

**Prikazi knjiga**  
**Book reviews**  
**Rezensionen**

**Amela Ćurković**

**Eva Lokotar**

**Klara Bilić Meštrić**

Filozofski fakultet

Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku

**Sylviane Granger and Fanny Meunier, eds. 2008. *Phraseology. An Interdisciplinary Perspective* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. xxviii, 422 pp. €125. ISSN 978 90 272 3246 5.**

Phraseology is no longer a neglected linguistic discipline. Rather than being presented as a subfield of lexicology, it has relatively recently become an established discipline of its own. The editors Sylviane Granger and Fanny Meunier give undoubtedly a significant contribution to this fact with the book under review.

In this book the editors facilitate the discussion on a wide range of issues which were explored as a result of intensive research in the field of phraseology in the recent past. Furthermore, the book specifically aims to include other disciplines in which researchers study the same types of expression as phraseology does, but from different perspectives, such as cultural, lexicographic and computational perspective. Such an approach justifies the title and character of the book which reflects an interdisciplinary dimension, thus showing that phraseology is not only a linguistic discipline.

The book has 422 pages and is divided in four thematic sections which are structured in total of 23 articles, which leads to the assumption that the editors wanted to inform the readers in detail about all aspects of contemporary phraseology. As the editors explain in the introduction, “the impetus for this volume

came from an interdisciplinary conference on phraseology entitled *Phraseology 2005. The Many Faces of Phraseology* organized in Louvain-la-Neuve in October 2005.” This book represents one of three volumes which resulted from presentations and research papers from 170 participants of the conference. The first section is entitled *Phraseology: Theory, typology and terminology*. Six articles are part of this section and they deal with different theoretical concepts, which critically address some open issues and offer various suggestions for the future research. The matter of terminology is still problematic and has overlaps and certain gaps due to varying and wide range of disciplines contributing to phraseology. The phenomena of fixed phrases and expressions are also dealt with in this but also in the following section, *Corpus-based analyses of phraseological units*, in the form of several case studies which use different word combinations but are all corpus-based. There are also different corpus methodologies offered in order to identify and analyse phraseological units in corpora. The third section titled *Phraseology across languages and cultures* presents cross-linguistic and cross-cultural approaches to phraseology dealing with language pairs which are close culturally and with those which are more remote in that respect. The fourth section entitled *Phraseology in lexicography and natural language processing* combines two more linguistic disciplines together, lexicography and natural language processing (NLP). Both monolingual and bilingual lexicography are analysed, whereby computational lexicography approach seems only natural in the fast growing development of electronic dictionaries. It seems fit to divide this review in the same four sections which reflect the structure of the book, with summaries of individual articles from each section, being presented from the authors’ point of view.

The author of the first article, Stefan Th. Gries, (*Phraseology and linguistic theory: A brief survey*) is of the opinion that there is no clear-cut definition of phraseology based on the offered and, in his opinion, too widespread concepts by various researchers so far. Therefore, he offers six parameters which should provide for more rigorous definitions of the term ‘phraseologism:’ nature and number of elements, frequency of occurrence, distance between elements, lexical and syntactic flexibility, semantic unity and non-compositionality. In the second part of the article Gries discusses the role that phraseology plays in different linguistic approaches: generative linguistics, cognitive linguistics and corpus linguistics. He stresses the need for more dialogue between these approaches due to the overlaps and shortcomings demonstrated in the works so far: On the one hand, cognitive linguists and construction grammarians have often shown little rigour in handling of frequency data and thus have much to gain from looking at how natural language processing researchers interested in phraseologisms use frequencies. On the other hand, many phraseologists have fo-

cused on a rather descriptive work on phraseologisms without integrating their accounts of phraseologisms into a larger theory of the linguistic system.

In the second article, *Disentangling the phraseological web*, Sylviane Granger and Magali Paquot, analyse two major approaches to phraseology, one being the traditional (phraseological) approach favoured by the East European tradition, which refers to fixed combinations like idioms or proverbs i.e. multi-word units, and the other more recent bottom-up corpus-based approach to identify lexical co-occurrences, identified as the distributional or frequency-based approach. This new approach includes many word combinations that would traditionally fall outside the scope of phraseology. Furthermore, France and Great Britain have quite different traditions, whereby the former favours the notion of fixedness and the latter the less fixed category of collocation. The authors state that such diversity is a source of richness but it also hinders communication between linguists and generally increases the impression of fuzziness in the field. The wider scope of the new frequency-based approach has been demonstrated through four neighbouring disciplines: semantics, morphology, syntax and discourse. In domain of semantics, for example, the distinction between free combinations like *spend a day/year* or *spend money/two pounds* is only governed by semantic co-occurrence restrictions and are thus considered as falling outside the realm of phraseology, and other multi-word units whose co-occurrence cannot be accounted for by semantics and thus qualify as phraseological units or phrasemes. After describing some of the most influential typologies of word combinations within the phraseological approach, the authors present a categorisation of multi-word units emerging from the distributional approach as their suggestion to reconcile the two approaches.

The third article in this section, *A unified approach to semantic frames and collocational patterns* by Willy Martin, aims to show that not only word meanings but also word combinations, specifically collocations, can benefit from the frame semantics. The author first presents the two 'schools' in the frame-based approach, the one more language (i.e. syntax) oriented à la Fillmore, and the other more 'knowledge' (i.e. cognition) oriented à la Minsky, and then introduced his new model called 'conceptual semantic frame' which enhances the purely quantitative, statistical, corpus-based approach with a more qualitative, cognitive, frame-based one. On a number of examples Martin demonstrates how conceptual semantic frames can help distinguish between different types of word combinations. Thus, he differentiates between type-bound collocations like *koffie malen* ('grind coffee'), token-bound collocations like *spalle koffie* ('weak coffee') and in-between cases like *koffie drinken* ('drink coffee'), which are essentially type-bound but intrude into the token-bound category because coffee is a prototypical drink. This qualitative frame-based approach is a useful way of

interpreting the data extracted automatically from corpora and can therefore be viewed as a valuable complement to quantitative corpus-based approaches.

Marija Omazić aims in her article (*Processing of idioms and idiom modifications: A view from cognitive linguistics*) to extend the application of the conceptual integration theory to idiom modification processing i.e. unpacking, in particular. The author establishes the role of the theory of conceptual metaphor and metonymy, as one of the central theories of cognitive linguistics, and of the more recent conceptual integration theory, or blending theory, of cognitive linguistics in the processing of figurative phraseological units. Furthermore, the author argues that only one factor in the processing is not enough and that instead there is a need for an interplay of factors that jointly lead to idiom interpretation (e.g. *to burn with love*), which are grouped as follows: cognitive modelling, knowledge of the language, knowledge of the world. However, in order to fully process idiom modifications Omazić considers the factors for conventional phraseological units insufficient and presents the following step sequence: recognition of the modification (using lexical, structural, semantic, or conceptual links), retrieval of the original, comparison of the original idiom and the modification (using knowledge of the language, knowledge of the world, and cognitive modelling), recognition of the communicative intent (in order to recognise the intended effects of modified idioms ranging from irony, humour, surprise and novelty) and understanding of idiom modification. This multitude of processes which occur in real time and different stages of the ‘unpacking process’ are illustrated through the conceptual integration network for *blue dress in Bush’s closet*. Similarly, the conceptual integration theory accounts for modified idiom *be born with a wooden (instead of silver) spoon in one’s mouth*. The author concludes by stressing that the two cognitive linguistic theories—metaphor theory and conceptual integration theory—are presented as complementary: both can be used to analyse phraseological material, conventional and modified, so as to provide insights into how it is processed.

The final two articles of the first section focus on two major features of phraseological units: non-compositionality and fixedness. Maria Helena Svensson argues in her article entitled *A very complex criterion of fixedness: non-compositionality* that non-compositionality, although an often used criterion in definitions of fixed expressions, is often ill-defined or simply taken for granted. In order to clarify the feature of non-compositionality the author presents four dichotomies associated with it: motivation/non-motivation, transparency/opacity, analysability/unanalysability and literal/figurative meaning, with their respective examples, such as: *white wedding/white night*, *white as snow/throw in the towel*, *pop the question/bite the dust*, *La moutarde lui monte au nez* [‘The mustard goes up his nose’] as the word unit which has a figurative interpretation

of getting angry and thus does not have a literal interpretation. In the definitions examined for each dichotomy, there is clearly an association between each of the four notions of non-motivation, opacity, unanalysability and figurative meaning and the notion of non-compositionality. But still, these concepts are not equivalents, because some examples proved that the same expression can be classified on different sides of the dichotomies. Therefore, these notions need to be clearly distinguished in phraseological studies. The interaction of a series of other notions such as prototypicality, salience and frequency is also discussed as well as some related notions like encyclopaedic non-compositionality. In conclusion, Swenson argues against using non-compositionality as an all-embracing term and suggests the need to specify which aspect of non-compositionality is intended.

The sixth article, *Reassessing the canon: 'Fixed' phrases in general reference corpora* by Gill Philip, continues the argument for reassessing fixed phrases by addressing the notion of fixedness which has long been considered as the defining feature of phraseological units together with non-compositionality. Although phraseology focuses primarily on phrase building, from word to collocate and beyond, this article sets out the case for phrase deconstruction. The reason for this lies in the fact that recent corpus-based studies have shown that beside their canonical forms, 'fixed phrases' display a wide range of variants and that variation within phraseological units is the rule rather than the exception. The article focuses on multi-word units referred to as 'phraseological skeletons' which include collocational frameworks (e.g. *an accident of birth*, *an accident of history*), lexicogrammatical frames (e.g. *beyond belief*, *beyond description*) and semi-prepackaged phrases (e.g. *the faintest idea*, *the least idea*, *the slightest idea*). The challenge posed by these types of fixed phrases is that they are very difficult to extract automatically since variants are largely unpredictable. The author, therefore, states the case for phrase deconstruction and suggests search strategies for extracting variants of idiomatic phrases.

In the first article in the section with corpus-based analyses of phraseological units, entitled *Adjective + Noun sequences in attributive or NP-final positions: Observations on lexicalization*, Pierre Arnaud, Emmanuel Ferragne, Diana M. Lewis and François Maniez examine some English adjective + noun sequences extracted from the British National Corpus (BNC) that are used as premodifiers of common nouns in order to find out whether, and if so, in which contexts they appear to be lexicalizing, e.g. [Adj. *long* + N *term*] + N *effects* = *long-term effects*, [Adj. *full* + N *time*] + N *job* = *full-time job*. All Adj + N sequences containing a highly frequent central adjective are extracted and further categorised syntactically. The analysis of these structures points to varying degrees of linear fusion of certain sequences which manifest themselves as syntactic recategorisa-

tion as Adj, N or Adv, loss of compositionality and loss of semantic transparency. At the same time, no evidence of accompanying phonological change was found, which suggests that syntactic and semantic shifts may be interdependent but phonological change may be independently motivated.

Kay Wikberg focuses in his chapter (*Phrasal similes in the BNC*) on a category of phraseological units that has been amply studied in the phraseology literature but suffers from a lack of corpus-based description. On the one hand, the concept of simile is defined and the differences between similes and comparisons pointed out, on the other hand, similes and metaphors are described in some detail with reference to the literature. Then four simile patterns are extracted from the BNC: *as Adj/Adv as*, *is like a(n)*, *is like V-ing a(n)* and *V like a(n)*. The article discusses the selection procedure which consists in sifting out literal comparisons using the reversibility test and the degree of figurativeness. This process highlights interesting differences between the patterns in terms of frequency, lexicalization and register. Moreover, Wikberg's study shows that similes fall into a relatively limited range of syntactic patterns, "a subset of comparative structures and that there is no close relation between the number of figurative stances of a given pattern and the number of figurative instances" (p. 134). Thus, the *as Adj/Adv as*-pattern is the most frequent in the BNC, but only a few per cent of the instances are similes. By contrast, the *is like a(n)*-sequence is much less common, but when it is used, the proportion of similes is very high, i.e. in the range of about 90 per cent. Despite being less common, the very same sequence is regularly figurative and innovative. Moreover, the *V like a(n)*-pattern also proves to contain a high proportion of similes, both lexicalized and innovative. In addition, the data also shows that when the co-text is examined, the world of comparisons is more complex than the impression one gets from stereotypical equations. Finally, the study shows that similes make up phraseological units which vary in figurative impact according to the comparative structure used. Some patterns are more innovative than others, i.e. *is like a(n)* and *V like a(n)*. At the same time *V like a(n)* and *as Adj as*-sequences tend to involve a high proportion of lexicalized uses. Similes, then, resemble metaphors in the sense that they form a cline from lexicalized units to more imaginative expressions.

In the chapter entitled *Foot and mouth*, Hans Lindquist and Magnus Levin combine concepts from cognitive linguistics with methods from corpus linguistics to study the phraseology formed around the frequent body part nouns FOOT and MOUTH. The material consists of the BNC accessed through Fletcher's (2003/2004) database *Phrases in English* supplemented with British, American and Australian newspapers on CD-ROM. In more than half of the occurrences in the BNC the single word forms *foot*, *feet*, *mouth* and *mouths* were used in phrases, where their meaning had often been extended



metonymically or metaphorically. The frequent lemmas FOOT and MOUTH are thus frequent at least partly because they occur in conventionalized phrases. Body parts are frequently mapped onto topographical phenomena in phrases like *the foot of the mountain* and *the mouth of the river*:

Apart from being used in phrases referring to, for instance, topographical phenomena, *mouth* is often connected to conventional ways of describing eating, drinking, speaking and the experience and expression of emotions. *Foot* more often refers to location, and also occurs in phrases expressing other meanings, such as measurement. (p. 143)

Metonymy and metaphor play a major role in the creation and extension of new phrasal patterns. Metonymic links are frequent because a physical reaction connected to the body part is used to represent the underlying emotion. In many cases these physical reactions have become such a conventionalized way of expressing the emotion that the reaction alone can stand for the emotion. The relative transparency of some phrases such as *down in the mouth*, *stamping one's foot* and *foaming at the mouth* is likely to facilitate their learning in spite of the fact that they are not very frequent in themselves. Phrases are often manipulated in various ways, so that they occur in non-canonical forms and in word play. The use of word play shows that the borderline between literal and nonliteral meanings is fuzzy, and that both, literal and nonliteral meaning can be available to speakers simultaneously, although at any given moment one is usually more salient than the other.

The article by Geoffrey C. Williams (*The Good Lord and his works: A corpus-driven study of collocational resonance*) reflects on the idiom principle outlined by John Sinclair, showing how much language consists of reused formulae of a collocational and colligational nature.

Resonance seeks to look at the usage of words and expressions that have retained strong semantic prosodies from earlier usage, prosodies of which the current user may not necessarily be aware. It appears here as a very diffuse form of intertextuality with an initial move from contextual to restricted collocation followed by a gradual move to the purely formulaic (p. 159).

This article illustrates this by exploring certain key words from the New Testament to see how they have been used in the works of Shakespeare, the other most cited source in the English language, and finally how these expressions are used in the BNC. Although having become almost purely formulaic, these expressions seem to retain sufficient religious resonance to give them their force. The first fundamental difference with other contexts is that in the Bible we have the revelation of the relationship of God with his son, who is deemed literally present; in

Shakespeare the invocation of God is through the mediation of Christianity. However, we also find that the invocation of the deity may already in some cases be purely mechanical. A phrase, such as, *God forbid*, can simply mean that something is not considered desirable. By the time we get to the BNC, these oral expressions are purely formulaic. This, in addition, does not necessarily mean that all religious meaning has gone, but that the ready invocation of a deity is no longer part of our current means of expression, at least in British English. However, it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that this is ongoing research so the conclusions are far from definitive. It is clear that contextual collocation is an important factor in the organisation of language. Collocational knowledge can act as a stimulus for information retrieval, but with the value given to the collocational unit varying with factors of time and context.

In the last article of this section, entitled *Fixed expressions, extenders and metonymy help in the speech of people with Alzheimer's disease*, Margaret Maclagan, Boyd Davis and Ron Lunsford demonstrate how fixed expressions, extender and metonymy help maintain the appearance of competence for speakers with Alzheimer's disease. They compare impaired and unimpaired speakers from two different countries (the United States of America and New Zealand) to show that speakers with Alzheimer's disease use fixed expressions, extenders and metonymy similarly to unimpaired speakers. Early in the course of Alzheimer's disease, speakers can retrieve the full range of meanings referenced by the extender or metonymy. As the disease progresses, extenders and metonymy are still used appropriately, but only the conversational partner is able to retrieve the full set of meanings. The use of fixed expressions, extenders and metonymy helps speakers with Alzheimer's disease to continue to position themselves as competent interactors and to participate in conversations.

In the first contribution in the section on phraseology across languages and cultures, entitled *Cross-linguistic phraseological studies*, Jean-Pierre Colson gives an overview of a wide range of challenging topics, from the simple comparison of idioms or metaphors in two languages, to the systematic contrastive study of all categories of set phrases across different languages. Current research demonstrates that idiomaticity is one of the key components of language and is probably universal. However, the focus of research has been primarily on European languages, and a comparison with other language families is necessary before one can draw any firm conclusions. From a theoretical point of view, cross-linguistic phraseology is a highly multi-disciplinary field. It is connected to contrastive lexicology, syntax, pragmatics and semantics, but also with semiotics and translation theory. The wide diversity of linguistic theories underpinning phraseology across languages can be an advantage, but the downside is that no single agreed methodology has been developed. Cognitive linguists largely rely on their intuition, while



corpus linguists have recourse to large corpora. A widely accepted view is that there is some truth in every theory, and future research may therefore benefit from meeting points between various linguistic schools. Moreover, cross-linguistic phraseology has important implications for translation theory and translation practice. The technological evolution in translation assessment should greatly benefit from new insights into the structure and functioning of set phrases.

The second article in this section, *Figurative phraseology and culture* by Elisabeth Piirainen, is an attempt to approach the complex of figurative phraseology and culture from various angles. The author seeks to outline the main trends in research on cultural aspects of conventional figurative language and to describe the connection between figurative units (such as idioms, proverbs, etc.) and culture as it becomes manifest in phraseological data from several languages. Numerous studies have highlighted the fact that “phasemes are not only units of a sign system, language, but also carriers of cultures, pointing out the necessity for modern phraseological research to turn to cultural phenomena” (p. 207). What exactly constitutes the connection between figurative phrasemes and culture, however, has never been examined systematically. This article uses a “typology of the cultural phenomena which underlie phrasemes, along with the relevant phraseological types, to explore this connection” (p. 207). In doing so, one has to consider both the literal and the figurative readings of phrasemes, as well as the different levels of describing phrasemes, since there are various ways in which the cultural aspects may become manifest. After defining the term *culture*, main types of cultural knowledge underlying figurative phrasemes are examined, followed by an outline of the types of phrasemes in view of their connections with cultural aspects. A look at entire conceptual domains shows that cultural phenomena are determinable at the levels of complete source concepts and semantic fields. Finally, the (im)possibility of capturing aspects of a cultural world-view by means of the analysis of cultural components and cross-linguistic comparisons is touched upon briefly, as in etymology and historical phraseology. To summarise, phrasemes as conventional figurative multi-word units that are passed on from generation to generation through continual repetition turn out to be especially suitable for revealing cultural relevant concepts.

The chapter by Annette Sabban, *Critical observations on the culture-boundness of phraseology*, argues for a more rigorous description of the culture-boundness of phrasemes, making a number of terminological proposals. In addition, Sabban suggests that a clear distinction be made between linguistic analyses and categorizations, on the one hand, and claims to modes of thinking of the present-day speaker, on the other, the latter generally being seen as belonging to the cognitive dimension of culture. A parallelism with two fundamental modes of existence of a group’s ‘cultural memory’ is identified. This amounts to distin-

guishing between concepts in language (which are the result of modes of thinking that need no longer be relevant to the users of the language) and (current) concepts of thought. Concepts in language (or linguistic concepts proper) are stored in the linguistic signs of a speech community. Current conceptual structures and modes of thinking need not coincide with them. It is hardly surprising that the investigation of these two kinds of concepts requires different and independent methods and approaches. In particular, current ways of thinking cannot be immediately inferred from the concepts accounting for the make-up of linguistic signs. Nevertheless, after arguing for a separation of these two aspects, Sabban concludes with a suggestion that reintegrates them:

Recurring patterns of conceptualization as manifest in linguistic expressions—as well as possibly other cultural codes—can be looked upon as traditions of conceptualization, these being themselves part of a culture and its legacy. Adopting this approach highlights the need to include a diachronic perspective in linguistic studies with a cultural orientation. (p. 239).

Another chapter by Elisabeth Piirainen, *Phraseology in a European framework: A cross linguistic and cross-cultural research project on widespread idioms*, gives an overview of a project *Widespread Idioms in Europe and Beyond*. The aim of this project is to make a thorough investigation into potential widespread idioms, that is, the idioms that have the same or similar lexical structure and the same figurative meaning in different languages. The author is critical of the Eurocentric approach of the previous idiom analysis practice as it has taken only the “major” languages into account. This project has included more than 70 languages, some of which are “unrelated and geographically distant” (p. 243). The results obtained (not all the European languages were analysed, namely of the Caucasian languages only Georgian took part in the project) imply that there are certain widespread idioms (WIs). The article gives an example of the idiom: *to swim against the tide/stream*, which is found in most of the European languages and in some non-European languages as well. The author questions most of the popular explanations behind these similarities, going as far as to label the common cultural European heritage a nebulous concept, as most of the WIs arise from the common cultural heritage, not particularly European. She also questions the existence of spontaneous metaphorization, as she believes that idioms that occur in different languages go back to the same textual source, even though this source cannot be always identified. The author also finds the common belief that many idioms are borrowed from English a wrong assumption. She claims that a closer analysis opposes this belief. As the general reason behind the WIs, she states the common educational code of the literate European social stratum, and this has been “achieved via reading and writing, mostly using Latin as a lingua franca” (p. 254). New media such as film producing have also had an important role in sharing these idioms. The author concludes that “the

role of textual dependence seems to be more important than has so far been assumed by phraseology research” (p. 254).

Next chapter, *Free and bound prepositions in a contrastive perspective. The case of with and avec*, written by Christelle Cosme and Gaëtanelle Gilquin, analyzes, as the title says, the possibilities of usage of *avec* as a the translational equivalent of *with* and notes that these two are rarely interchangeable. In the introductory part, the authors give a general comparative analysis of French and English prepositions, stressing the kinetic value of prepositions in English, as they often fulfil the function of a verb. The main part of the article deals with differences between *avec* and *with*. The reason behind these differences lies in *with* being more polysemous than *avec*. *With* is also more frequent, and has a wider usage than *avec*, which also plays the role in their lack of interchangeability. This means that *with* has developed more metaphorical senses than *avec*. This analysis was carried out using English-French corpus data “coming from PLECI (*Poitiers-Louvain Échange de Corpus Informatisés*), a bilingual corpus made up of journalistic and fictional texts” (Granger/Meunier 2008: 265). This corpus, as the authors state, functions both as a comparable and parallel corpus enabling analysis of both original French and English texts, while bidirectional corpus data enabled an insight into translations of *avec* into English, and of *with* into French. The authors emphasise the importance of these insights for both foreign language learning and translations.

The sixth article in this section, *Contrastive idiom analysis, The case of Japanese and English idioms of anger*, by Priscilla Ishida, gives an overview of “a method for contrastive analysis of idioms that focuses on the L1/L2 semantic networks, as well as on the way that idioms are actually used in text and discourse” (p. 275). Japanese and English verb phrase idioms of anger, including *hara ga tatsu* ‘one’s belly rises up’, *blow one’s stack/top*, etc. are analysed. The author uses corpus data and the co-occurrence test to identify semantic features which distinguish the meanings of idioms in L1 and L2. She concludes that there is no perfect overlapping in semantic networks between similar idioms in English and Japanese, the differences normally refer to features/lexical fields such as <continuative>, <instantaneous>, <time before realisation>, <other-oriented>, <expressive>.

A group of authors (O. Mudraya, S. S.L. Piao, P. Rayson, S. Sharoff, B. Babych, L. Löfberg) tries to bridge the gap between the functionalist theoretical perspective on word usage and corpus-based studies in their chapter entitled *Automatic extraction of translation equivalents of phrasal and light verbs in English and Russian*. The authors are trying to produce a “construction of reliable lists of what is called ‘phraseological units’ in general linguistics literature

or ‘multi-word expressions’ (MWEs) in literature on computational linguistics” (p. 293). The article analyzes phrasal verbs and light verbs from a multilingual perspective, namely phrasal verbs and light verbs in English and their translations in Russian and vice versa. Light verbs are defined as a set of verbs that combine with a noun (*have/take a look, give advice* etc.). The study reveals “some interesting cross-language structural divergences between the languages under consideration and shows that a phraseological expression in a language may have equivalent expressions in other languages with different morpho-syntactic structures and semantic properties” (p. 293). It also shows that, though the same phraseological expressions exist in both languages, they have different morpho-syntactic structures and semantic properties. Similarly to Croatian, there is also re-occurring pattern of having a single-word translation in Russian for English phrasal verbs. Moreover, their “study of phrasal and light verbs demonstrates that corpus-based resources can provide an invaluable help to a practising translator, as dictionaries do not cover a large variety of real-life language examples” (p. 293).

The opening article of the fourth Section of the book, *Dictionaries and collocations* by Rosamund Moon, addresses phraseology representation in dictionaries but in a narrow scope, as the author points out. First, it analyzes collocations of three very common lemmas in English (*river, rivet, riven*) drawn from the 450-million word Bank of English corpus. The author then analyses historical aspects of collocations representations in dictionaries, and focuses on their representation in monolingual dictionaries for native speakers, learner’s dictionaries, bilingual French-English dictionaries and English collocation dictionaries inquiring whether the phraseological information is redundant. The author concludes that “as it is not yet obvious that any one collocational measure, or corpus type, can supply everything necessary to create useful dictionary entries for all items...the nature of dictionaries is changing and ...descriptive phraseology as a subdiscipline has not yet fully matured” (p. 334).

The second article, *Computational phraseology: An overview* by Ulrich Heid, is, as the title states, description of computational linguistic work concerned with phraseology and is bidirectional; on the one hand, it refers to “computing and computational linguistic methods applied to phraseology” and, on the other, to “methods of automatic language processing” (p. 337.) The author stresses the partiality of the article as it is only a short overview of the bulk of work that is currently being produced, and (in the other sense of the word) the author acknowledges that certain methods are preferred to the others. Article analyses multi-word expressions (MWE) and their processing, representation of phraseological units, ways for accounting for the frequency and productivity, automatic and semi-automatic methods of extracting data on multi-word expressions

from text corpora. The author concludes that the field of computational phraseology is rapidly evolving “as NLP researchers and developers have become aware of the prevalence of non-compositional uses of lexical items in texts: it is impossible to create large scale NLP applications without ways of handling phraseological phenomena of all kinds. There is clearly a need for more research in this field” (p. 354).

The article by Cornelia Tschichold, *A computational lexicography approach to phraseologisms*, is somewhat similar to the previous one, as it also deals with the relation between phraseology and computational linguistics. However, this article is more concerned with compilation of computational phraseological database as, according to the author, “the contact zone between the two linguistic fields of phraseology and computational lexicography has a great potential for fruitful cooperation” (p. 362). Hence, the area of lexical data collection is the first point of contact and a major aim at the first stage. The second issue that the author addresses is the access route, but for those MWEs “that show considerable variation in form and variable word order of the component, a formalism for access that is linguistically transparent and at the same time technically feasible has to be found” (p. 367), in other words, the detailed formalization is required. The third issue, after a successful data base of MWEs has been compiled, refers to the development of “possible applications of the resulting lexical database in all types of complex NLP programs” (p. 368). The second part of the article describes Phrase Manager (PM), the lexical database system that offers “a transparent formalism to handle the formalization of the canonical form and all of the modifications of these complex lexemes and to specify which are possible for each expression” (p. 369). In the conclusion, the author stresses that the importance of this system also lies in that it is language-independent.

The fourth article on computational linguistics, *Extracting specialized collocations using lexical functions* by Brigitte Orliac, represents another programme—Colex, which “uses statistical measures to distinguish true collocations from free combinations” (p. 377) developed within the framework of Igor Mel’čuk’s Meaning-Text Theory, which is a multi-layer model of transforming text into the meaning and vice versa. The method for automatic extraction of specialized lexical combinations from corpora based on lexical functions is presented. The text analyzes the key concepts—collocations (from the field of computer science), lexical functions—the model for describing collocations on which the author has based the methodology. It also analyses other programmes that serve for extracting collocations. Finally, the author argues that “a combination’s ability to express one of the general meanings associated with lexical functions would represent a better test of its collocational nature than the statistical test” (p. 378).



The last article of this section, *Combined statistical and grammatical criteria for the retrieval of phraseological units in an electronic corpus* by José-Manuel Pazos Bretaña and Antonio Pamies Bertrán, also analyzes statistical and distributional approach to the automatic extraction of phraseological units from text corpora, but it applies different methods for its improvement—introduction of minimal linguistic elements (lemmatisation and grammatical tagging). The authors compared the new results with those from the previous research and have detected that “the detection ability had improved substantially” (p. 391). They repeated the same thing with a larger corpus, and again the results obtained were significantly better “with phraseological densities up to 64.5% for the verb+noun category” (p. 391).

John McH. Sinclair, who also wrote the Preface of the book, states in *Envoi, The phrase, the whole phrase and nothing but the phrase*: “Phrases have never had a proper status in linguistic theory, and, as a consequence, are anomalous in descriptions” (p. 407). The reason behind this lack of proper treatment of phrase lies in its nature between grammar and lexicon “since the central notion of a phrase entails *coselection*, the simultaneous selection from both grammar and lexis...” (p. 407), and we are well aware of the long tradition of describing grammar and lexis separately. If we want to analyse language properly, then the phrase must be central and pivotal in the description. As Sinclair states, the phrase “is the place where structures are engineered to allow meanings to take shape” (p. 408). Furthermore, the role of the computer is impressive in the elucidation of the text structure for it has proven that the multi-word units of meaning seem to be the norm, and not the word as it has ever been assumed. Taken MWUs as single units for statistical purposes might eventually produce an exhaustive lexicon of the language, which is something all linguists are attempting, Sinclair concludes.

The editors state that the aim of this volume is to reflect the interdisciplinary dimension of the phraseological studies. One cannot but agree that this aim has been thoroughly accomplished as the volume covers such a wide range of perspectives, beginning with theoretical aspect, reflecting on corpus-based analysis of phraseological units and phraseology across different languages and cultures, ending, not surprisingly, with computational linguistics. This volume might be considered a phraseological manifesto of a kind, since most of the articles clearly advocate the strong necessity for studying phrases, multi-word units, phraseological units, or whatever term we choose. The diverse terminology also testifies to the maturing and early stage of this branch of linguistics. We might conclude that this book mirrors a view that with the general increase in research in phraseology and the fast development of computational linguistics, it is a



---

rather promising linguistic discipline whose time, to put it in a phrase, has yet to come.