" og "grimt" har ingenting at gøre i denne sammenhæng: private fornemmelser for det æstetiske kan ikke bruges til at bestemme, hvad der er rigtigt og forkert dansk. Men som eksemplet med majonæsen viser, har det personligt-æstetiske en stærk placering hos mange, når det kommer til en sprogdebat. I stedet for at fokusere på forståelighed og gennem argumenter, ræsonnementer og sund fornuft nå til enighed om en løsning, så får følelserne frit løb:

"Der findes overhovedet ingen tilsvarende argumenter for, at vor er bedre end vores, at fordi er bedre end fordi at, eller for at gymnasium er bedre end gymnase. Derfor er mange slet ikke i stand til at diskutere sådanne eksempler, for valget mellem vor og vores osv. ligger langt uden for fornuftens rækkevidde. Man føler dybt i sit indre, at den ene

form eller det ene ord er rigtigere og bedre, men man ved ikke hvorfor. Af den grund kan man kun skændes om den slags spørgsmål, og uenigheden er ganske ufrugtbar og fører ikke til fællesskab og forståelse, men til aggression, had og hån.” (s 26)

Som min norske kollega sagde, à propos sprogdebat i Norge: “I Norge har man ikke opdaget, at sproget er et kommunikationsmiddel”. En sådan debat om rigtigt og forkert, der baserer sig på smukt og grimt, har for mig at se netop glemt, at sproget faktisk er et kommunikationsmiddel.

Men dette løser selvfølgelig ikke det problem, at man - når man kommunikerer med folk med denne indstilling - bliver bedømt efter sit sprog. Derfor er mange af de råd, Erik Hansen giver, fulgt af en pragmatisk modifikation, som ang. *forpligtige*: “Ud fra logik og grammatik er der ikke et ondt ord at sige om *forpligtige* (og *forpligtigelse*). Men når det nu generer mange mennesker, ophidsrer dem og flytter deres opmærksomhed fra det, der bliver sagt, til måden, det bliver sagt på, så kan det være u hensigtsmæssigt at bruge ordet.” (s 95). Så generelt må man sige, at Hansen giver en forklaring på, dels hvad der er rigtigt dansk, dels hvorfor fejlene er opstået, men at han samtidig også giver en pragmatisk vurdering af fordele og ulemper ved at bruge de rigtige og forkerte former - det sidste ofte med veloplagede ironiske bemærkninger, som gør bogen til ganske underholdende læsning. Måtte den vække til eftertanke hos såvel “de strenge vogtere af korrekt “rigsdansk”” som hos “de ubekymrede liberale sproglippere”, som mener at alt er tilladt. Og måtte den højne debatniveauet blot en lille smule... men det er nok for meget forlangt.

Orla Vigsø

Michael Herslund (ed.): *Word Order. Two studies on central issues in the syntax of Danish and French.* Copenhagen Studies in Language 15. Copenhagen: Handelshøjskolens Forlag, 1992.

As the only morpho-syntactic fact that can be directly observed, word order has been investigated by all scholars in linguistics - including inter language and typological studies, as well as language specific studies. It appears to be a complex phenomenon, which is hardly surprising, as all the different aspects of structure and meaning have to be conflated in order to be captured in the one-dimensional medium - for obvious “physical” reasons (“it is, as is well-known, impossible to produce more than one segment of speech at a time”, as Herslund puts it in his introduction, p. 7)¹. This volume illustrates different approaches to this

¹ Actually the linear (surface) structure is bidimensional inasmuch as prosody yields a second dimension indicating different aspects of structure. It is, in fact, surprising that no researchers - and those under review are no exception - seem to have made this rather evident observation.

problem. It contains two long papers about the Danish and the French language, respectively, preceded by a short introduction, which is an independent essay and a small masterpiece in its own right. In this introduction (pp. 7-11), Michael Herslund briefly surveys the history of research on word order and he points out that it would be more correct to talk about “the order of meaningful elements” as did Greenberg. There is, however, a crucial difference between the ordering principles at the word level and at the clause level. In fact, the ordering of word segments is fixed once and for all, whereas word order may be used for a variety of purposes. The fixed ordering of word segments is illustrated by examples drawn from polysynthetic and agglutinative languages like Greenlandic and Turkish. Ordering principles at clausal level are illustrated by Latin examples. These principles are, of course, abundantly developed in the two papers introduced.

Heltoft’s paper: “The Typology of Verb Second and SVO Languages. A Study in the Sign Functions of Word Order.” (pp. 13-64) is first of all, in spite of its title, a study of word order in Danish with some sporadic remarks on universal properties of word order. The author’s main point is that “word order is an [independent] expression system for one or more content systems - depending on the language in question.” (p. 15). Thus

“word order can identify 1) grammatical relations (sentence members), 2) illocutionary value (reality/Realität), 3) information structure, and finally 4) quantifier scope. In Danish word order covers all four fields” (*idem.*)

Only the three first of these functions are treated in the paper. An immediate consequence of considering word order as an *independent* expression system is, as Heltoft remarks (p. 18), that there should be languages whose word order cannot be explained as a function of the syntactic structure and its regulating principles. This hypothesis contradicts most current research on word order which seems actually to be guilty of category mistake, an approach denounced by Heltoft as a “syntactic fallacy” (p. 20). In the main body of the paper, Heltoft takes off to demonstrate the explanatory superiority of a purely topological approach for explaining the word order of Danish.

Danish linguistics definitely has a long topological tradition, dating back to Diderichsen’s work in the 1940s. Heltoft presents a functional interpretation of Diderichsen’s sentence frame, which includes three main fields: the **fundamental field**, the **actuality** (or **nexus**) **field** and the **content field**. It is essential to note that the model presupposes a sharp distinction between syntactic and topological concepts. The latter are, in fact, “locations or sites for complex and simple constituents, respectively, but do not themselves denote constituents” (p. 18). Topological structure is found within domains (predication, argument, adjective phrase), and each domain has a centre or a **pivot**. The paper principally deals with field structure at the sentence level, but it is suggested that the utterance should also be considered as a topological domain, a fact allegedly overlooked by most linguists. This claim apparently hinges upon a somewhat surprising

notion of ‘utterance’. No definition of ‘utterance’ is offered, though, so I shall not go into further detail with this point.

After this introduction of the genuinely topological approach, Heltoft discusses how generative grammar has treated topological phenomena. He argues that constituent grammars of the Chomskyan type do not allow for an explanation of the relations between word order and content systems. This is due to “syntactic imperialism”. Heltoft might have a point here, but his argumentation is somewhat flawed by the fact that he is ignoring important work in the field. Most surprising is that he does not even mention Finn Sørensen’s paper: “The Extended Standard Theory. A presentation with reference to topicalization in Danish”, which has appeared in *NyS 14* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1984), edited by Finn Sørensen and Lars Heltoft himself! And this in spite of the fact that topicalization is Heltoft’s principal example of a phenomenon that generative grammar allegedly cannot treat satisfactorily. On the whole, his review of generative grammar seems rather biased and would appear to reflect the well-known antipathy that many Danish linguists feel towards transformational grammar.

In the following section, Heltoft’s own version of the sentence frame is summarized. As he explicitly states on page 19, the functional interpretation adhered to is inspired by Dik’s analysis of ordering principles, but it is pointed out how the strictly topological premises underlying Heltoft’s version enable him to overcome some inherent problems in Dik’s approach, e.g. with respect to the position of Danish nuclear adverbials.

A main concern in a purely topological analysis is to determine the topological pivot of the language examined. Most scholars have taken for granted that the verb is a universal pivot. Of course, this is an instance of what Heltoft calls the “syntactic fallacy”. Heltoft shows that only an analysis which takes the negation as the pivot in Danish is likely to yield a satisfactory and unified account of all the empirical facts in the investigation. He draws the conclusion that,

“Danish is topologically organized around what turns out to be the central informational boundary, that between the focus domain (to the right of the negation) and the neutral (non-focus) domain.” (p. 40)

This idea is thoroughly developed in the last three chapters which deal with sentence frames, information structure and typology. The paper finishes with some tentative remarks on typological analyses of English and French which, according to Heltoft, are topological subject languages, ie. languages having the subject as their typological pivot. It should be emphasized, however, that Heltoft’s remarks concerning English and French are very rudimentary.

There can be no doubt that Heltoft is making an important point when he denounces the “syntactic fallacy”. He shows convincingly that many facts concerning word order cannot find satisfactory explanations in purely syntactic terms. The question is now whether the strictly topological approach offers a

better and more convincing explanatory set-off. It goes without saying that this approach produces accurate descriptions of the linear facts, but in order to merit the predicate of having explanatory power it should also be capable of yielding systematic analyses of the postulated relations between expression and content and of the non-importance of syntax in this game. Let us have a closer look at how this works.

It will not be possible to examine all details here. I shall concentrate on chapters 10-11, in which the author treats information structure. These chapters undoubtedly lie at the heart of his approach in general and of the central thesis in particular. According to this thesis word order should be considered an (independent) expression system for four content systems (in Danish), among them information structure (cf. p. 15).

In chapter 10, the author sketches out what he calls the outline of information structure at the universal pragmatic (UP) level, and the relation between this structure and the form level in Danish is the subject of chapter 11. Thus, if we want to judge the explanatory power of Heltoft's topological approach in this aspect, we have to accept his perception of UP information structure, which is somewhat untraditional and - at least from an international point of view - rather confusing, since he uses a number of well-established terms in a personalized way and in new constellations, without giving real arguments for his innovations. Heltoft is not always entirely well informed in the area, a fact that is revealed in the first lines of chapter 10. He begins with asserting that most studies on information structure pay too little attention to the distinction between *langue* and *parole* (in Saussurean terms) (p. 40). Quoting the works by Givón and Halliday, his point would seem to be (elegantly) underscored. And the examples quoted are, indeed, good (Halliday even argues strongly for the abolition of this distinction). However, these scholars may represent a minority. Actually, many other authors working on information structure pay a lot of attention to the important level problem. This is for instance the case with the very influential Czech school and with most French linguists to mention but a few (see also Nølle 1986). After his initial somewhat easy criticism, Heltoft proceeds to develop his own system. The central concept is coherence. Presupposition does not belong to coherence, since, as he puts it, "it is a communicative concept in my universe" (p. 41). Inspired by the Norwegian linguist Thorstein Fretheim he defines **theme** as an element that communicates unbound but not new information. Thus theme is "what we talk about *next*" (my italics). A bound entity (e.g. an anaphor) is therefore never a theme. In a text like: *Peter arrived. He looked horrible.*, there is no theme in the second sentence. **Rhemes** concern "information which is regarded by the speaker as new **in the situation** [...]. Unbound elements are normally rhematic" (p. 42) (or they are thematic(!), my remark). **Focus** is the central or most prominent information unit: It "indicates the centre of relevance" (p. 44). "Central to our interest here is negation and its scope. What is negated in

a sentence is by definition identical to focus” (p. 43). Unfortunately, without a definition of scope, definitions of this kind are circular (see e.g. Nølke 1992).

In chapter 11, Heltoft uses these concepts to show form relations in Danish. Inspired by Askedal (1986), he uses the French linguist Zemb’s concept ‘pHEME’ to denote the two positions of sentence adverbials and negation which are labelled 1st and 2nd pHEME. For Heltoft, pHEME is thus a topological concept and it does not form a conceptual triad with theme and rheme as it does for its inventor Zemb. Now the analysis consists of an inquiry into possible fulfilments of the different fields in the sentence frame. Many examples are given, and three patterns are distinguished: **unmarked rheme and focus** (e.g. *Den mand må I aldrig købe hus af*), **marked inclusion of subject position in focus domain** (e.g. *I går kom sgu så hans kone for at klage*) and **heavily marked inverted information structure** (e.g. *40 dage vil jeg give dig*). For each structure, it is shown which kind of functional elements each field may contain. Thus the fundamental field contains [non-rhematic], i.e. anaphors and themes (indeed, taken together these two concepts correspond to what most people call theme) and [non-focus] elements in the first two patterns, whereas it contains [rhematic or non-rhematic] and [focus] elements in the third pattern. In the reality field we find [non-rhematic] and [non-focus] constituents in all cases, and the nucleus field, finally, contains [rhematic] elements and functions as [focus domain] in the two first patterns and as [non-rhematic] and [non-focus] in the third one.

Now, can this topological analysis be said to have explanatory power and thus to be superior to various more or less syntactically motivated analyses that are so severely criticized by Heltoft? Barely. We have been offered a very precise description of the different informational sentence patterns in Danish, a language which obviously has rich possibilities for communicating different informational concepts in many different positions. But we have learned nothing, or very little about when and why the different options are selected and about their possible usage restrictions, if any. Add to this that the three main patterns are developed on purely descriptive grounds. Also it certainly does not help our understanding that the conceptual framework used to describe information structure is highly idiosyncratic.

As it stands, the topological approach defended by Heltoft in this paper seems to produce a mere description - and a rather superficial one - of the observed facts. A thought which immediately suggests itself is that this is due to what we may be tempted to call a *topological fallacy*. In fact, it does not seem plausible to me that information structure should be explained in purely topological terms, just as it does not lend itself to a strictly syntactic explanation. But it is hardly possible to be sure at this point. Too many aspects have been deliberately omitted (e.g. intonation patterns, which, however, seem to play a crucial role in the comprehension of information structure), most analyses are too superficial, and the special conceptual framework applied for the description of information structure at the universal pragmatic level does not facilitate our understanding.

There can be no doubt that Heltoft's paper includes a large number of very perspicacious observations which bring our knowledge of Danish language structure a good step further, but these insights are unfortunately clouded by conceptual overloading.

In many ways, Hanne Korzen's paper "The Predicative Unit and Subject-Verb Inversion in Modern French" (pp. 65-123) is Heltoft's diametrical opposite. It has no theoretical or universal pretension but gives an extremely concise account of a limited word order problem in one specific language, namely modern French. Korzen has worked a number of years on the subject-verb inversion in French and has become one of the leading experts in this field. She is very precise about the aim of her present paper. Explicitly disregarding the question of knowing **why** inversion is used (she rapidly enumerates a number of possible special purposes, "... forming questions, topicalization, focusing, contrasting, etc.", p. 65), she starts by concentrating on the question: **How** is the form of inversion (i.e. which place is selected for the subject), once inversion has been chosen (p. 66)? The main problem is to define the position of the subject in relation to the other elements of the sentence. Korzen defines her task as follows:

"This position seems mainly to be determined by internal factors in the sentence. This is why in this study my point of departure will be isolated sentences. It is obvious however that such a study has to be supplemented by text studies. It is to be regarded merely as a single - yet important - piece in the large puzzle which a coherent description of the position of the subject in the French language can be said to constitute." (pp. 66-67)

Korzen's research is based on an extensive corpus of authentic examples gathered not only from a large number of text excerpts but also from the rich linguistic literature on inversion in French. The corpus is supplemented by examples constructed for the different investigation purposes and checked with native speakers. The author first gives a survey of the constructions to be examined. The collection presented includes a number of rather similar sentences of which some are grammatical, some ungrammatical, and others problematic without being clearly ungrammatical. Reflections on this inventory enable the author to suggest a first explanatory hypothesis, which is going to be developed throughout the paper.

Any explanation presupposes a precise description. In the third chapter, Korzen presents her descriptive apparatus. Actually, this involves much more than a merely descriptive tool for the inversion issue. Opting for "a "dynamic model" in which sentences with subject-verb inversion are regarded as transformations of sentences with normal word order (S+V)" (p. 74), Korzen proposes a rather elaborate model of the syntactic construction of this "normal French sentence". The basic principle is a hierarchical organization of the sentence elements, but Korzen also considers (in the second part of this chapter) some "aspects of linear order". Starting from the top, she first separates sentence adver-

bials (like *heureusement, peut-être, franchement*). The remaining part of the sentence is called the “central clause”. This includes “adverbs of reason or cause” and the “elementary clause”. The reason why Korzen has to give these adverbials a special treatment is that they may trigger the so-called “complex inversion” but never the non-clitic subject-verb inversion under consideration in this paper. As a matter of fact, only elements of the elementary clause can have an effect on inversion mechanisms.

“Denoting in most instances a situation, the elementary clause contains first and foremost the finite verb and the valency-determined elements” (p. 76). Inspired by Herslund and Sørensen’s valency theory (1985; 1987), Korzen analyzes the elementary clause as built up of a predication or a nexus whose two parts are the subject and the sentence predicate. Then she develops a hierarchical model of the sentence predicate where each level constitutes a **predicative unit** embracing all lower levels. Thus, the smallest predicative unit, step one, consists of the verb and the direct object. In step two the indirect object is added, and finally, in step three, the “scenic” adverbials of time and place are attached to the unit. Two terminological clarifications are essential here. First it is important to emphasize that the category of “indirect object” comprises the traditional prepositional object as well as the dative and the valency-determined adverb of place (or time), called “local object”, as in *Pierre va à Paris*; and second, scenic adverbials are “non-valency-determined places”. The idea is now that “when placing a given element in a unit, one has to include those elements that are found on a lower level in the diagram of relationships” (p. 81). In other words, the presence of a dative with a transitive verb, for example, presupposes the presence of a direct object. Whereas a sentence can contain only one direct object and one indirect object in the above-mentioned sense, it can contain more scenic adverbials. Therefore, Korzen discusses at some length the structure of elementary clauses with more than one such element. It turns out that no general rule can be given for these cases. In the second part of this chapter Korzen reviews three “forces” that affect the order of the elements, included the inverted subject, in the postverbal zone. These tendencies (which, I believe, are probably universal principles) are the following: “1° A tendency towards placing the element that has the closest relationship to the verb as near as possible to it. 2° A tendency towards placing the most voluminous element finally. 3° A tendency towards placing the most significant element finally” (p. 93). The interaction of these principles is examined at some length.

This very meticulous description of the inversion facts puts Korzen in a position to propose some rules governing the position of the inverted subject (chapter 4). The explanatory system is built up of a general rule supplemented by some “regulating mechanisms”. The general rule is an elaboration of the hypothesis put forward in the beginning of the article. The regulating mechanisms, which - probably unescapably - are given rather loose formulations, deal with

the principle of rhythm and the autonomy of the predicative unit. The central concept in the explanatory architecture is the **minimal predicative unit**. This is the predicative unit in which the interrogative is the outermost element. The principal mechanism governing the positioning of the inverted subject may now be boiled down to, “The non-clitic subject must not break into the minimal predicative unit” (p. 104). The complete rule is surely a bit more complex because it is more complete. This explanation is shown to work for all the examined examples.

Finally, Korzen rounds her paper off by some remarks on non-interrogative constructions, which basically are to be explained along the same lines, and by an ultra-short over-all characterisation of the construction in modern French compared to some other (Romance and Germanic) languages.

Korzen’s analysis seems convincing. Her paper is very well-written: Taken by the hand we witness the stepwise uncovering of the rules underlying the inversion mechanisms. Every empirical fact is scrutinized, every stone is turned over, and the author does not give herself any rest until she has understood all the riddles of inversion. The text has no grand theoretic pretensions. Integrating the results in a more general linguistic theory is a task which still remains to be done. The descriptive apparatus adopted is by no way claimed to be universally superior to other syntactic descriptions, but it is - and this is clearly demonstrated - an extremely good basis for the formulation of rather simple and yet very concise rules for a highly complex phenomenon which so far has hardly been understood at all. Yet, from a theoretical point of view, some aspects of the model have to be refined, and some ideas merit further exploration. Thus the hierarchical model of the sentence predicate, which is at the core of the explanation, is basically syntactically defined. In fact, the distinction between direct object, indirect object and adverbial is a syntactical one. However, when it comes to hierarchisation of adverbials of time and place, semantical considerations get involved, and the implications of this mishmash of criteria do not seem altogether clear to me. This issue clearly deserves further scrutiny. The notion of “prototypicality” alluded to on page 101 would seem to be another point that would need further elaboration. According to Korzen’s analyses, three-element-constructions like *Quand reviendra votre oncle?* constitute the best examples of inversion. It appears, namely, that the nearer a construction gets to this prototype, the more acceptable it becomes. This is a very neat prototypical effect.

My two last remarks are examples of a well-known fact: A well-documented and methodologically consistent study of a restricted empirical domain very often turns out to be of greatest value for the general linguistic theorizing as such.

Word order is of crucial interest to any study of language. The linear surface format remains our main entrance to language structure and it is not surprising that so many phenomena are likely to influence its shape. Taken as a whole, the book

under review gives us a rather broad insight in the word order mechanisms and we are taught a good deal about the problems attached to the study of the underlying principles. Actually, it is extremely intriguing to notice that Heltoft argues for a strictly topological approach, whereas Korzen's very detailed study is basically syntactic, topological considerations being only awarded a regulating function. Now, it does not seem possible to make any definitive judgement as to which approach is most appropriate. It is true that Korzen's analysis seems distinctly superior as far as explanatory power is concerned, but contrarily to Heltoft, she only deals with a very confined problem, and it is by no way obvious that her explanatory device, working so well for the explanation of inversion mechanisms, should also work in other contexts. I believe that one should try to develop a genuine, modular approach to word order problematics. This would allow us to take into account, in a systematic and principled manner, the mass of phenomena likely to play an important role. It seems for instance obvious that prosodic facts should be accounted for, an aspect which has been completely neglected in both papers. As it stands, we are only at the beginning of the long road that may lead us to a better understanding of why the languages of the world put their words - or their meaningful elements - in the order they do. There is no doubt, however, that the two papers (and the introduction) of this volume, each one in its own right, have contributed to our understanding of which way to go.

References

- Askedal, John Ole (1986): "Topologisk feltanalyse, koderingsystemer og pragmatiske funksjoner" in: Andersen, John E. and Lars Heltoft: *Sætningsleddene og deres stilling - 50 år efter. NyS* 16-17. (18-55)
- Givón, Talmy (1990): *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction*, Vol II. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985): *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Herslund, Michael and Finn Sørensen (1985): *De franske verber. En valensgrammatisk fremstilling. I. Verbernes syntaks*. Romance Department, University of Copenhagen.
- Herslund, Michael and Finn Sørensen (1985): *De franske verber 2. En valensgrammatisk fremstilling. II. Klassifikation*. Samfundslitteratur, Copenhagen Business School.
- Nølke, Henning (1986): "Tema-remå og tekstlingvistik", *CEBAL* 8. Copenhagen: Arnold Busck. (358-376)
- Nølke, Henning (1992): "NE...PAS : négation descriptive ou polémique? Contraintes formelles sur son interprétation", *Langue française* 94. (48-67)
- Sørensen, Finn (1984): "The Extended Standard Theory. A presentation with reference to topicalization in Danish", in: Finn Sørensen and Lars Heltoft: *Topics in Danish Syntax. NyS* 14, Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Grethe Hjorth: *Dansk-Tysk Ordbog. Undervisning* (Gyldendals røde undervisningsordbøger). København: Gyldendal, 1993.

Da *Dansk-Engelsk undervisning* ved Jens Axelsen udkom i 1990 fik den en gennemgående god modtagelse. Nu foreligger så *Dansk-Tysk undervisning*, og også den fortjener ros - ikke ubetinget ganske vist, men i hovedsagen så absolut.

Dansk-tysk undervisning foreligger i det vante Gyldendal-udstyr: håndterlig og behagelig størrelse, solid indbinding, god papirkvalitet, og overskueligt layout, herunder gennemtænkt brug af varierende skriftstørrelse og skrifttype - et enkelt slip, og dét et alvorligt, er det dog, at der i kommentarsproget ikke skelnes typografisk mellem kommentar og lemma, jf fx følgende passus s.v. *i*³ s. 270b: ...; *i efter uo., se disse fx falde i, lukke i, slå i.*

“Ordbogen er udformet, så den er let at anvende”, anfører forordet. For at nå dette mål har man bl.a. benyttet danske grammatiske betegnelser (bortset fra kasusangivelserne), som de kendes fra Retskrivningsordbogen, og man har begrænset udvalget af tegn og forkortelser til et minimum. Placeringen af tegn- og forkortelseslisterne på forsatsen både foran og bagi bogen er meget hensigtsmæssig og burde være inspiration for andre ordbogsforlag.

Brugen af danske grammatiske fagtermer er uheldig, idet den bryder med traditionen for at benævne i det mindste ordklasserne med deres latinske navne til skade for koblingen til andre sprogfag. Ydermere virker forkortelserne for de danske betegnelser ofte forstyrrende: *bio.* leder snarere tanken hen på biologien end på ‘biord’, *ent.* (= ental) læses meget let *enten*, og *talo.* virker aldeles eksotisk og forbindes ikke umiddelbart med ‘talord’, som meningen er. *fho.* og *to.* for hhv. ‘forholdsord’ og ‘tillægsord’ er ligeledes uforståelige og sinker læseren unødigt. Forfatteren ville have stået sig ved at følge anbefalingerne i KUP-rapporten *Sproglig Viden og Bevidsthed* og dermed benyttet det latinske inspirerede nomenklatur ved ordklasser samt store dele af morfologien og syntaksen.

De anvendte tegn er standardtegn og giver ikke unødige problemer, bortset fra angivelsen af løst sammensatte verber: mens de fleste ordbøger ikke markerer løse sammensætninger særskilt, men kun anvender trykstreg ved faste sammensætninger (fx *aufhören* : *über’setzen*), vælger *Dansk-tysk undervisning* at signalere løs sammensætning ved at indføje et punkt mellem præfiks og stamme (fx *auf’hören*) for så i øvrigt at fastholde den traditionelle angivelse af fast sammensætning (altså fx *über’setzen* som ovenfor). Notationsformen for løst sammensatte verber er direkte forstyrrende; nogle læser den som angivelse af tryk, andre som angivelse af længde, og kun få erkender umiddelbart dens funktion. Da man som princip har fuldstændighed i de supplerende angivelser og altså ikke har villet lade det usagte være en oplysning i sig selv (hvorfor man i øvrigt også konsekvent angiver pluralisendelsen *-en* for femininum), burde man have noteret tryk ensartet, altså ‘*aufhören* og *über’setzen*’.

Lemmafølgen er alfabetets. Ved homografier forsynes de enkelte opslag med indekstal og ordklasseangivelse; ordklasser nævnes i øvrigt ikke, hvilket kan undre, da fuldstændighed som nævnt i anden sammenhæng er et princip.

Af og til opereres der beklageligvis med en pseudohomografi; der tænkes på tilfælde, hvor et ords funktion bliver afgørende for lemmatiseringen, selv om dets ordklassetilhør afgøres af deklinationskarakteristika. Et eksempel ses s.v. *bestemt* s. 63b, hvor der ud over et adjektiv *bestimmt* anføres et adverbium *bestimmt* med betydningen “helt sikker, afgjort” (*er kommt bestimmt; ich weiß es bestimmt; das ist bestimmt wahr; er tritt immer sehr bestimmt auf*). *bestimmt* er her ubestrideligt **adverbialled**, men ordet er alt andet lige et **adjektiv**. Det sidste eksempel blandt de anførte, *er tritt immer sehr bestimmt auf*, er i øvrigt ilde anbragt under betydningen “helt sikker, afgjort”; det hører naturligt hjemme under betydningen “energisk, viljestærk”, der anføres for adjektivet *bestimmt*. Ganske vist har *bestimmt* i sin adverbielle funktion en særlig betydning (netop bekræftelsen), men noget sådant gælder flere andre adjektiver, bl.a. *sicher*, for hvilket der ikke anføres flere ordklassemuligheder og dermed heller ikke et adverbium med egen betydning (jf. s. 521a); desuden er specialbetydningen blot en let variant af adjektivbetydningen “fast”, og man havde nok kunnet finde en fællesnævner.

Ved polysemi og homonymi opsplittes og nummereres de forskellige betydninger på vanlig vis, og ved særlig omfattende artikler som *gang* s. 206b-207a og *grund* s. 222a, *lov* s. 348b og *tag* 621a-622b får enkeltbetydningerne ligefrem et eget opslag - et udmærket og brugervenligt princip. Naturligvis beror det på forfatterens personlige skøn, om der skal samles eller splittes, men problemet er alt i alt håndteret ganske udmærket.

I forordet anføres det, at der “i udvalget af danske opslagsord og udtryk er ... lagt vægt på de nutidige og hyppigt anvendte i almindelige kommunikationssituationer”. Denne målsætning må siges at være nået. *Dansk-tysk undervisning* er behageligt fri for eksotiske lemmata og rummer med sine 32.400 lemmata i alt væsentligt et bredt, moderne ordforråd; lad så være, at man i “en almindelig kommunikationssituation” antagelig nok kunne klare sig uden *agten for, duelig-hedstegn, liggehøne, rådyrkalv, rågekoloni* m.m. - sådanne småslip vil man altid kunne påpege, og de forstyrrer ingenlunde helheden. Behageligt er det i øvrigt, at forfatteren ikke holder sig tilbage for at optage kraftudtryk og eder; intet er vanskeligere end at bande på fremmedsprog, og det er kun ret og rimeligt, at ordbøgerne - ikke mindst sådanne, der netop sigter mod almindelig kommunikation - giver vejledning og oplysning.

Også det nyeste ordforråd er tilgodeset; som eksempler herpå anføres - stadig i forordet - *gensplejset, indre marked, iltsvind, rygsækturist, vindmøllepark*. Man konstaterer i den forbindelse endvidere tilstedeværelsen af opslagsord som *brugervenlig, cowboybukser* og *cowboyjakke, gyldent håndtryk, mikrobølgeovnsamlever, optrappe, pløkke ned, på forkant med udviklingen, sætte sit finger-*

aftryk på noget, temadag, temaug, togkiosk; desuden opstart (men ikke starte op/ud) og seddelbetegnelserne *hund* og *tusse*, som dog meget uheldigt med hhv. kommentaren '100 kroner' og oversættelsen *Tausendkronenschein* præsenteres som et dansk fænomen, selv om *Hunderter* og *Tausender* som bekendt uden videre kan bruges om DM-sedler. Til gengæld er *Dansk-tysk undervisning* i nogle tilfælde heldigere end den store Munksgaard med sine oversættelser, jf. fx *våddragt*, der i Munksgaard ikke særlig vellykket oversættes til *Kälteschutzanzug*, mens *Dansk-tysk undervisning* har hhv. *Surfanzug* og *Taucheranzug*; lemmet *joggesko* er *Dansk-tysk undervisning* i øvrigt ene om.

Man kan så naturligvis liste adskillige nyere ord op, som savnes i *Dansk-tysk undervisning*, fx *boom*, *brainstorm(ing)*, *carport*, *debatartikel*, *debatteater*, *fejl-køb*, *muzak*, *nærradio*, *plante* (fx *en agent*), *rentefradrag*, *skatteskruen*, *skattemæk*, *voldsbølge*, *work-shop* osv. Pladsen er begrænset, og man skal træffe et valg, og det valg kan kun være subjektivt bestemt.

Uheldige oversættelser og deciderede mangler kan naturligvis eftervises, men ikke i voldsomt stort tal, jf. fx angivelsen af femininumformen *Doktorin* s. 112a, der netop ikke bruges, fx angivelsen af tiltaleformen *gnädige Frau*, der dog ikke er normen, fx oversættelsen s. 603b af *sundhedsminister* til *Minister(in) für Gesundheit*, der vel snarest er en forklaring af det danske opslagsord og dermed står i skærende modsætning til oplysningen "(kan gengives) Ministerpräsident" s.v. *statsminister* s. 580b og fx mangelen på opslagsordet *skatteminister*. Men bortset fra disse vel nok mere specielle områder, hvor man altså generelt må være på vagt, er man gennemgående godt hjulpet med *Dansk-tysk undervisning*. Naturligvis afhængigt af, hvem *man* er - et problem, der hidtil er blevet ladet ude af betragtning. Ordbogen angiver ikke, hvilken målgruppe den har, og det samme gælder *Dansk-engelsk undervisning*, der i forordet udtrykkelig nævnes som grundlag. Et ledsagebrev til anmeldereksemplaret fra forlaget angiver, at ordbogen er specielt beregnet til brug i folkeskolen, hvilket må udlægges "for folkeskolens lærere". Det forklarer naturligvis de mange - i øvrigt instruktive - grammatiske kommentarer i artiklerne, men påkalder samtidig undren, for ordforrådet er ganske vist som allerede omtalt sammensat mhp. almindelig kommunikation, men det forekommer dog stedvis at befinde sig på et højere niveau end krævet for folkeskolen eller helt uden for folkeskolens interesse-sfære, jf. fx *følfod*, *hævvert*, *mørtelfabrik*, *møtrik*, *ordonnans*, *orgelregister*, *pasteurisere*, *paternosterelevator* osv. osv.

Som ordbogen fremstår, har den bredere appel og kan med fordel benyttes både på det gymnasiale og det postgymnasiale niveau, både af undervisere og underviste.

Til slut skal ordbogsgrammatikken, udarbejdet af Ingeborg Zint, omtales. Der er i ordbøger udgivet i Danmark ikke rigtig tradition for også at optage en kortfattet egentlig grammatik, og initiativet skal hilses velkomment - ikke mindst da der er tale om en usædvanlig god og letforståelig fremstilling, som tilmed på

glimrende vis får indsmuglet og anvendeliggjort valensteorien (afsnittet "Sætningsmønstre"). Det kan så ærgre, at lay-outet er så uheldigt; al den gode tekst, de gennemgående instruktive eksempler og forklaringer bliver meget svær at læse pga. overdreven brug af indstregede skemaer og indrykninger samt et udbredt skifte mellem sammentrængt tekst og al for megen luft. Forhåbentlig bliver der rettet op på dette forhold i næste udgave.

Ole Lauridsen

Jørgen Erik Nielsen (ed.): *Words that teem with meaning. (Copenhagen Studies in Translation vol. 2). Copenhagen: Copenhagen University, 1992.*

In April 1992 the Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography at Copenhagen University published *Words that teem with meaning Copenhagen Views on Lexicography* in the series Copenhagen Studies in Translation vol. 2, edited by Jørgen Erik Nielsen. The volume results from a meeting at the Center in the autumn of 1990, which shows the fruitfulness of cooperation between lexicographers and translators, as many lexicographical problems very clearly show up in practical translation work. Most of the articles deal with problems in bilingual lexicography concerned with contrastive approaches to English and Danish vocabulary, one has Russian-Danish lexicography as its subject, and one gives a bibliographical survey of a type of innovations in English lexicography.

The first article, by *Bent Nordhjem*, covers approximately one third of the volume. He presents a descriptive study of the ever interesting lexicographical topic of neologisms, namely the development of nominalized phrasal verbs (NPVs) in English, consisting of a (monosyllabic) verbal stem followed (or preceded - a possibility that is forgotten in Nordhjem's definition) by an adverbial particle: **look out, backlash**. This is a kind of noun that gives difficulties in translation into other Germanic languages, where this kind of word formation is not productive. Nordhjem shows how this type of compound nouns first appeared in English literary prose during the last two centuries, by studying a material of ten literary works published in the period 1726 - 1913, 58 works from the period 1814 - 1920, and an unstated number of works published after 1920. The first occurrence in his material is dated back to Henry Fielding in 1749: **look-out**. In the period 1814 - 1920 the construction increases in literary use. The material chosen shows 75 types of them; only a few, however, are in common use. Not till the period after 1920 the type is commonly known and in widespread use, representing well known words like **blowout, breakdown, turnover**, many of which have also been directly adopted in the Scandinavian languages.

Nordhjem's aim is to sketch an outline of the history of NPVs in English literary prose since 1796, showing that the first **drawback** appeared in 1759 and the first **break down** in 1836. He also discusses the interesting problem of *why* this new type of nominal phrases appears, suggesting semantic and social reasons, without coming very close to an explanation. An idea which immediately suggest itself, is the development of the type in spoken language - an idea that is not discussed. A further semantic and functional analysis of the NPVs would probably have given an even more interesting contribution to the lexicological and syntactic description of these phrases. It would also have been interesting to know more about Nordhjem's method, the corpus compiling (why he has chosen just those works and authors he investigates), how he localizes the NPVs, and in what way he has made his frequency analyses.

The article includes a list of the NPV-occurrences in his material, giving quotations and an original kind of glosses suggesting the words "pictorial or associational force". Some of these glosses seem somewhat unsystematic, e. g. **look-out** has not been labelled "metaphorically" in the meaning 'prospects, hope', but **runaway**, defined as 'two people escaping from their stable pattern of their lives', has been given this label.

It seems, however, that the author's main concern is to show the growth of the types and the dating of the NPVs. Here Nordhjem has done a good piece of work in locating, dating and listing the occurrences of this type of verbal phrases, and it is highly interesting to see how rapidly a lexical innovation spreads, after having been established and accepted in literary prose.

Henrik Gottlieb presents an ongoing project, "Idioms into Danish", about principles and designs of an English-Danish Idiomatic Dictionary, a rather new kind of dictionary. This work not only aims at giving a useful dictionary for translators and other users as a result, but will also give an analysis of Danish and English idiomatics, as well as a tool for making the same kinds of dictionaries and surveys of other pairs of languages, thanks to its very systematic construction and the semantic analysis behind it.

The author first discusses the criterias of an idiom, defining it as an expression not only having a "pre-packaged" form, but also a non-transparent meaning. To be included in the dictionary it even has to be documented in standard speech and writing after 1950. (How this documentation is to be found, is not presented in the article - it would be interesting to know whether this will be based on a corpus, or experimentally with native informants. Sooner or later this problem has to be solved when the usage examples are to be found. In the pilot study it seems to have been solved by accident.) The idiom selection is made from "all available post-war dictionaries and collections of idiomatic English", a list of 43 works. To investigate such a number of dictionaries and phrase collections systematically means a great amount of work and in itself gives a good contribution to the description of English and Danish idomatics.

The microstructure in itself, including special graphic elements, is semantically relevant, informing the user of status and variability of the idiom, which means how to put the idiom to active use. An idiomatic expression having an entry form like “**have* one’s nose in a book**” is to be read: the verb **have** might be inflected, the pronoun *one’s* might be interchanged with any pronoun, and **nose in a book** is the fixed part of the idiom.

The equivalents are sorted into five categories, showing the grade of similarity between the two languages. Languages such as English and Danish are highly related, making the categories of twins, calques and parallels quite filled. More distant language pairs might have to make an extensive use of paraphrases or the “opposite” category single-word lexemes.

Equivalents that are not self-explaining will have an additional literal definition. Besides, every idiom will be given authentic usage examples (none older than 1950?) and etymological information of different kinds. Gottlieb also shows a critical attitude towards etymological information in traditional dictionaries, and gives convincing examples of misunderstandings and misinterpreted etymology. It would, however, have been interesting to see how he will solve the problem of sorting the reliable information out from the unreliable.

The macrostructure is of a problematic nature in idiomatic dictionaries. The solution here will be an alpha-lexical arrangement of entries, where each idiom will have a keyword listed in strictly alphabetical order. A keyword is defined as the first word in the idiom that is not “syntactically eroded in use”. This might be a somewhat dubious criterion, but a generous amount of references will help the user to find his way to the right entry.

The project seems well planned and theoretically and methodologically well founded. Gottlieb presents no schedule for these plans, how many persons are involved in the project, or the definition of the corpus or base for lemma selection. Planning a large dictionary estimated to 800 pages, this is a question of high interest and also decisive for the success of the project.

Jørgen Erik Nielsen examines the translations of some of Charles Dickens’ works in order to find out whether they give rise to the coinage of neologisms in the target language, in this case Danish. A most interesting aspect of this article is the discussion and definition of neologisms. His hypothesis is that translations give no rise to neologisms in the target language, and he finds support for this in his material, or at least that such neologisms come into existence only to a very small degree, meaning, as far as I can see, when both author and translator have been especially successful in their coinage, as the example of **Circumlocution Office**, in Danish called **Omsvøbsdepartementet**. But this is not a normal kind of neologism, because Dickens here not only creates a word, but also the entire concept.

Nielsen is likely to get these findings according to the way he defines a neologism, namely that the word has to be found in a dictionary. His example of

Dickens' **election cry**, that has been translated into **valgråb**, is not defined as a new coinage because it has not been taken into the dictionaries; not the contemporary ones, and not the latest English-Danish dictionaries, nor the ODS. Another way of seeing this is that a word is brand new when it is not to be found in earlier literature, and it is a word when it performs a full job in the translation of Dickens' play. This does not mean that it has to be an entry in a dictionary of general language. Another question is how to know that the words are new coinages in Dickens' plays. It is more likely that Dickens was the first person to bring them into written language (and often even made them famous), hence they could not have been excerpted for any dictionary before he used them, but they might very well have been in long use among e.g. coal loaders on the harbour.

Nilsen's study first of all shows that a new word will be taken into a language only if it is needed. If we do not need to distinguish between different types of screws, we do not need different terms for them. Nevertheless there might be different terms used between ironmongers, a type of vocabulary that will not appear in general dictionaries. In the end this leads to a discussion of what a language really consists of, and a functional view seems to be a more fruitful approach. What a neologism is, and how to determine its "birthday", has to be discussed further, and also what is the point of making this kind of determination.

Viggo Hjørnager Pedersen reports from the work on a new edition of Vinterberg & Bodelsen: *Dansk-Engelsk ordbog (VB3)*. The problem he wants to discuss is loan-words from English into Danish, but he also takes up several other aspects of bilingual dictionary-making as well as translation theory. The article would have gained in precision if some of the themes had been dropped and others discussed more thoroughly. Nevertheless the problems of loan words and the development of vocabularies are very complicated, and well worth reflecting upon when revising a bilingual dictionary.

Hjørnager Pedersen has made an investigation of the entries of VB3 for the letters I-J, finding that 83 of them are new words. A further discussion of how he defines a new word is missing. He draws the conclusion that 2000 words or 4% of the entries are new words. This might be a somewhat rash conclusion, as the letter I probably contains more loans from English than other letters, because of the prefix in-, which in fact adds up to 32 of the total of 83 loans (+ 2 of the delabialized im-) he lists.

The policy of the VB3 is to list all Danish words in common use, irrespective of origin, which means not to choose the entries according to puristic criteria. But in the end intuition proves to be the last and deciding criterion, as VB3 wants to practice a moderate conservatism. This clearly shows the dilemma in which every lexicographer will find himself: A wish to describe the language system or ideal has to be reduced to what is practically feasible.

Jørgen Harrit gives us an insight into some of the problems of making an active bilingual dictionary of Danish-Russian. **Possession** and **Existence** are the examples by which he illustrates the difficulties of helping the dictionary user to find what he calls ‘the correct translation’. He pays no more attention to this very problematic term, but throughout the article it appears to mean the equivalents which satisfy idiomatic as well as syntactico-semantic restrictions in the target language. As a Germanic and a Slavic language are quite different in structure, the only way to lead the user on to the right path is to split up the Danish entries to match the Russian structures. This means that the target language gives the structure of the articles in the source language as well. This microstructure will be of great help to the user, but will also be very space-demanding. The Danish entry for have must include and handle six items in Russian. Harrit gives no information of the number of entries to be taken into the dictionary, where to find the lemmas, or what kind of users they have in mind. But to complete a project of this kind with a considerable amount of lemmas will be a huge work.

Ellen M. Pedersen presents the ongoing work of compiling a Danish-English Synonymics base. She wants to present a new definition of the synonym, as “post-Chomskyan translators cannot feel satisfied with word-to-word translation”. In regard to the users’ different strategies when they look for an equivalent the editors want to organize the base as a thesaurus with Danish entry words. The project is ambitious on the users’ part, and it will be interesting to see the result from this work, not only giving a new concept of synonymy, but also more or less a new concept of dictionary.

The article would have gained in clarity if it had been kept in the more traditional academical form, and had led the reader more directly to the aim of the project. Their new definition, “Synonymics, the study of signs and their content, becomes the study of single words whose combinations affirm, maintain and continue the idiomatic process unique to the language” shows that they want to define synonymy as a dynamic concept. I would have wished for a further discussion of this approach, which means to capture a dynamic process into a static base, as well as a discussion of the concepts’ idiomacy, equivalence and content, which might have shed more light on their concept of synonymy.

Arne Zettersten wants to discuss the current status of English historical dictionaries. What he gives us in his article is not so much a discussion as a useful bibliography of modern English historical lexicography. He implicitly brings it into a discussion by pointing out the usefulness of electronic tools in lexicography (implying that these tools have not been satisfactorily brought into use?). It is impressive to see the number of lexicographical products that have been made on the basis of the electronic version of the New Oxford English Dictionary, and the wide range of different products that have been compiled.

What seems unclear is what is meant by historical linguistics; the dictionaries presented are both historical and contemporary. This seems even more unclear when the author says about the Helsinki Corpus, “one part of this historical corpus is a corpus of present day English dialects”.

Anyway, it is very useful to have this kind of survey. The field is rapidly growing, and it is difficult to be updated. The article closes with a short listing of concordances, frequency studies and electronic corpora, as well as software tools for analyses and retrieving. This listing might have been more complete, e.g. the very useful programme TACT is not mentioned. However, that somebody tries to make a listing, is praiseworthy.

I do not see why the listings and surveys should be limited to historical linguistics.

As a report from the Center for Translation Studies on Lexicography this book shows a good variety in the subjects studied and the ongoing projects. It also shows the great progress in the field, and some of the challenges that lies in using new tools and methods in lexicography. But the front page, showing a picture of Samuel Johnson, indicates the lexicographical tradition these works are written into. This book should give inspiration to other institutions in the field, and final results from the projects are looked forward to!

Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld

Lars S. Vikør: *The Nordic Languages. Their Status and Interrelations*. Oslo: Nordic Language Secretariat/Novus Press, 1993.

The situation in Scandinavia - i.e. Sweden, Denmark, and Norway - is quite unique, seen in a global perspective. The social structure of these three independent countries is almost identical (as seen from afar), and at the same time the languages are so alike that even where mutual understanding is at its lowest (between Sweden and Denmark), people from one country understand at least 20% of what is said by their neighbouring country, and that is without any formal training at all. With just a little effort, a full understanding is within reach.

This social and linguistic bond has tied the three Scandinavian countries together throughout history, in spite of wars, powerful international organisations etc. But at the same time, the three countries are part of a larger region, which has been regarded as a unity for centuries: “Norden”, the Nordic countries.

When speaking of the Nordic countries, one is faced with a number of problems, all of which stem from the fact that there is nothing “natural” about this way of grouping 5 independent countries together. The whole idea of a “Nordic Community” is a political construction, which has served as a counterweight to

other - and stronger - forces: the Hansa, Russia, Germany, and lately the EEC. Political cooperation takes place amongst the ministers of all countries, but there is no legal body to impose decisions.

So, to cut a long story short, there is a linguistic bond between three countries, and a political bond between seven countries. This fact leaves me asking, for whom this new book by Lars Vikør was written. "The book is written for students of one or more of these languages, for people with a general interest in the Nordic countries and their cultures, and for those interested in the sociology of language and language planning. It covers a wide range of topics concerning the social aspect of language in the Nordic countries, and it contains much information which is difficult to obtain for those who are unable to read Nordic languages themselves." (As it says on the backpage.) The book deals with the historical background, the languages and the relations between official languages and minority languages, the inter-Nordic relations in the teaching of native languages, and a large part on language planning and politics and the different official bodies.

The book actually consists of several reports: "The languages of the Nordic countries and their historical development." (50 pages) "The situation in the different countries regarding the other languages." (60 pages) "The agencies doing language politics in all the countries, and the major political topics." (75 pages) But as far as I know, nobody studies "Nordic languages" at any university - either it is Scandinavian languages, or Fenno-Ugric languages, or different minority languages. And to those studying language politics or linguistic minorities, the book may contain otherwise unavailable information, but without the proper cultural context and the theoretical discussions, which make this relevant. And, I am sad to say, this does tend to make the reading quite tedious.

Still, I find that The Nordic "idea", the cooperation in different cultural contexts, is a good idea and one worth fighting for. I have myself for several years enjoyed the fruitfull discussion in "Nordic Summeruniversity", and have made friends all over the Nordic countries. But to group these countries together as if this was a natural thing to do, and pretend there exists some kind of "deeper" understanding between the inhabitants underneath the serious linguistic difficulties is not a wise thing to do. The only ones who seriously believe that the Inuits of Greenland, the Sami, the Finns, and the Scandinavians feel some kind of natural togetherness are the people in the Nordic Council - not the students in linguistics departments all over the world.

The single most interesting feature, as seen from a linguistic and pragmatic point of view, is the fact that Scandinavians actually manage to communicate, each using his own language. This has been termed "the Scandinavian semi-communication", which is a badly chosen expression, but it is a unique situation, given the fact that Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian are three separate languages (but, again, not for linguistic reasons but for political reasons). Unfortunately,

this part of Vikør's report does not enter into the pragmatic reasons for the success of this "semi-communication", nor the communicative consequences. Instead, we are left with a discussion on the degree of understanding between the three languages.

As a teacher of Danish at Uppsala University, my personal experiences tell me that these statistics are, at their best, not very reliable. The problem is that the Interscandinavian understanding is very hard to measure, as it is intimately connected with the pragmatics of communication. The topic, the speaker, the addressee, and the context are crucial in all kinds of communication, but even more so in the Interscandinavian communication. They are the factors which act as a counterweight to the ambiguity which arises when two languages are confronted. If we want to examine the specific features of Interscandinavian communication, it is to this part we must pay our attention. Publishing a book on "the Nordic languages" as if it were a natural fact may in fact contribute to the false picture of the Nordic countries as "one happy family", when the fact is that a majority of young Swedes even at university level admit to speaking English when in Denmark - and hoping for the Danes to answer in English!

Orla Vigsø

Ordbog over det danske Sprog. Første bind A (Aa) - Bh. København: Gyldendal. Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab, 1992.

Ordbog over det danske Sprog (ODS) – das zwischen 1918 und 1956 erschiene-
ne 28bändige dänische Nationalwörterbuch, das sich in vielerlei Hinsicht mit
lexikographischen Leistungen wie etwa dem *Deutschen Wörterbuch* der Brüder
Grimm oder dem *Oxford English Dictionary* vergleichen läßt – gilt heute noch
als ein Musterbeispiel philologisch-akribischer Qualität, und seine Bedeutung
für die Erforschung der dänischen Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte kann kaum
überschätzt werden. Dieses Urteil wird nicht nur durch die Fülle begeisterter
Rezensionen aus dem Erscheinungszeitraum untermauert (z.B. Flom 1931, Joli-
vet 1934 und Ranisch 1932), sondern auch durch die Tatsache, daß das Wörter-
buch bis heute drei unveränderte photomechanische Nachdrucke erfahren hat.
Einen Eindruck des hochqualifizierten Teams von Mitarbeitern an dem von Ver-
ner Dahlerup gegründeten und seit 1915 von der dänischen Sprach- und Litera-
turgesellschaft weitergeführten Wörterbuch gewinnt man ferner durch die bio-
graphischen Darstellungen zu namhaften Persönlichkeiten wie beispielsweise
dem Literaturwissenschaftler Paul V. Rubow bzw. dem Sprachwissenschaftler
Kristian Sandfeld, von deren Mitarbeit am Wörterbuch etwa in Billeskov Jansen
(1983, 244-245) und Skytte (1991, 82-86) berichtet wird.

Die Notwendigkeit einer ergänzenden Bearbeitung wurde jedoch schon früh erkannt, denn wie andere über einen längeren Zeitraum herausgegebene Großwörterbücher leidet auch das ODS fast naturgemäß an gewissen Homogenitätsproblemen: Erstens wurde zwar für sämtliche Bände das Jahr 1700 als etwaiger Anfangszeitpunkt angesetzt, aber da der Endzeitpunkt einfach mit dem Redaktionsschluß der jeweiligen Bände zusammenfällt, fehlt eine einheitliche Berücksichtigung des Zeitraums zwischen 1918 und 1955, d.h.: In einer Neubearbeitung müßte für die gesamte Wörterbuchstrecke ein festgesetzter Endzeitpunkt – z.B. eben das Jahr 1955 – eingeführt werden. Zweitens liegen den einzelnen Bänden teilweise unterschiedliche redaktionelle Richtlinien zugrunde, u.a. in bezug auf die Fach- bzw. Fremdwörter, die Ersatzwörter der Puristen sowie die Komposita, die in den jüngeren (und daher auch umfangreicheren) Bänden bei weitem viel stärker vertreten sind, als es besonders in den ersten fünf Bänden der Fall war. Drittens hat allmählich eine Erweiterung des Quellenkorpus (u.a. zugunsten der Zeitungen, einer in den früheren Bänden eher vernachlässigten Textsorte) stattgefunden, und hinzu kommt noch, daß erschöpfende Verweisstrukturen selbstverständlich erst nach dem Vorliegen des Gesamtwerkes möglich sind. So wurde die Überarbeitung der gesamten Wörterbuchstrecke bereits 1956 angefangen – eine Arbeit, die seit 1965 unter der Leitung von Anne Duekilde intensiviert wurde und die bis heute in nicht weniger als 1,5 Millionen Wörterbuchzetteln (gegenüber ca. 2,5 Millionen im Hauptwerk) resultiert hat. Im Gegensatz zur Neubearbeitung etwa des Deutschen Wörterbuches oder des Oxford English Dictionary (1989), in denen Ergänzungen und Hauptwerk bei der Neubearbeitung integriert wurden, hat man es im Falle von ODS vorgezogen, die Ergänzungen in einem gesonderten fünfbändigen *Supplement (ODS-S)* darzubieten, von dem der erste Band (*ODS-S.I*) mit Unterstützung der Stiftung Carlsbergfondet bzw. des dänischen Kultusministeriums Ende 1992 beim Verlag Gyldendal erschienen ist. Insgesamt wird mit vier weiteren Ergänzungsbänden gerechnet, die jeweils 1994, 1996, 1999 bzw. 2003 erscheinen sollen und die aufgrund der oben bereits angesprochenen größeren Ergänzungsbedürftigkeit der älteren ODS-Bände immer längere Wörterbuchstrecken enthalten werden.

Der jetzt vorliegende erste Ergänzungsband *ODS-S.I*, der die Strecke *A (Aa)* bis *Bh* berücksichtigen will, umfaßt insgesamt 712 Seiten: Neben einem kurzen Geleitwort des Herausgebers, der dänischen Sprach- und Literaturgesellschaft, findet sich zuerst eine Einleitung von 66 Seiten (u.a. zum historischen Hintergrund und zum Aufbau der Wörterbuchartikel sowie mit einem Abkürzungsverzeichnis und einer Auswahlbibliographie der über das ODS verfaßten Sekundärliteratur). Danach folgt der Wörterbuchteil, der aus 10.536 Artikeln auf 645 Seiten zu je zwei Spalten von jeweils 58 nummerierten Zeilen besteht – alles, zugleich ein Stück Buchhandwerk, auf Qualitätspapier in schön lesbaren "Melior"-Typen und mit Hilfe von *Compulexis* gedruckt, einem EDV-Programm, das auf den Erfahrungen des ursprünglich von der dänischen Forschungsgemein-

schaft der Geisteswissenschaften (Statens Humanistiske Forskningsråd) initiierten DANLEX-Projekts basiert (vgl. dazu Hjorth et al. 1987).

Die Ergänzungen beziehen sich zum einen auf solche Stichwörter, die gegenüber dem ODS in dem Sinne "neu" sind, daß sie im ODS nicht vorkommen, sei dies nun darauf zurückzuführen, daß die betreffenden Stichwörter zum Redaktionsschluß des ODS noch nicht als Lexeme existierten, aus irgendwelchen redaktionellen Gründen damals nicht berücksichtigt werden konnten oder sich auf Lemmata in jüngeren ODS-Bänden beziehende Verweislemmata darstellen. In diese Gruppe sogenannter "neuer" Stichwörter, aus denen der Ergänzungsband mehr als zur Hälfte besteht, gehören typisch: a) in die Allgemeinsprache aufgenommene Fach- und Fremdwörter, b) Ersatzwörter der Puristen, c) Komposita und d) Derivativa. Zum anderen bestehen die Ergänzungen in Änderungen und Hinzufügungen zu solchen Stichwörtern, die im ODS zwar bereits vorhanden sind, die aber in irgendwelcher Hinsicht der Redaktion als ergänzungsbedürftig erschienen sind, beispielsweise in bezug auf durchsichtigere Bedeutungserläuterungen, das Hinzufügen neuer (und z.T. im Zuge der gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung aufgekommener) Sememe, genauere Datierungen, aussagekräftigere Belege und vieles mehr.

Trotz der weitgehenden Beibehaltung des ursprünglichen lexikographischen Konzepts des ODS kommen doch auch im konzeptionellen Bereich einige geringfügige Änderungen vor. Beispielsweise sind die Fachsprachenmarkierungen des ODS in Form von Piktogrammen (z.B. eine Blume für *Botanik*, ein Merkurstab für *Handel*, ein Degen für *militärisch*, ein Anker für *maritim* usw.) durch die entsprechenden lexikalischen Ausdrücke ersetzt worden. Außerdem wird bei den "neuen" Stichwörtern vernünftigerweise auf Ausspracheangaben verzichtet, da es sich beim ODS-S auf keinen Fall mehr um ein gegenwartsbezogenes Wörterbuch handelt (die Ausspracheangaben des – zumindest partiell gegenwartsbezogenen – ODS waren, nebenbei bemerkt, ohnehin schon immer ziemlich problematisch, u.a. weil sie auf den – wenigstens nach 1906 – ziemlich veralteten Angaben bei Jespersen 1906 fußten).

Die Artikelpositionen sind – wie im ODS – maximal die folgenden: a) Lemma, b) Wortklasse, c) Wortvarianten, d) Aussprache (nicht im ODS-S), e) Flexionsmorphologie, f) Etymologie, g) Gebrauch (hierunter Bedeutungserläuterung bzw. diasystematische Markierungen wie *Botanik*, *Handel* u.ä.), h) ein umfangreicher Belegteil (hierunter Datierung des Belegs). Begrüßenswert ist außerdem die im Vergleich zum ODS jetzt konsequenter gehandhabte Berücksichtigung der onomasiologischen Vernetzung des Wortschatzes mit Hilfe der sich auf eventuelle (partielle) Synonyme eines gegebenen Lemmas beziehenden Abkürzung *jf.* (= vgl.).

In der Einleitung wird mehrmals betont, daß das ODS-S kein selbständiges Werk ist, sondern als Ergänzungsband immer zusammen mit dem Hauptwerk zu benutzen ist, was konkreter formuliert bedeutet, daß der Benutzer die Auskünfte

im ODS Zeile für Zeile mit denjenigen im ODS-S zu vergleichen hat. Daß dieses Verfahren die Benutzungssituation bis zu einem erheblichen Grad erschwert, kann kaum geleugnet werden: Ohne jeden Zweifel wäre die Nachschlagehandlung durch den Benutzer einfacher, falls die Ergänzungen – so wie es beispielsweise bei der Neubearbeitung des Deutschen Wörterbuches oder des Oxford English Dictionary der Fall ist – in einer Neuauflage des gesamten Werkes integriert worden wären. Aber gerade ein solcher jemandem sofort gleichsam in die Augen springender Nachteil legt die Vermutung nahe, daß die Herausgeber sogar sehr gute Gründe für den Verzicht auf eine solche integrierte Neuauflage gehabt haben. Vorstellen könnte man sich, daß Überlegungen sowohl finanzieller wie vielleicht auch wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Art dabei ausschlaggebend gewesen sein könnten: Teils ist die Herausgabe von fünf Ergänzungsbänden (für Verlag sowie Käufer) selbstverständlich mit einem unvergleichbar geringeren Kostenaufwand verbunden als die Herausgabe etwa 33 neuer Bände, teils könnte der Verzicht etwa mit irgendwelchen Pietätsgefühlen in bezug auf den Wunsch nach dem Weiterfunktionieren des Hauptwerkes in seiner alten Gestalt im Zusammenhang stehen. Es bleibe jedoch dahingestellt, ob sich dies alles nun in der Tat auch so verhält, denn in der ansonsten sehr breit angelegten Einleitung erfährt man zu diesem zentralen und unter lexikographiegeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten hochinteressanten Thema leider überhaupt nichts.

Gerade aufgrund der fehlenden Integration der Ergänzungen wird der Benutzer erwarten können, daß aus den einzelnen Artikeln deutlich hervorgeht, genau wie sich die im ODS.S-I enthaltenen Ergänzungen konkret auf das ODS beziehen, und daß der Gebrauch der dabei verwendeten Textsymbole in einer zentral platzierten Übersicht erläutert wird. Außerdem kann der Benutzer eine genaue bibliographische Aufschlüsselung der im Belegteil der Wörterbuchartikel verwendeten Quellensiglen verlangen, damit ihm die Verifikation der zitierten Belege anhand der Quellen selbst ermöglicht wird.

Aus der Einleitung, wo die Beziehung der ODS-S-Artikel zum ODS sehr gründlich erläutert wird, geht – nach etwa 30 Seiten mit einer Fülle von Informationen vor allem zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Bandes, hierunter mit einer Namensnennung vieler der im Laufe der Jahre beteiligten Mitarbeiter – in einem Abschnitt auf Seite XXXIV hervor, daß das im Falle von Hinzufügungen verwendete Symbol ein Plus-Zeichen darstellt. Bei neuen Artikeln (d.h. solchen, die im ODS nicht vorkommen) steht das Plus vor dem Lemma. Bei Hinzufügungen zu solchen Stichwörtern, die im ODS bereits vorhanden sind, steht das Plus-Zeichen vor dem hinzuzufügenden Text. Je nach Art der Korrekturen werden diese mit Formulierungen wie *udgår*, *læs* und *artiklen erstattes af* gekennzeichnet. Allerdings wird nur der Anfang und nicht das Ende einer gegebenen Ergänzung explizit gekennzeichnet, weshalb der Benutzer eine Erläuterung der konkreten Reichweite z.B. eines Plus-Zeichens benötigt. Diesen Hinweis findet er denn auch in der Einleitung; zwar nicht in dem genannten Abschnitt Seite XXXIV,

wohl aber in einem längeren Abschnitt über Beleggruppen Seite XLV, wo es über das Pluszeichen u.a. folgendes heißt:

Plustegnene indgår i hierarkiet, idet deres rækkevidde er bestemt af placeringen. Når der tilføjes en ny hovedbetydning, fx + 3), så rækker dette plus naturligvis til hele betydning 3, der evt. kan indeholde underordnede citatgrupper (ligesom plus foran et opslagsord gælder for hele artiklen). Hvis der tilføjes flere nye hovedbetydninger sættes der plus foran hver enkelt, + 4), + 5) osv. Samme praksis, med plus foran hver enkelt, er fulgt ved plankegrupperne.

Når S-artiklen går ind i begyndelsen af en citatgruppe for at tilføje noget, fx 2) +, så rækker dette plus til både redaktionelle oplysninger og kildemateriale, og desuden til de underordnede grupper faste ordforbindelser og koloncitater. Ofte gentages noget af ODS' citatgruppekarakteristik, til orientering for læseren, før plusset sættes.¹

Mit etwas Geduld findet der Benutzer also – wenn auch an verschiedenen Stellen in der Einleitung und nicht selten in einer mit der Ausdrucksweise der Merkblätter der dänischen Steuerbehörden vergleichbaren Sprache ausgedrückt – durchaus alle für die Nachschlagehandlung notwendigen Hinweise. Aus der Sicht des Benutzers muß das Fehlen einer zusammenfassenden Übersicht über sämtliche für die Nachschlagehandlung unbedingt notwendige Hinweise bedauert werden.

Von einem anderen Gesichtspunkt aus betrachtet, und zwar dem des Metalexikographen, gibt es eine Reihe von Punkten, bei denen man das Urteil der ODS-S-Redaktion von vornherein mit Spannung erwartet hatte. Unternimmt man nun anhand der Einleitung etwa den Versuch, der zentralen Frage nachzugehen, wann bei der Bedeutungserläuterung zugunsten des phrastischen und wann zugunsten des partiell synonymischen/heteronymischen Erläuterungstyps entschieden wurde, ist man leider enttäuscht: Die Einleitung enthält (auf Seite XXV) nur insgesamt 2 1/2 Zeilen zum Problem der Bedeutungserläuterung, wobei das Wesentliche sogar in Klammern und mit Hilfe des (in der Einleitung nebenbei bemerkt leider zu frequent vorkommenden) wenig aussagekräftigen Adverbs *ofte* abgehandelt wird:

¹ [Die Pluszeichen gehen in die Hierarchie ein, da ihre Reichweite von ihrem Platz her bestimmt wird. Wenn eine neue Hauptbedeutung, z.B. + 3), hinzugefügt wird, so bezieht sich dieses Plus natürlich auf die gesamte Bedeutung Nr. 3, die evtl. untergeordnete Beleggruppen enthalten können (ebenso wie ein Plus vor einem Nachschlagewort sich auf den ganzen Artikel bezieht). Wenn zusätzliche neue Hauptbedeutungen hinzugefügt werden, wird vor jede einzelne Hauptbedeutung ein Plus gesetzt: + 4), + 5) usw. Dieselbe Praxis, d.h. vor jeder einzelnen Gruppe steht ein Plus, ist bei den Plankegruppen befolgt worden. Wenn im S-Artikel innerhalb einer Beleggruppe etwas hingefügt wird, z.B. 2) +, so bezieht sich dieses Plus nicht nur auf redaktionelle Informationen bzw. auf das Quellenmaterial, sondern außerdem auch auf untergeordnete Gruppen, feste Wortverbindungen und Kolonbeleggruppen. Häufig wird ein Teil der Wortgruppencharakteristik des ODS als Orientierungshilfe für den Leser vor dem Pluszeichen wiederholt].

Undertiden kan en jf.-henvisning erstatte betydningsbeskrivelsen (svarende til at synonymet ofte erstatter en egentlig betydningsbeskrivelse).²
[Hervorhebung durch den Rezensenten].

Ebenfalls hätte man aus theoretischer Sicht gerne die Auffassung der Redaktion vom Verhältnis zwischen semantischen und enzyklopädischen Informationen bei der Bedeutungserläuterung gekannt. Findet man in der Einleitung zu diesem Thema keine Auskünfte, so fällt trotzdem auf, daß man sich im ODS-S offensichtlich stärker als im ODS für den enzyklopädischen Gesichtspunkt einsetzt, vgl. z.B. s. v. *Barbermaskine*:

ODS 1918

Barber- [...] -maskine, en. *apparat, hvormed man kan barbere sig selv.*
Pol. 8/41914.3.

ODS-S 1992

Barber- [...] -maskine, en. *artiklen erstattes af: apparat (opfundet 1901 af amerikaneren Gillette) som er holder for barberbladet, der ved maskinens sammenskrining bringes i den bøjede form som giver det en skrå stilling i forhold til skæghårene; fra o. 1950 ogs. om elektrisk drevet skæreapparat; elektrisk barbermaskine; shaver. Pol. 8/4 1914.3. paa en øde Ø uden Babérmaskine og rent Halm i Træskoene. Storm P. *BedreBørnsFolk. (1930).14. Sal.T.1943-44.66. jf.: de nye elektriske T ø r - B a r b e r i n g s m a s k i n e r*, som i Øjeblikket sælges i stort Omfang i U.S.A. og England. *EAlkjær.Emballagen.(1939).51.* den elektriske barbermaskine er en tørbarbermaskine .. Den første brugbare elektriske barbermaskine fremkom i 1931. *NySal.319.**

Beispielsweise ist aus diesem Artikel sofort erkennbar, wieviel bewundernswerte Präzisionsarbeit nicht nur in bezug auf die Bedeutungserläuterung, sondern überhaupt im Wörterbuch geleistet wurde. Auch bei der Auswahl der Belege hat sich die Redaktion viel Mühe gegeben. Der älteste Beleg wird immer zitiert, und das syntagmatische Potential des betreffenden Lexems wird im Belegteil in vorbildlicher Weise veranschaulicht. Obwohl dies in der Einleitung nicht eigens expliziert wird, geht aus den Artikeln hervor, daß häufig – was in der historischen Lexikographie immer besonders wertvoll ist – Beispielbelege des textinternen definitionsartigen Erläuterungstyps³ sorgfältig ausgewählt wurden, vgl. z.B. s. v. *II.Babs*:

Hvad er en Babs for noget? | Det er en helt ny Ting | Et Pigebarn paa 14,
| der siger det med Swing, | udstøder Gurglelyde | til rytmisk Jazzmusik.⁴

Beeindruckend ist ferner der Umstand, daß insgesamt nicht weniger als 18.900 Quellen exzerpiert und lexikographisch ausgewertet wurden. Was die verkürzten

² [Manchmal ersetzt ein durch die Abkürzung jf. (= vgl.) eingeleiteter Hinweis die Bedeutungsbeschreibung (entsprechend der Tatsache, daß Synonyme öfters eine eigentliche Bedeutungsbeschreibung ersetzen)].

³ Zur Typologisierung von Beispielbelegen vgl. z.B. Reichmann (1988).

⁴ [Was ist ein Babs? | Das ist ein ganz neues Ding | Ein Mädchen von 14 Jahren, | das etc.].

Titel betrifft, können die vollen bibliographischen Angaben entweder im ODS, Band 28 (insgesamt 6.000 Quellen) oder – falls es sich um “neue” Quellen handelt (d.h. solche, die nicht im Korpus des ODS eingingen) – im ODS-S Seite LI nachgeschlagen werden (insgesamt 400 Quellen). Was die nicht verkürzten Titel betrifft (insgesamt 12.500), so werden diese weder im ODS noch im ODS-S aufgeschlüsselt, sondern der Benutzer muß sie entweder in den Bibliotheken oder in den bibliographischen Nachschlagewerken wie z.B. der *Bibliotheca Danica* oder dem *Dansk Bogfortegnelse* nachschlagen. Im Korpus besonders dicht vertreten ist die schöne Literatur (und das ODS ist somit gleichzeitig ein hervorragendes Klassikerwörterbuch). Zunehmend sind jedoch auch z.B. Zeitungen, Zeitschriften, Briefe, Fachbücher und Enzyklopädien benutzt worden. Aus metalexikographischer, hierunter auch lexikographiegeschichtlicher, Sicht hätte man jedoch gern aus der Einleitung erfahren, genau wieviele Seiten der einzelnen Quellen mit welcher Dichte exzerpiert wurden und wie die Quellen im einzelnen diasystematisch verankert sind: Ein vollständiges Quellenverzeichnis mit diasystematischen Angaben ist ein Desiderat.

Aus dem soeben Angeführten wird hervorgegangen sein, daß die Hinweise zur Benutzung des ODS-S.I zwar in der Einleitung vorhanden sind, daß ihre Unterbringung an verschiedenen Stellen neben z.B. lexikographiegeschichtlichen und biographischen Informationen nicht gerade mit dem Prädikat *benutzerfreundlich* zu charakterisieren ist, ebenso wie die – auffällig frequente – Verwendung einschränkender Adverbiale wie *ofte, normalt, undertiden* und *af og til* nicht immer zu der Klarheit beiträgt, die man sich von einer lexikographischen Einleitung hätte wünschen können. War auch das ODS “not immediately accessible to the untrained user”⁵ und kann die Redaktion des ODS-S auch mit Recht ein gewisses Bildungsniveau bei den Benutzern voraussetzen, so wäre es doch sicher nicht unmöglich, sondern in Anbetracht des Fehlens der oben bereits angesprochenen Integration der Ergänzungen im Hauptwerk geradezu sehr angebracht gewesen, ein kurzes Kapitel mit den notwendigsten Hinweisen etwa ganz am Anfang zu bringen. Dies hätte übrigens zur Folge gehabt, daß die drauffolgende lexikographische Einleitung sich nicht so sehr an den praktischen Benutzer, sondern in höherem Grade ausschließlich an den metalexikographisch Interessierten hätte wenden können, der gerne von den langjährigen theoretischen Überlegungen der unbedingt als lexikographische Autorität aufzufassenden Redaktion gelernt hätte.⁶ – Obgleich die Herstellung des Bandes lange Zeit gefordert und viel Mühe gekostet hat, bedeutet dies aber nicht umgekehrt, daß es auch lange Zeit fordern und viel Mühe kosten muß, das Wörterbuch zu benutzen.

⁵ Hjorth (1991, 1915, linke Spalte).

⁶ Vgl. z.B. die Weise, wie im *Frühneuhochdeutschen Wörterbuch* zwischen einem Kapitel mit Hinweisen zur Benutzung des Wörterbuches (S. 1-6) und der lexikographischen Einleitung (S. 10-164) unterschieden wird.

Diese wenigen kritischen Bemerkungen in bezug auf die Benutzerfreundlichkeit seien keineswegs im negativen Sinne gemeint, sondern sie sind vielmehr im positiven Sinne als mögliche Vorschläge für die noch nicht erschienenen vier weiteren Ergänzungsbände aufzufassen, in denen man auf eine kurze Benutzungsanleitung (etwa auf dem Umschlag?) und vielleicht ein erschöpfendes Quellenverzeichnis hoffen könnte.

Fest steht aber folgendes: Durch den Ergänzungsband ist das eingangs angesprochene Homogenitätsproblem des ODS für die Strecke *A (Aa)* bis *Bh* in überzeugender Weise gelöst, und dank der mühsamen Fleißarbeit und bewundernswerten Akribie der Mitarbeiter, von denen viele lange Jahre hindurch ehrenamtlich gearbeitet haben, ist es der Redaktion und den Herausgebern durchaus gelungen, die philologische Tradition des ODS auf einem Niveau fortzusetzen, das mit Sicherheit nicht hinter den Großwörterbüchern anderer (lies auch: größerer) Nationen zurücksteht. Das ODS-S.I zu benutzen (d.h. auch einfach darin herumzulesen) ist u.a. ein philologisches, ein sprachgeschichtliches, ein kulturgeschichtliches, ein lexikographisches, ein metalexikographisches, ein lexikographiegeschichtliches und ein ästhetisches – kurz: ein intellektuelles – Erlebnis und Vergnügen zugleich. – Daß diese beeindruckende lexikographische Leistung es aber andererseits verdient hätte, in einer integrierten Neuauflage präsentiert zu werden, ist eine nach Ansicht des Rezensenten nicht ernsthaft anzufechtende Tatsache.

Den restlichen vier Ergänzungsbänden sei ein guter und planmäßiger Fortgang gewünscht, damit der Synchronie und Diachronie des dänischen Wortschatzes im Zeitraum 1700 bis 1955 endlich eine umfassende lexikographische Beschreibung nach einheitlichen Prinzipien zuteil werden möge.

Literatur

- Billeskov Jansen, F. J. (1983): *Liv og Lærdom. Kapitler af dansk Videnskabs Historie*. København.
- Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm*. I-XXVII. Leipzig 1854-1971. – Neubearbeitung, hrsg. von der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR in Zusammenarbeit mit der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1. Band: *A–Affrikata*, Leipzig 1983.
- Flom, George T. (1931): *Ordbog over det Danske Sprog I-XII, A-luevarm*, 1918-31, in: *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XXX. Urbana, Illinois, USA, 583-585.
- Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Hrsg. von Robert R. Anderson / Ulrich Goebel / Oskar Reichmann. Berlin/New York 1986–.
- Hausmann, Franz Joseph/Oskar Reichmann/Herbert Ernst Wiegand/Ladislav Zgusta (Hrsg.) (1991): *Wörterbücher - Dictionaries - Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie - International Encyclopedia of Lexicography - Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*. Berlin/New York.

- Hjorth, Ebba et al. (1987): *Descriptive Tools for Electronic Processing of Dictionary Data. Studies in Computational Lexicography*. (Lexicographica. Series Maior; 20). Tübingen.
- Hjorth, Poul Lindegård (1991): Danish Lexicography, in: Hausmann/Reichmann/Wiegand/Zgusta (Hrsg.) (1991), 1913-1922.
- Jespersen, Otto (1906): *Modersmålets fonetik*. København og Kristiania.
- Jolivet, A. (1934): Ordbog over det Danske Sprog I-XIV. 1918-1933, in: *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature*. Paris, 405-407.
- Ordbog over det danske Sprog*. Udgivet af Det danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. 28 Bde. København 1918-1955.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. (A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles)*. I-XII. Oxford 1884-1928. – Ergänzung. 1933. – Ergänzung I-IV. 1972-86. – 2. Aufl. (integrierte Ausgabe) I-XX. 1989.
- Ranisch, W. (1932): Ordbog over det danske Sprog, in: *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*. LI. Berlin, 133-134.
- Reichmann, Oskar (1988): Zur Funktion, zu einigen Typen und zur Auswahl von Beispielbelegen im historischen Bedeutungswörterbuch, in: Hyldgaard-Jensen, Karl / Zettersten, Arne (Hrsg.): *Symposium on Lexicography III. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography May 14-16, 1986, at the University of Copenhagen*. Tübingen, 413-444. (Lexicographica, Series Maior; 19).
- Skytte, Gunver (1991): *Kr. Sandfeld. En hovedperson i dansk romanistiks historie*. København.

Jens Erik Mogensen